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

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

Anglo-Catholicism.

Its Strength and Weakness.

I GLADLY accept the courteous invitation extended to me to write in this Magazine on the subject of the Anglo-Catholic Movement. For such an invitation I am most grateful, as we are only too anxious that our real aims should be known by others. I fully realize that much that I shall say will be untenable by my readers, but this article is entirely explanatory and not argumentative in its purpose.

I must preface my remarks by a personal explanation. I am no well-known figure in Anglo-Catholic circles, and I have no right to speak with any authority for others. I am just a very ordinary Parish Priest in a crowded London area, with but little time for writing magazine articles, and with but very little chance of getting people to read what I do write! But possibly we Parish Priests, engaged all day in purely pastoral work in our parishes, can be better judges of such a Movement as the Anglo-Catholic activities than a select Committee sitting round a table and discussing theoretical problems. I presume the invitation to write this article came to me because my parish is an "Anglo-Catholic" one, and also because the one who gave the invitation knows that I am one of those people who say exactly what they feel and are not given to keeping back criticisms because they may meet with disapproval. At the commencement of what I have to say let me endeavour to explain as simply as I can what our Movement stands for. Put simply it is this, the continuation of the Oxford Movement, which was to revive the ideal of the Catholic Church and to claim that the Church of England is a living part of that Church. It is our desire to follow as humbly and as loyally as we can such famous leaders as Pusey, Keble, the saintly Bishop King of Lincoln, Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews, Canon Scott-Holland, and Father Stanton of St. Albans, Holborn. What was it these men stood for? I think we may summarize the answer by saying that it was the demand that the Church of England was an integral part of the Catholic Church founded on the Day of Pentecost. We claim that the Church of England with its insistence on the Sacramental system—a system that in past days was nearly forgotten—was and is part of the Historic Church of Christendom. We deny that any "new" Church came into existence at the Reformation. If we talk of a "reformed"

man we mean that it is the same man and not a different man who has been reformed. So with the phrase "The Reformed Church." It is the same Church, reformed in certain ways but still the same historic Church with its Sacraments and Ministry. Those who know our Movement best are fully aware that our main effort is the saving of souls and not mere empty external questions of ceremonial. I shall say more on this point anon. Every day throughout this year and last year there have been "Days of Prayer for the conversion of England" to the Catholic Faith. We have not given up our time to praying that Churches may in increasing numbers use Vestments, or so on. These Days of Prayer which have had such a truly wonderful response in crowded towns and isolated villages have been great adventures in the realm of Prayer for the winning of souls to God. And we believe most intensely that the best and only way of really winning souls is by teaching the Catholic Faith. I hope my readers will understand that I use the word "Catholic" in no small sense, such as "Roman," but in the fuller and more glorious explanation given in the Te Deum as "The Holy Church throughout all the world." We believe that The Catholic Church is the Divine scheme for the salvation of souls, with all its historic continuity and Sacramental means of Grace. It is this insistence on the Historic Church which makes us safeguard so strongly the three-fold Orders of the Sacred Ministry. If I may speak very frankly I would honestly say that I see no chance of our re-union with any who would ask us to deny the opening sentence of the Ordinal in our Book of Common Prayer, viz., "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that since the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests and Deacons." I am afraid many people imagine our main efforts are confined to such secondary matters as Ceremonial. I can only ask my readers to accept my assurance that such is not the case. We have found Ceremonial of great help and teaching power, but all Anglo-Catholics readily assert that though we regard a decent Ceremonial as a great help and incentive to worship, yet we fully realize it is a secondary matter. We are really endeavouring in our Movement to put first things first, and the first thing is personal loyalty to God and His Church.

Having now, I hope, cleared the ground as to what our real aims are, let us go on to see what the strength and weakness of the Anglo-Catholic Movement are. I hope it will be obvious that as regards dealing with our weaknesses my intention is to be as frank as one can possibly be. May I therefore ask that I may be given credit for the same honest frankness in speaking of the strength of the Movement.

OUR STRENGTH.

It is impossible within the space at my disposal to enter in detail into many points of which one could write. I will only take those points which from my parochial experience I find are the main cause for the average man desiring to join the Anglo-Catholic effort.

(1) Our appeal to History undoubtedly wins the allegiance of many. In this ever-changing world men long for Continuity, and we tell them that the most continuous thing to-day is the historic Church of Christ. Nations may fade away in power or even disappear entirely, Governments pass away from the stage of history with an almost alarming regularity. Famous men and women live their little life and pass into The Beyond. But the Church of Christ goes on its unbroken way and even if its numbers at times may decrease, yet its influence grows continually. Christians have always been a minority, but they have exercised a far greater influence on the history of the world than all the majorities. The Church of Christ has all down the ages met with every kind of persecution that the mind of man could devise to oppose it. Theological, national, civil, legal and military powers have done their best to kill Christianity, but the Historic Church still goes on its conquering way, thus showing its Divine power which alone could withstand such opposition as has been meted out to it. It has gone forward in the face of persecution of every kind, and still to-day it lives and is the world's greatest power. It owes nothing to "popularity." And men weary of changes and of an ever-increasing lack of Brotherhood look around them with wistful eyes to see what is really lasting. And we point them to the Church of Christ with its unbroken history. Without doubt this appeal to the Historic Church, of which we claim that the Church of England is an integral part, wins followers in great numbers.

(2) Although as I have already stated we regard a decent and beautiful Ceremonial as a secondary matter, yet we do not by any means belittle it. We find that a reasonable and sane desire for Ceremonial is a great need in men's minds to-day. The world longs for greater beauty amidst the terribly drab and dreary surroundings of so many lives. But our desire for a more beautiful external for our worship is no mere aesthetic wish. Our desire for Ceremonial is the response to our inner feelings that God should be worshipped in the beauty of holiness, and so our Ceremonial is a homage which we endeavour to pay to The Divine Majesty. To worship God in a Church of unprepossessing surroundings whilst in our own homes we try to surround ourselves with all that is artistic and lovely seems to us to be wrong. The Old Testament teaches us that God willed no

slovenly external worship. His instructions to Moses as to the smallest details of The Tabernacle Worship assures us that He will gratefully accept our efforts to worship Him with the homage of beauty and Art. We regard all Art of whatever form to be an offering which we can in our worship offer back to Him Who created and inspired it all. The simple Christmas decorations in some poor cottage or slum dwelling speaks of the innate desire to make things beautiful as an expression of corporate joy. This instinct we feel should be "christianized" and so save our Churches from being the dullest and ugliest building in the Parish. But, again, allow me to insist that it is not a mere aesthetic taste, but a homage on our part to the God Who made "all things bright and beautiful." We merely try to give Him of His own when we bring beauty and Art into our worship. But in some cases History again comes into the picture. Vestments, for instance, are used because we know from history that they are the "official uniform" of the Celebrant as he stands at the Altar to celebrate the Sacred Mysteries of the Holy Church. The surplice is the innovation and not Vestments. And we cling to these historical robes just as a "Beef-eater" at the Tower of London rejoices in his historic uniform and would be dumbfounded if Parliament ordered the historic uniform to be discarded for the Boy Scouts' uniform on the score that the old uniform was a relic of past ages.

(3) Another appeal which the Anglo-Catholic Movement makes is the insistence on a Disciplined Inner Life. We are beginning to realize anew that if a thing is worth doing at all it is worth doing well. Thus we endeavour to bring a new thoroughness into our Christian life. What we are ready to do in the sphere of sport or art, namely, to take real pains and practise self-discipline, we feel we must do in the spiritual realm. Let us illustrate this by two examples. The Fast before Communion. We teach that this has always been the ancient custom of the Catholic Church, and though there is no definite Church rule yet ancient custom has to all intents and purposes made it a rule conditional upon physical fitness. May I be pardoned if I quote my own experince. In my younger days I regarded "Fasting Communion" as nonsense. But gradually I found that as I recalled the tremendous sacredness of God's Gift to me of His Body and Blood I felt that so sacred a Gift demanded a bodily discipline from very reverence. Since I have learnt to submit to such voluntary discipline The Holy Communion has become a new Service altogether, and my experience could be substantiated by the experience of thousands. Or to take another instance. Consider the question of Confession. Again—in my youth the word to me was "a red rag to a bull." But as one grew in the

spiritual realm I found myself demanding some such spiritual aid and I found that the Prayer Book made full provision for it. Any Anglican Priest who teaches compulsory Confession is disloyal to the Church of England. But so is he who deliberately hides this spiritual method from his people. Our teaching is that Confession is open to all but compulsory on none. The Church knows no compulsion as to its use or neglect. And the experience of those who have used this spiritual exercise is that it is of the greatest value. An ounce of experience is worth hours of discussion or shelves of books.

(4) Again, we stress Learning. By means of Conferences, and Congresses up and down the Country the Anglo-Catholic Movement is "out to teach." Men to-day do not want what has been called "the worst form of vice—advice." They want instruction. The crowds in a London Park are thickest round the stand of the man who will teach the reason for his Faith and not round the pulpit of the man who merely gives moral exhortation. And so the Anglo-Catholic Movement is winning many a recruit by asking people to learn and think for themselves. By the issue of well got-up cheap and popular booklets dealing with the Catholic Faith we are helping people to think things out for themselves and giving them such simple help as we can. In our Churches we find a sale that astonishes us for the well-got-up 3d. Anglo-Catholic Manuals of Instruction.

(5) The last reason which I will advance for our growing numbers is the insistence that The Catholic Faith must be connected with our daily Life. For example, we stress the point that mere reception of The Blessed Sacrament is not enough. We have to live that Divinely received Life in our daily transactions and behaviour. To worship God and be untouched by the social problems of the day is wrong. We cannot love God and go on "nagging" our next door neighbour. Christianity has not always associated Faith and Practice as it should. But our insistence on this need is one great source of influence in the Anglo-Catholic Movement. When our profession of Christianity really colours our daily lives and contact with our neighbours then people are ready to know the secret, and the Anglo-Catholic answers, "You cannot really love God and yet be isolated from your neighbour and his problems."

But now let me turn to point out quite frankly some of our weaknesses.

(1) Paradoxical though it may sound, many of us regard our very success as our greatest danger. Woe-betide our work when it becomes "a popular thing" to be an Anglo-Catholic, and that danger is a very real one. Many in our midst are trying to run before they have learnt to walk. There is a grave danger that

people will accept Anglo-Catholicism as "the sort of thing to do" without having taken the trouble to realize all we stand for and the discipline which we insist on. It is here that the cult of the Ceremonial becomes so deadly. The external signs of Catholicity are useless unless backed by the inner Faith. The Church which uses Vestments, for example, because so many others are using them is a real danger and hindrance to our work. Quite frankly I admit that this danger does lurk in our midst. The first essential is definite and systematic teaching.

(2) There is also the danger lest Anglo-Catholics shall think more of their own special presentation of the Truth and of external aids than of the Church Catholic. We all know cases where the danger lurks of loyalty to a certain personality rather than to the Church as such. Quite recently this grave danger was boldly pointed out by *The Church Times*, which cannot be regarded as a foe to our Movement!

(3) Our work is being rendered more difficult by the "extreme" Party in our midst. It is useless denying that they are there and that they are a very real source of danger. Unless they are content with what they can find in the Church of England I for one wish devoutly they would join the Church of Rome. Unfortunately these "extremists" get mentioned far more in the Press then the huge loyal body of Anglo-Catholics. The vast majority of us are ready to fight any Papal jurisdiction over the Church of England. We are totally out of sympathy with the claim made by a few of the extreme party that the Laity should be denied The Chalice. We desire to honour The Mother of God as the greatest Lady of the Ages and honoured by God as no other woman was, but we refuse to offer Her the worship which alone can be given to and accepted by Her Divine Son. But, unfortunately, the excesses of a few are regarded typical of the whole. The main body of Anglo-Catholics are absolutely sound and safe as regards such matters.

(4) We have much to learn as to our Missionary duty. It would be false to pretend that as a whole the Anglo-Catholic Churches are doing their full share in the Missionary work of The Church. The Vestry Books with their details of Offertories would soon prove the contrary. But—thank God—this weakness is being remedied very largely now. But alas, a keen missionary-hearted Anglo-Catholic Church is the exception rather than the rule at present. But this matter is being attended to by an ever-increasing number, and we long for the day when the Anglo-Catholics can equal the Evangelical School of thought in their Missionary devotion.

(5) I promised to write frankly, and so I must not omit what is perhaps one of the gravest difficulties we have to face,

though I am sure my readers will realize my difficulty in writing on this point. Until the Bishops of the Church are more united amongst themselves we must not look for any great increase in the unity amongst Priests and Laity. One Bishop authorizes what his Brother Bishop of the next Diocese refuses, and the rest of us are left in a muddle that is at once unwholesome and difficult. I believe if the Bishops would speak with a united voice and not merely from their own personal prejudices there would be a response which would astonish everyone. We are often accused of "Bishop-baiting," but the truth is that we are pathetically trying to render absolute loyalty to our superiors and to work loyally with them. But as long as each individual Bishop is the judge of what he will allow or disallow, where are we? With our insistence on the three-fold Ministry which I have mentioned above are we likely to be the ones who want to go "Bishop-baiting"? If the Bishops would only summon their Synods and compel the attendance of all their Priests and take counsel with them, half our difficulties would disappear. It is ignorance of each other's stand-point which causes so much trouble to-day. If the Bishops would summon us all, regardless of "parties" to their Diocesan Synods and allow each side to explain fully what they are really out for, the Church of England would be stronger and more peaceful than at present. But until we Priests get that opportunity for mutual discussion and learning, I see no great hopes of a better mutual understanding, and in this case it is the Bishops alone who can take the initial step. In a Diocesan Synod the Priests have no executive status, but are purely a consultative body for the Bishop to consult. It allows all sections of theological thought to explain their position and all can thus learn from each other. Surely this is an obvious way in which greater internal unity within the Church of England can be gained, and the Anglo-Catholic Party earnestly desire it. May I end as I began by reminding my readers that I have tried to write purely from an explanatory point of view. I am fully aware that our views are in many cases diametrically opposed to those who are the regular readers of this Magazine, but only good can come of any attempt to know each other's stand-point better. That is the sole reason why I accepted so kind an invitation to write on this subject.

H. G. PEILE,
All Saints' Vicarage, South Acton.

Character and Ministry.

IT has been said that the culture of character is the task of life. It begins with the cradle, and who shall say when and where it ends. In our Christian ministry there is the ever-present, and all-pervasive factor of character and personality. "Give diligence to present thyself . . . a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," wrote Paul to Timothy; for work and "workmen" are here indissolubly joined. As Dr. Ritson put it the other day, "the Christian ministry is the only profession in the world in which the Message and the Messenger are inseparable." There are vocations in which workmanship may be in almost inverse ratio to the character of the worker. Dissolute genius may be artistically creative. There is a workmanship which remains what it is, apart from the test of any ethical standard. But in the cure of souls, the character basis of personality is a determinant. The nexus here between the man and his ministry is a vital one. "If a man therefore purge himself . . . he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, meet for the Master's use prepared unto every good work."

We shall possibly all admit that some of the graver perils of ministry cluster about the temptation to neglect this more "intensive" culture of our vocation. "While thy servant was busy here and there, he was gone!" A minister is busy here and there, and some, almost inperceptible, loss is more or less apparent:—a withering of moral tone, a certain perishing of spiritual power: the "quality" of our ministry is strained: the level of our spiritual receptiveness becomes low, and we are aware of a certain powerlessness to communicate anything. It has been truly said that the secret of the preacher's power is in "the presence of the life of God in his own soul, and the ability to communicate that life to others." Sylvester Horne in one of his letters wrote: "The fruit of our work on others depends upon the fruit of God's work on us." The "increase" of our ministry has its rise in the heart and soul of the preacher himself. There is the testimony of a Master in Israel. Dr. Maclaren was wont to say:—"I have always found that my own comfort and efficiency in preaching have been in direct proportion to the frequency and depth of my daily communion with God. I know of no other way in which we can do our work, but in quiet fellowship with Him."

But while we readily admit the claim and value of the

spiritual culture of the "inner life," the problem for the minister is always, how, amid a plethora of calls and tasks, to give time and attention to such culture. Perhaps the first requirement is to settle in our own minds the positive value and supremacy of character for ministry, the utility, power, and real worth of personal influence. Personality—and I use the term in quite a non-psychological sense—as an instrument in ministry can be trained and cultivated, and has a range of influence all its own. Mr. Chesterton says in his biography of Browning that the poet believed that to "every man that lived upon this earth had been given a definite and peculiar confidence of God." We are more than persons. Each has a power hidden somewhere of "personality"—a potential genius of personality. According to the New Testament the best personality is made. In Christ persons became personalities. Our Lord did not look for men and women who were specially gifted and endowed. A person, an ordinary person, was enough. Whatever the talents or talent, each had the power of doubling. Dr. Burroughs, in a suggestive chapter in one of his books, reminds us that our poverty in moral and spiritual leadership is due to the paucity of personalities. We have the persons, and we need the personalities. We could meet the need if men and women would consent to be made by Jesus Christ. He quotes the saying of George Macdonald:—"If men would but believe that they are in process of creation, and consent to be made!"

We are apt to put the balance of emphasis on work, on something accomplished, something done, and leave the potent factor of personality in ministry to take care of itself. A facetious tramway conductor asked me some time ago how I would like to earn my living. There was at least a distorted conception in the laughing rebuke, that to be a minister was to be something more than a man with a job. Underneath the "soft impeachment" there was the recognition, of a sort, that my vocation was not exhausted in terms of toil. The Christian ministry is life at a certain level of life, at a certain level of character and personality. There is something other than work which is ministry, and great ministry, too. This is not to minimise in the least the necessity for stern and unbending labour. It was the fragrance of the alabaster cruse of ointment that filled the room, not its costliness. The costly box was but the medium of something else, something intangible and priceless. Some few of our sermons are remembered, *as sermons*. But there is a sense in which they may *all* be remembered, "a sense sublime of something far more deeply interfused," something that lives on, and is interwoven in the hearts and lives of the flock of God. Dr. Stalker, in his book, *The Preacher and His Models*, quotes the

estimate of a professor on the work of the minister. This professor was reputed the most severely scientific of the staff, and it was expected that he would indulge in a scathing rebuke of the weakness of ministers, or deliver a strong exhortation to study. Dr. Stalker says: "We listened to a conception of the ministry which had scarcely occurred to any of us before. The Professor declared that the great purpose for which a minister is settled in a Church, is not to cultivate scholarship, or to visit the people during the week, or even to preach to them on Sunday, but to live among them as a good man, whose mere presence is a demonstration which cannot be gainsaid, that there is a life possible on earth which is fed from no earthly source, and that the things spoken of in Church on Sundays are realities." A minister is apt to get caught in the very machinery which, with the best intention, he sets going to increase the scope of his ministry. A diary which is all engagements, and no blanks, may bring on Sunday impotence. Robert Hall, I believe, is credited with the saying that when the devil sees that a minister is likely to be useful in the Church, his way of disposing of him is to get on his back, and ride him to death with engagements.

There is a strong urge from without to-day to the culture and spiritual equipment of our own manhood. The moral victories of character are at a discount in an age where life moves with "the vibration of a cinematograph." We can all blame the "traffic"; but can we do anything to arrest it, to make it move more safely, with less danger to soul and body? If the streets are congested to-day, so are those roads and avenues that lead in to life. Mr. Filson Young has been telling us that "people are losing or have lost, the power of resting, and life is becoming less fertile of those fruits which a more placid generation so richly harvested." We can run, but we cannot rest—unless it be a brief stop for a further supply of petrol! Our triumphs in the realm of mechanical locomotion are far ahead of our command of the more intricate and delicate machinery of personality. We are conquering distance, an achievement which has its value, no doubt, if our sense of moral values be not lost. "Greater is he that ruleth his own spirit than he that taketh a city." And part of our Christian ministry to-day is to speak through disciplined and controlled personality and character, to reveal the harvests of the quiet eye, and to show that there is a type of life capable of using wisely the rich and complex civilization of our time.

The mysticism of another day may not be our sign-post for to-day. We may be justly doubtful about a virtue that has not been put into practice. Wherever our "secret place," it must open out on to the market place. "They shall go in and out and find pasture." We must shut to our own door, and keep it shut until

we can safely open it—so that we can hear "the bubbling of the springs that feed the world." With the New Testament in our hands, and the Spirit of God as Guide, we can find "the green pastures and the still waters"—our own spiritual enrichment for our own peculiar ministry. It is somewhere "behind" and "within" that the real and abiding results of ministry are won. The weapons of our wonderful and varied warfare are spiritual.

ALLAN M. RITCHIE.

JOHN MILLER, of Hanley, in Dorset, was arrested on Sunday, 31 August, 1662, for teaching and preaching to thirty or forty people in the house of John Kingman at Britford, contrary to the King's proclamation. Both men refused to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. Their friends declared they believed Miller was a true minister. After eighteen weeks in prison, thev petitioned for release, protesting loyalty, and pleading the Declaration of Breda. Miller is the man who died in 1694, Messenger of the General Baptists. In 1666 many similar cases came up at the Wilts. Quarter Sessions, also in 1671, when 2,000 people were said to have been at a conventicle in Brockerswood, North Bradley. In 1682 the jurymen of the hundred of Aldersbury refused to present a conventicle frequently held there. In 1689 twenty places were certified to Quarter Sessions for Protestant dissenting worship.

* * * * * *

ANNE COOPER of Alington was presented to Quarter Sessions in Wilts. for not coming to church. John Rede, (colonel, of Idmiston) wrote to the clerk of the peace to have her name struck out; she was a godly woman, delighting to hear the truth by whomsoever it was delivered in the fear of the Lord, and usually took all opportunities to hear such as were enabled by the Spirit of Truth to make known what they had received of the Lord.

* * * * * *

SAMUEL OATES, 29 June, 1646. This day I held against Oates the Anabaptist, morning and afternoon. Argument: that they had no ministry, and that particular Christians out of office had no power to send ministers out to preach. He confessed it, and held only to do what he did as a disciple; I showed him it was contrary to scripture. Our discourse was without passion. The man boldly continued in town till Wednesday, exercising all three days. *Diary of Ralph Josselin,* vicar of Earles Colne, Essex: Royal Historical Society, 1908.

"Faith and Creed."

(An address given to the London University Theological Students' Union, at Regent's Park College, on Friday, February 23rd, 1921; now printed in commemoration of the sixteenth centenary of the Creed of Nicaea (1925).

IF we had been meeting to discuss the subject of "Faith and Creed" half a century ago, I might have begun by quoting the obvious couplet to which the representative poet of the Victorian age had given the currency of a proverb:—

> "There lives more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds."

But in this Georgian epoch, I can quote it only in a Revised Version, in view of present tendencies and present needs:—

> "There lives more faith in honest creeds,
> Believe me, than in half the doubts."

When doubts have become a conventional fashion, most men need to be told that there is something to be said for creeds, and that morality cannot afford to dispense with religion. Every faith involves a creed, and our subject is not the perilous and rather stupid antithesis, "Faith *or* Creed," but "Faith *and* Creed." Faith is a personal trust and loyalty; creed is the intellectual analysis, more or less authoritative, of the belief which that trust implies. We must distinguish clearly between them, but only to do justice to their ideal unity.

Most of us, when we are young, are in too great a hurry to find a formula by which to live; then, when one formula after another proves inadequate to the complex art of living, some men turn away from all formulae as useless. We are rightly eager to discover the secret of the happy life; we are wrongly expectant that someone will be able to formulate it in a manner exactly suited to our individual needs. I have a keen remembrance of my own impatience as a student with one preacher or speaker or writer after another who led me along some promising path, only to leave me at what seemed a parting of the ways, if not in a blind alley. I am more charitable towards them to-day, not simply because I have learnt how hard it is to make truth living, but even more because I am convinced that in every man's path of faith there is a point where he must choose for himself, a point at

which the will must reinforce the intellect, a point at which the whole personality must make its venture of faith. We may, indeed, we must, use a creed either explicitly or implicitly in all attempts at religious instruction; but we must not confuse the result of our instruction with personal faith, individual conviction. One great change for the better has come in all modern education, and that is the substitution of the laboratory for the museum, of emphasis on the process rather than on the exhibition of the product. Sir Francis Darwin has told us that "when science began to flourish at Cambridge in the 'seventies, and the University was asked to supply money for buildings, an eminent person objected and said, 'What do they want with their laboratories? Why can't they believe their teachers, who are in most cases clergymen of the Church of England?'" We have learnt, or at least we are learning, that the acquisition of personal faith takes us of necessity into the laboratory of life. The creed has its legitimate and even necessary place, like that of the analytical tables used by the chemist; but you cannot learn chemistry out of a text-book, and you cannot learn faith out of a creed. Begin with the articles of a whole creed and you may worry yourself into the belief that you are not a Christian at all. Begin with some strong conviction of truth, however fragmentary, and give it a fair chance, and it will grow into a creed, as the partial and varied messages of the prophets orb into the revelation of the Son of God.

It is easy to confirm this relation of faith and creed from the beginnings of faith in the New Testament. "It is no accident," says a recent book on *Christianity in History*, in writing which an Anglican and a Free Churchman have shared, "it is no accident that the most typical and sacred form of words in Christianity is not a creed or a law, but a prayer" (p. 33). Indeed, Wellhausen has gone so far as to say that the only adequate form of confession of faith is a prayer. The centre and object of faith, in the living sense of the New Testament is a Person, the Person who both exemplifies and inspires the attitude expressed in "the Lord's Prayer." Dr. Macgregor, in his fine book on *Christian Freedom*, speaks of "the look of the heart towards Christ the Crucified which is the essential element in faith" (p. 165). The New Testament does not, of course, ignore the value of definite and articulate confession. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The simplicity of *this* creed is significant—"Jesus is Lord." There are many confessions of faith throughout the New Testament

which clearly show that the emphasis falls on trust in and loyalty to the central Person. The two great confessions of faith made by Simon Peter are singularly suggestive in this respect. At Caesarea Philippi, he made the declaration of his conviction, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." That was not the less sincere, because it was theological, but it did not save him from denying Christ. But by the Sea of Galilee, we hear him saying something that was a more profound, if less articulated, confession of faith, "Thou knowest that I love Thee," and that confession became the commission of his renewed apostolate. Living faith, as we shall all agree, demands a loving heart as its only adequate guardian, and the true Christian creed will be the affirmation of that in Christ which has won our loving trust. Such a faith-creed calls for the ripe experience of Christian life, and for the fullest development of Christian personality, in thought and feeling and will. Its full attainment lies at the end, rather than at the beginning of life, and it is an individual achievement, rather than a social inheritance, an ideal rather than a present possession.

II. But it will be said that by creed, in the ordinary use of the term, we mean something different from this, something that *is* a social inheritance, something that is of use in religious education and propaganda, in legal definition and ecclesiastical unity, as well as in the devotional exercises of the Church. Let us, then, think of creed in this more usual sense, always remembering that this meaning must fall short of that ideal relation to faith of which I have spoken. Every social act involves a compromise—the adjustment of my egoism to that altruism without which social relations are impossible. We learn nothing at school more useful than to put up with other people. We cannot live together in a home, a city, a nation, without respecting the different standpoints of others. We cannot worship together in a church without some compromise of individuality—which is indeed part of the value to us of worship. So when, for any purpose, a community agrees to frame its religious convictions in a creed, there will be an inevitable compromise; you can escape it only by remaining a rank individualist, i.e., not a Christian at all. No two men would spontaneously frame their creed in exactly the same way; even if they agreed on the same form of words there would be subtle differences of emphasis, and enormous differences of connotation in the words employed. We see the differences clearly enough when we leave two communities free to express their faith independently, as for example in the Anglican Catechism and in the Shorter Catechism of the Presbyterian Churches. You may remember that Robert Louis Stevenson said that all the difference between the Scotsman and the Englishman came out in the way those two catechisms begin. The Scotsman comes to the point

with a fine disdain of ephemeral interests, and asks, "What is the chief end of man?" the more sober and prosaic Englishman asks, "What is your name?" But if such differences, in small or great things, always emerge when unchecked and unrepressed, are they not present in any single community, especially when the first generation of creed-framers is succeeded by the second, and the children inevitably fail to be replicas of their parents? I do not, of course, use this fact to argue that creeds are useless, but simply to show some of the limitations of their legitimate use. Used illegitimately, they may and do become not foster-mothers, but bogies to faith. By what they seem to demand, and to demand full-grown from the very beginning—a faith full armoured, like Athene springing from the head of Zeus, they may and do often inhibit faith, and warn people away from trust. The more sincere and the more conscientious a man is, the more he may shirk from professing the full creed of his Church, when he asks himself that very necessary question, "How much of the creed is my faith?" Let us remember, then, the perils of creeds, and the fatal ease with which they may come to be treated as synonymous with faith, by those who are without it. We must have them, in some form or other. How is property, for example, to be legally secured to the use of a religious community, unless there is some definition of its faith, i.e., a creed? How can a Church provide for the training of its young life, and preserve any consistency of right opinion unless there is some epitome of what it holds most worth teaching, and most worth preserving? There is also a true place for the creed in both the private and public devotions of the Church, when we think of the creed as a guide to thought and prayer, a subject for meditation. None has spoken more nobly of this aspect of the creed than Newman, in his *Grammar of Assent;* he singles out the much-criticised Athanasian Creed for his praise:—

> "It is not a mere collection of notions, however momentous. It is a psalm or hymn of praise, of confession, and of profound, self-prostrating homage, parallel to the canticles of the elect in the Apocalypse. It appeals to the imagination quite as much as to the intellect. It is the war-song of faith, with which we warn first ourselves, then each other and then all those who are within its hearing, and the hearing of the Truth, who our God is, and how we must worship Him, and how vast our responsibility will be, if we know what to believe and yet believe not. . . . For myself, I have ever felt it is the most simple and sublime, the most devotional formulary to which Christianity has given birth, more so even than the *Veni Creator* and the *Te Deum.*" (p. 133.)

But if creeds, notwithstanding these great and necessary uses, always involve some mutual compromise in comparison with an ideal expression of personal faith, even for those who have first united to frame them—how much more will this be felt by many in regard to those great creeds of the Church which we agree to call "historic"?

III. It is obvious that when we speak of a creed as a "historic document" we are considering it in relation to the age which gave birth to it, and not in relation to its utility for faith. Every creed, of course, does bear the mark of its birth upon it, if only by what it inserts or omits. It has been estimated that there are upwards of 150 public confessions of faith which have been or are accepted as authoritative in the Christian Church, an eloquent testimony to the intellectual awakening that characterizes Christianity beyond any other religion. If we were to try and write an adequate commentary on those creeds and confessions, we should find that we had written a history of the Church and a history of the doctrine of the Church throughout its kaleidoscopic changes of character and fortune. Yet each of these creeds claimed to be the statement of eternal and revealed truth—something in itself unchanging. We are forced to admit that the history of the Church thus reflected in the creeds is marked by as many changes as the history of politics, reflected in the successive constitutions and institutions of human society, and as the history of philosophy, reflected in the successive systems of thought. Even a Newman has to formulate a doctrine of development. Yet there must be some real continuity through all this change, if the Church of the ages is in any sense a unity; in what does it lie? Or, to put the same question in another form, what is the essence of the Christian religion? Clearly it must be "something more catholic than its creeds" unless we are to dischurch the majority of our fellow-Christians" (cf. John Caird, Univ. Sermons, p. 23) As Dr. John Caird has said, "Could we get at that something—call it spiritual life, godliness, holiness, self-abnegation, surrender of the soul to God, or, better still, love and loyalty to Christ as the one only Redeemer and Lord of the spirit—could we, I say, pierce deeper than the notions of the understanding to that strange, sweet, all-subduing temper and habit of spirit, that climate and atmosphere of heaven in a human breast, would not the essence of religion lie in that?" If we agree to call this something "faith" as distinct from creed, its intellectual expression, then we may rightly claim that faith is much more continuous than creed. I do not say that faith itself remains the same; it is a living thing, and the great characteristic of life is growth, which means change. But the life of the plant is a unity in a sense in which the successive text-books describing

it are not. Take the familiar eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the heroes of faith are enumerated. Try to frame a creed which a Samson or a Rahab might have monotoned with an Isaiah or a Jeremiah. You will hardly get past the opening words of the chapter, that faith is a confidence in what is hoped for, and a conviction of what is unseen—a description of faith that would take in all the religions of the world. But if it is said that such an idea of faith is dangerously broad, we may point out the corresponding depth of moral quality in the faith there described. These heroes of faith are depicted as those who are stirred to self-sacrifice in their whole personality—Abraham to go forth not knowing whither he went, and Moses to choose affliction with the people of God. Faith can afford to be very broad in its charities if it is proportionately deep in its self-sacrifice and courage. Let us not make the mistake, therefore, of confusing identity of creed, so far as such a thing really exists, with continuity of faith. We cannot take any of these "historic documents" in its strict original meaning, not even the Apostles' Creed, to express exactly and naturally our present-day faith. We can read our own meaning more or less into the ancient form of words, but that is a different thing.

IV. Perhaps you are saying, "Enough of generalizations; tell us exactly what value you, as a Free Churchman, attach to such Creeds as the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian." To answer that question fairly, we must, I think, recall both those principles which have been already outlined and certain facts as to the origin of these creeds. The three principles of which I have spoken are (1) that faith is a larger thing than creed, because it involves emotion and will as well as cognition; (2) that the social use of a creed necessarily involves compromise; (3) that faith is an underlying unity much more continuous than its credal expression would suggest. The historic facts concerning these early creeds must here be simply stated, and not argued, especially as they are generally accepted by scholars. (1) The Apostles' Creed was not written by the apostles, though it can be traced back more or less to the middle of the second century, as an evident expansion of the baptismal confession. (2) The Nicene Creed is not the Creed of Nicaea, though containing some phrases from it, which have been added to the Creed of Jerusalem to produce the familiar form. (A plausible view of the Nicene Creed would regard it as the expansion of the baptismal confession in the East, as the Apostles' is a similar expansion in the West). (3) The Athanasian Creed is of quite different character, though like the others, it has gained a name that does not belong to it. It is best regarded as a collection of Augustinian formulae, which seems to have been drawn up in Southern Gaul, in the fifth or sixth century. It is

highly technical, and really unintelligible except to a mind trained in philosophical distinctions and theological history. As to the circulation of these creeds, we must not exaggerate their importance, even as historic documents. The Apostles' Creed is unknown to the Greek and Oriental Churches, and no council of the Church has given it authority. The Athanasian Creed has never been used by the East; it seems to have come into prominence in the West against Muhammedan Unitarianism. The Nicene Creed was approved by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and is used by both East and West. No doubt it is partly on this ground, as well as on that of the character of the Creed, that the Lambeth Resolutions of 1920 give it the central place in the theological foundation of a reunited Church. "We believe," says the Lambeth Report, "that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of . . . the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief." That statement, it will be seen, carries us back to the origin of these creeds, their primary function as a confession of personal faith. How far are they still adequate or useful for the same purpose? This is a question that ought to be answered strictly on internal evidence. The place of these creeds in the history of the Church entitles them to respect; but their adequacy for a modern man's faith is a distinct question. So far as the popular use of the Nicene Creed is concerned, the same objection holds against its more theological part as holds against the Athanasian; how many, even in this august assembly, would face an examination on the exact meaning of "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father"? Further, when this theological part, which mainly distinguishes the Nicene from the Apostles' Creed, has been understood, there is the whole question of its underlying philosophy. How far can the Greek metaphysics of the fourth century really become the basis of a modern Christology? How far have modern thinkers shifted their ground from a metaphysical to an ethical starting-point, for example? Are we really prepared to bind ourselves down to the fourth century interpretation of Christ, as the Roman Catholic Church is bound down to the thirteenth century theology of Aquinas? This is a not unimportant question, which ought to be faced before we consider the whole-hearted acceptance of particular Creeds.

It has sometimes been said that such objections do not lie against the Apostles' Creed, because that simply recites facts of history, which Christians in general agree to accept. Of course, if this were absolutely true, it would take away all religious value from the Apostles' Creed, for religion is concerned with the

valuation of facts, not with "bare facts" in themselves. As Lord Bryce once remarked, "No one at a supreme crisis in his life can nerve himself to action, or comfort himself under a stroke of fate, by reflecting that the angles at the base of an isosceles triangle are equal." Even the selection of historical details involves an interpretation. For instance, the modern man, with his awakened interest in the "Jesus of History," would not leap at once from "Born of the Virgin Mary" to "Suffered under Pontius Pilate," and would probably wish that "He descended into hell" had never been inserted into the original form of the Creed. If the Apostles' Creed was originally directed against Gnostic docetism, then the selection of facts emphasizing the real humanity and historical place of Jesus is explained; but to-day, most of us would assume the real humanity, and need rather to be protected against an under-valuation of the divinity. But I do not want to seem a thankless and ungrateful critic of the two Creeds because I thus remind you of some of their limitations, as statements of personal faith to which whole-hearted acceptance is asked. I would rather venture to indicate these limitations, from a frankly personal and individual point of view, by offering an example of an evangelical creed to which I could subscribe whole-heartedly :—

GOD'S INITIATIVE . . . AN EVANGELICAL CREED.

In the fulness of the time, God sent forth His Son to be the Saviour of the world; Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh; He gave His life a ransom for many; God raised Him from the dead, has committed to Him the issues of time and eternity, and through Him gives the Holy Spirit to them that obey God. The only way of salvation is that of repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and new birth through the Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, this would be my statement of :—

MAN'S RESPONSE . . . A WORKING FAITH.

In every man there is something of God, which Christ claims. Loyalty to that claim means new strength of character, new power to serve men, new peace of heart with God; it makes of life a fascinating adventure, with somebody caring for us all the way. If we go on, we shall win through, though we stagger under a cross, for in death as in life, we belong to God.

Whatever may be thought of this "creed" and "faith," it is an excellent discipline to compel ourselves to think out these things for ourselves. Any one who does that honestly and very thoroughly will be surprised to find how different in form a modern creed is from the creeds of the ancient Church. But I think he will also find, if he have gained anything that is worth calling a

Christian experience, that there is a real continuity between his own faith and the faith that is so differently expressed by those before him.

V. I have urged these points not to draw the conclusion that there is no value in the ancient creeds, save as historic documents, but simply to make clear the limitations under which they can be properly and intelligently used for religion. Their value is great, if they are frankly used as a testimony and not as a test. Interpret them broadly, as a statement in the vocabulary and thought of their own time of permanent elements of Christian faith—and they may serve a great purpose and be a great help to religion. Apply them in the spirit of the heresy-hunter, as if they were the basis of a legal contract drawn up yesterday, and they are not only an encumbrance to religion, but an instrument of torture to goad the most conscientious people out of the Church. As an example of what I mean by broad interpretation, let me quote the remark made by Professor Curtis that " in the Apostolic age confession fluctuated between three main forms: (1) acceptance of Jesus as Christ, or Lord, or Son of God; (2) acceptance of an outline of the main facts of tradition about His home and life; and (3) acceptance of the threefold Divine self-revelation in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." He then goes on to say, " What came in a later age to be known as the Apostles' Creed was, in fact, the briefest possible combination of the three." (E.R.E., III. 834.) In that broad sense, we might fairly expect the main body of Christians to give a whole-hearted acceptance to he Apostles' Creed, and the same thing applies to the parallel elements in the Nicene Creed. As to the technical theology and philosophy in that Creed, I accept it as representing the best explanation that age could give of the unique relation of Jesus to God, and the unique place of Jesus in history. Believing as I personally do, in the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, I am bound to recognize the Nicene Creed as a noble attempt to express a permanent and most essential element in the Christian faith. In a word, I agree with what it meant, though I cannot assimilate all it says. I accept it as representing the main stream of true Christian continuity. Of course, in the same sense, and with equal rights of intrinsic worth, I should accept the Westminster Confession of Faith. Indeed, the Reformation Creeds, with their emphasis on Anthropology and Soteriology, are needed by the side of the others to supplement the earlier emphasis on Theology and Christology. There is no peculiar virtue in the Nicene Creed, either in character or origin, that entitles it to be set apart from all other creeds; its claim is *de facto* rather than *de. jure.* It has come to be the particular form which has gained the widest currancy in the Church of the East and the West. It deals com-

pendiously with the fundamental doctrine of the Person of Christ. It also expands in a welcome manner the confession of faith in the Holy Spirit, a doctrine which has been so neglected by the Church in its formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity. It was accepted, with other documents, as representing the main current of Christian thought, by a large gathering of bishops who met in the middle of the fifth century. It is probably the expansion of the baptismal creed of Jerusalem. On these grounds it may well take rank as a historic basis of reunion, and I think that Evangelical Free Churchmen could give as whole-hearted an acceptance to it as would the Anglican Church. But this statement must not obscure the fact that there is a real difference of emphasis and atmosphere between Anglicans and Free Churchmen, in regard to the use of creeds.

It may be that such a position as this may seem unsatisfactory to some of my younger fellow-students here, just because it savours of compromise. Young men are often impatient with the readiness of middle-aged men to compromise things, and to put up with the half-loaf. It is the difference that experience brings to most of us, though it may easily be misrepresented. All that I urge is the necessity of compromise on both sides if there is ever to be reunion; the very principle of society demands it. If there is ever to be reunion on the basis of the Nicene Creed, Anglicans must be content to recognize, as by a "Declaratory Act," such as that of the Church of Scotland, the quite general and historical sense in which Free Churchmen are willing to accept it, whilst Free Churchmen must broaden their conceptions of the Church to include in a true catholicity types of thought and forms of expression which are not identical with their own. We all agree to use such a hymn as the Te Deum, which covers much the same ground as the Apostles 'and Nicene Creed; there is no unworthy compromise in accepting any of the three as a testimony of the faith of the Church, within which our own personal convictions have been nurtured. In the conduct of public worship, I prefer to make the confession of faith in the form of prayer, for that is where we Christians come closest together, because closer to the one Father of us all. It is a suggestive fact that the very words of our Lord upon the cross, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit," are used by the dying Jew in his death-bed confession. How wide the gulf that parts the Crucified from His crucifiers! Yet how wonderful that those for whom He prayed, "Father, forgive them," should be turning to the one Father throughout the generations, with *His* dying confession of faith upon their lips!

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Preaching in the Open Air.

(Address delivered to students and friends at a Theological Training College.)

OPEN Air preaching is woven into the texture of Bible history. The first sermon ever delivered was preached in a garden. It opened with the words "Where art thou?" and was continued by the Divine Preacher with much heart-searching. The two most prominent sermons in the Word of God were both delivered from mountains: the giving of the Ten Commandments from Sinai; and the discourse on the hill-side in the New Testament, known as the Sermon on the Mount.

In Old Testament history, discourses to large assemblies of people were perforce delivered in the open air, as there were no buildings erected large enough to hold the multitudes. The two places of concourse in the open air most frequently mentioned were "at the door of the tabernacle" and "at the gate of the city." When we come to New Testament history, we find Jesus often preaching in synagogues, but perhaps as frequently using the shore of the lake, the hill side, or the public street. As far as one can judge from reading the Book of Acts, the early preachers appear to have followed the example of their Master, dividing their discourses equally between the synagogues and schools, and the open air.

Open Air preaching early fell into neglect. It may have been that the cooler air of the various climes to which the Gospel speedily was taken, had something to do with this; but, alas, too probably the reason was to be found in the loss of the early aggressive and missionary spirit of the Churches. Believers began to look upon their places of assembly in the same way that the Church or Chapel is regarded to-day, i.e., too much as a religious club, a place for the comfortable enjoyment of the study of the Word. We fear that self-satisfaction is at the root of the neglect of the proclamation of Divine Truth in street and field; this is proved by the fact that whenever the Spirit grants a definite Revival of religion, Open Air preaching comes to the front once more. It was so in the days of Wyclif when he sent his preachers over the land. Also when the multitudes heard the Word at St. Paul's Cross. What a Revival of Open Air work did the Reformation bring in! Then, as Bishop Ryle says in his "Christian Leaders of the Eighteenth Century"—"those who

were forbidden the Churches were willing to use the steps of the Market Cross, or even a horse block as a pulpit, and found their audiences in market place, street, and field." In the 1859 Revival —see Gibson's "Year of Grace"—the valleys of Ireland adjacent to the towns in which the Revival was the most marked, proved vantage grounds for the preaching. Now there is need for another return to these great evangelistic methods. We would offer a few preliminary remarks concerning Open Air preaching before coming to the heart of our subject.

First, Prayer. Let none go forth to the difficult task we are studying, without an interview with the Master. Christ's severe words about those who pray at the corners of the streets should deter us from postponing our prayers until we get outside. Let the house—whether it be residence or place of worship—be the place of our petitions, and the open-air the place for our proclamation of the Word; that "our Father Who seeth in secret" may "reward us openly." The din and bustle of a public thoroughfare are not conducive to reverence of worship and singleness of thought required in prayer.

An important preliminary to the study of the work is the need of careful selection of the pitch or stand where the Service is to be held. Of course, the aim must be at the most populous site. In a late Mission conducted by the writer he was ignorant of the locality, and the Open Air leaders chose several spots where but few people could hear. He found afterwards that a well-frequented spot could be reached in five minutes from the Chapel. It was too late in the Mission then to hold more than one service there, but hundreds must have heard the Word. This matter needs the strictest attention.

We must remember to avoid, as far as possible, bringing ridicule upon ourselves and our message. Spurgeon, with playful sarcasm, pictured the Open Air preacher as talking to one child and a dog! A preacher is generally ill-advised to stand alone in a public thoroughfare. Christ sent out His missionary workers two and two. Of course, again, there may be exceptions to this rule. In a story from the "Quaker Saints" we read of a preacher urged by an inward compulsion, preaching on a vacated camping ground in the backwoods, not knowing that he had even one hearer. God blest the Word to a man hidden in the bush, and he was the means of leading to Christ some who became winners of many souls afterwards. But, as a general thing, co-operation should be sought. The street march is a valuable form of open-air work when there is an imposing company to take part. The march is preliminary. It should be remembered that, while conviction of sin in the open air is very frequent, conversion—that is to say a definite decision for Christ—is seldom made till the

indoor service is reached. Therefore, let the outdoor service be followed by an indoor meeting, however short, to give enquirers the opportunity of being further instructed.

Now, following these preparatory hints, let us survey the subject of preaching in the open air under four heads. First, the speaking; secondly, the singing; thirdly, the workers; and, fourthly, the results.

I. It is best to consider both the manner and the matter of the speaking. The manner is as the body of the work, the matter is the very soul itself. As to the manner, we have to remember the voice, the hands, and the style.

As to the voice, let us say at once, use it! God has given to the speaker a certain volume of sound which it is possible for him to produce. Let him make use of it all. Mumbling, murmuring, drawling, and half-hearted tones are not suited for the proclamation of Divine Truth. When the writer was speaking to a minister concerning our subject, and mentioned how gladly the people listened to the Lord in the open air, his comment was, "Yes, Jesus opened His mouth, and taught them." No semi-tones would satisfy the Master in His telling of the Father's Message. But an equally important remark concerning the voice is, do not abuse it. Nothing is more unpleasant to listen to than an over-strained voice, excepting it be an instrument out of tune. Above all, let us avoid the alternate shriek and whisper which only call down the ridicule of men in the street. Monotony of tone is equally to be deprecated. As far as possible, let the people be addressed in open-air gatherings in the voice and tones used in ordinary conversation, only, of course, heightened in accordance with the number of the listeners.

The use of the hands is almost as important as the voice. The senseless waving about of the hands will be derided by those who look on. Let what has been called "babbling of the fingers" be carefully avoided. Inappropriate actions are also quickly noticed by the crowd and will certainly prejudice their minds.

No less important is the style. Let us drop the ministerial altogether when we are out in the open. "Dearly beloved brethren," "my text this evening is," "let us take for our subject"—and similar expressions almost expected in indoor worship, are fatal in the open air, and will only disperse the crowd. Beginning with—"By the bye, have you heard?" Or "What a remarkable piece of news we have!" is sure to hold the listeners at least for a few moments, until you can turn the incident related to some good account. This was the style of Christ, using the news of the day as the door to some eternal truth. When they thought to shock Him by telling Him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, He turned upon them with the

solemn lesson, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." It is easy to gain the attention of the crowd by some incident from the daily papers. The parabolic and pictorial style, such as Christ used, is more difficult for a western speaker and audience than for an eastern. But the human mind loves pictures, and therefore, illustrate freely, with the caution not to let your illustrations drown the truth you want to bring forward.

We have said much concerning the manner of open air preaching, but now we come to the soul of the thing, the matter. The speaker in the field or street must remember, equally with his brethren inside the building, that he is bound to "preach the Word," and to walk in the footsteps of the Apostle who said, "I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." Let the Open Air preacher take his stand at the Cross and refuse to leave it. A gentleman, some fifty years ago, who went to hear Dr. Parker on a Sunday morning, Canon Liddon in the afternoon, and C. H. Spurgeon at night, said he was more impressed by a working man in the open air talking about the Cross of the Lord, than by the sermons of the great preachers. Do not fear to detail the sufferings of the Saviour. As you picture Christ unrobing Himself before lying down on the Cross; then voluntarily making the wood His couch as He lies back upon it—"The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep"—as you show the executioners sending the cruel iron through hands and feet; as you bid the people listen to His cries; as you echo the triumphant shout which sealed the work of our salvation, "It is finished," you will find that you hold your audience with astonishing ease. "I, if I lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

Further, do not set aside the great doctrines of the faith when you preach in the open air. Remember, that the Spirit's work accompanies the words of Truth themselves. Texts of Scripture repeated by the helpers, as we point them out one after the other, the shot and shell of the open air worker, are very effective. So also with the text repeated in a loud voice by the whole company of friends with you.

Matter of the greatest importance, next to the Gospel Story, is the frequent relating of personal experience. To get one of either sex, and even a young convert, to tell in public how Christ found the wandering soul and brought it to Himself, will often hold a crowd which has been difficult to retain under an ordinary address. Where there are none with you able or willing thus to give their own conversion story, telling of the conversions of others will often prove effective.

It is possible even to use objections made, and turn them to good account as texts or themes or illustrations. An Open Air

preacher in the East End was interrupted by a listener who cried out, "Away with your Christianity! I believe in modern inventions." The preacher's wise answer was—"Then, my friend, when you are dying you had better send for the gasfitter." Another interrupter, speaking of the preacher, called out—"Don't believe a word he says! When we die, we die like the animals, and there is an end of us." The preacher calmly remarked, "Make way there for a man who believes that when his mother died, she died like a dog." Forgetting his previous remark, the interrupter shouted—"That's a lie! When my mother died she went straight to heaven." When a cabbage stalk was flung at the writer whilst he was speaking in the open air, he held it up and made it an illustration of spiritual death, a poor, lifeless thing. So we can find matter for our talks even from those who are seeking to put an end to them.

Sometimes a drunken man will stagger into the crowd. Let such interruptions be valued. It is sure to draw an increase to the throng. Patiently wait until the people have gathered around to listen to his wild remarks, then let a worker beckon him out of the crowd. Intoxicated curiosity will nearly always make him obey. And there you have the crowd he has provided for you. Infidelity will at times lift up its head. Refuse to argue publicly in the street upon religious questions. You might ask them if they believe in the Bible; and on getting the answer that they do not—refuse to discuss the question with them. Probably you will be asked such a stock question as "Where did Cain get his wife?" etc. One speaker in the open air always answered with Deut. xxix. 29.: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law."

II. A few words about the Singing. Let this be as good as it is possible to have it. This inborn love of music is in almost every mind. Whenever possible, let the singing be accompanied by an instrument. Let the hymns be chosen sometimes from old and well remembered ones, to awaken old memories in the hearts of hardened sinners; and sometimes from the newer pieces to attract the curious. Solos are immensely effectual in the street services. It is hardly possible to pay too much attention to this branch of usefulness in Open Air work.

III. But what about the Workers? There should be as many of them as possible, and friends who do not possess the gift of either speech or song should still be encouraged, and indeed urged, to come, that the Service may be a true demonstration for Divine Truth, and that the speaker be supported by their prayers. It should be impressed upon all workers, that, although prayer was offered in the building before coming out, private, individual,

secret prayer should be ascending from every heart whilst the service is proceeding. Herein is the source of strength for the speaker, and for all the effort, the value of which can never be known. Let the workers always show a spirit of reverence. The moment the service in the street is concluded, let each worker turn round and speak to someone in the crowd. It may be found that something said or sung has taken effect. It is the worker's privilege to deepen that impression in the heart.

Do not reject the use of our sisters in testifying to what they know of the Saviour's Cross. If the woman of Samaria was so mightily used among her neighbours, how much more should we expect that Christian women will be used to-day. Be sure of one thing, that not only has it been well said that Conscience is always on the side of the Christian preacher, but in these Open Air audiences "chords that were broken will vibrate once more," as Truths long ago heard, hymns long ago listened to, fall upon apparently careless ears. Those who have neglected the worship of God since childhood will be reminded of scenes in village Chapels and in Sunday Schools which had been almost erased from their memories. That recollection may be used by the Spirit of God to deepen the impression of the Truths which you bring before them.

IV. The fourth view we take of Open Air work is that of certain and remarkable Results already accomplished. Let us picture to ourselves a crowd of men on Sunday morning in years gone by, waiting for the opening of neighbouring public-houses. As the service is proceeding, a young coster, leaning against the shutters of the corner shop, listens with interest; he is spoken to, and promises to attend the indoor service that night. The promise is kept, and he is converted to God. Only a few months ago he passed into his Saviour's presence, after over thirty years of faithful witness to his Lord. Picture again a gentleman walking down the same street and coming across a little band of open air workers. Having nothing to do that evening, he follows them into the concert hall, where the service is to be held. He has private conversation with the preacher afterwards, and comes out a changed man. This brother has since pursued a career of great usefulness in the United States of America and at home. One more picture; a man who afterward declared he had been the biggest drunkard, as well as wife-beater, in Bermondsey, listens to the open air speaking and singing. He comes into the hall to which the workers belong. He is given the text, "Him that cometh unto Me I will in nowise cast out." He carries it home in his memory, and in the solemn stillness of the early hours of the next morning he is led by the Word to his Saviour's feet. For some twenty years he has been an earnest worker in the midst

of the folks whose open air work was made such a blessing to him.

These are but a few of the many results which have come to the writer's knowledge as the years have gone by. Oh! the blessing God gives to preaching in the open air! Who can estimate it? Would that clergy and ministers all sought for opportunities thus to reach the non-church-going masses.

We are praying, as Churches of Jesus Christ, for missionary work in foreign lands, but let us not neglect the missionary work which lies close at hand in the un-Christianised millions of our own population. Whatever be the crowding of other duties upon us, is any one of them more important than obedience to our Master's Word, "Preach the Gospel to every creature," and "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He send forth more labourers into His harvest?"

O come! let us go and find them!
In the paths of death they roam.
At the close of the day 'twill be sweet to say
I have brought some lost one home.

WILLIAM OLNEY.

PAUL FRUIN was in 1653 Elder of the church at Dymock, Gloucestershire, now Upton-on-Severn, in Worcestershire. He became incumbent of Kempley in Gloucestershire, and was ejected. He took a licence in 1672 at Trowbridge. He was presented by the constables of Trowbridge both for commonly teaching in conventicles and for living within five miles of a corporation—which was an offence only because he had held a living. They called him Fluine, alias Fluellin, which at once suggests a Welshman; Welsh Baptists had been peculiarly ready to serve parish churches. In 1689 he appeared at London as pastor of the church at Warwick.

* * * * * *

THOMAS ADLAM was a soldier under the command of William Eyre, of Monkes, in the parish of Corsham, at the Devizes when forces were first raised for parliament. In 1651 he brought to Quarter Sessions of Wilts. a printed form of certificate from the treasurers for maimed soldiers, that he had latterly been a trooper under Captain Robert Glinn in the regiment of Colonel Matthew Thomlinson: he was allowed a pension of 53s. 4d. In 1672 William Adlames of Deverill Longbridge took from Charles II a licence as a Baptist teacher.

Catholic Holy Days and Puritan Sabbaths.

WHEN the Invincible Armada was scattered by the winds, England was freed from the Spanish nightmare that had troubled her for a generation. Fear of the Roman Catholics died down rapidly, and in church matters Elizabeth and the Puritans were now face to face, with no third party of whom both were afraid, to force them into unwilling partnership. The steady fining of Catholic recusants had reduced the number of people worth attention to only 8,500, of whom a third lived in Lancashire. So the Star Chamber turned its attention to Puritan Nonconformists.

It was high time from the standpoint of the government, which wished to control all the machinery of the church. For in 1592 some trials failed to convict, Parliament betrayed great sympathy with the Puritans; while across the border the Scotch abolished bishops, and set up a system of church government which was speedily to become a Puritan republic, with no room for any sovereign to take part in its management.

The inspiration of the Puritans was in the Bible, and since 1560 there had been a popular version, executed at Geneva, and furnished with abundant notes reflecting the stern Genevan doctrine as worked out by Calvin and Beza. This was in Scotland the authorized version; every Church and every substantial householder was obliged by law to own a copy.[1] And although no such law held in England, the size and price made it popular everywhere.

Now it is in connection with this version that there arose in the Puritan mind an identification of the Sabbath and the Sunday. When Whittingham, Knox and others wrote to Calvin a criticism of the English Prayer Book, while they often speak of Sunday, yet twice over they use the term " Sabothe daie " as an alternative, therein following an occasional phrase of Hooper and Latimer.[2] And this usage quickly became general, as may be seen by the fact that in 1563 Archbishop Parker, writing about the Dutch and Walloons at Sandwich, testified that they were " very godly in the

[1] Darlow and Moule: Hist. Cat. of Printed Bibles, I, 89.
[2] Hessey: Bampton Lectures, 461.

Sabbath-day, and busy in their work on the week-day."[3] From this application of the name Sabbath to the first day of the week, two results followed. First, a polemic by the Puritans against the word Sunday, as heathen; second, a desire to apply to the first day of the week, the customs of the Jews.

It should be remembered that the cessation of work on Sunday was no new thing, nor was it desired only by clergy and puritans. The guilds of Beverley in the fifteenth century had strictly forbidden smiths, shoe-makers and bakers to ply their crafts then, with a curious exception that in harvest time the shoemakers might work outside church-doors in the country.[4] A hundred years later, butchers were forbidden to ride on Sunday for buying, unless a fair was on. And at Aldeburgh the town council obliged all fishermen to come in at eight on Saturday till noon on Sunday.

The whole subject was brought up as part of the Puritan plea to get rid of the relics of the papal system. They regarded the plans of Elizabeth as an illogical compromise between the old system and a true reformed system, such as was well illustrated at Geneva. In 1572 Thomas Cartwright, professor of Divinity at Cambridge, began publishing Puritan manifestos and programmes; and they met with such general sympathy that no mere legal measures of deprivation and punishment availed; books had to be issued to break the force of Cartwright's arguments.

Cartwright attacked the general observing of holy days, and on this point as on others he was answered by Whitgift in a tractate covering pages 565-595 in the second volume of the Oxford reprint of his works. Cartwright claimed that one day after another had been labelled Holy by the Medieval Church, and so many of these were still regarded holy by the Church of England, that in the end a man was compelled to abstain from work twice as many days as the Jews had been: he pleaded that all these days of mere ecclesiastical appointment be abandoned, even Easter, and that the Lord's day only be observed as a day of rest and worship. To this Whitgift objected. But in the controversy they cite modern foreign divines like Bullinger and Flacius Illyricus, all using the word Sabbath to signify The Lord's day. This was evidently the meaning of all the passages cited, and the word Sabbath was used by Whitgift himself in the same way, even as Parker had done.

It may be noted that Calvinists on the continent were all precise on the observance of the first day. Even in 1589, when an important embassy from Elizabeth was conferring daily with the States General of the Netherlands, the daily register records re-

[3] Works, Oxford Edition, 189.
[4] Hist. MSS Commission, 79.

gularly, "Jan. 15. Sunday.—This day was spent, as usual, in prayers."[5]

Whitgift once or twice pointed out that Cartwright was confusing together the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day in his quotations from ancient writers.

"The Sabbath day mentioned by Ambrose and Augustine is not the Lord's Day, which we call the Sunday, and whereof both Ignatius and Tertullian speak; but it is the Saturday which is called Sabbatum."[6] This he proves by quotations from Augustine expressly distinguishing the two. It is to be remembered that there were no Jews in England, nor had been for two centuries; so there was nothing visible to remind anybody that Jews still worshipped on the Saturday, keeping that and not Sunday as their Sabbath.

Whitgift gave his view that on every Holy day, and not on the Sabbath alone, men might justly be debarred from all work that was not urgent, so that they might instruct their households in God's word. Cartwright took his stand on the words, "Six days shalt thou work," and insisted that Holy days were absolutely wrong in principle.

But both Cartwright and Whitgift in their prolonged debate, stretching over three or four books, suppose that while the Jewish Sabbath is abolished, the Lord's Day is fitly termed the Sabbath, and that it is to be observed on the lines indicated in the Old Testament. And this was generally in the minds of all earnest men then.

After the earthquake of 1580, there was published a Godly admonition in which the official view of how the Lord's Day ought to be spent is contrasted with the frequent practices.[7] "The Sabbath days and holy days ordained for the hearing of God's word to the reformation of our lives, for the administration and receiving of the Sacraments to our comfort, for the seeking of all things behooveful for body or soul at God's hand by prayer, for the minding of his benefits, and to yield praise and thanks unto Him for the same, and finally, for the special occupying of ourselves in all spiritual exercises, is spent full heathenishly, in taverning, tippling, gaming, playing and beholding of Bear-baiting and Stage plays, to the utter dishonour of God." &c.

Three years later Whitgift was made Archbishop of Canterbury, and he at once issued a circular to his suffragan bishops, telling them how to attend to children.[8] Amongst other points he ordered them to execute the provision for catechizing and instruct-

[5] Earls of Ancaster's MSS, page 251.
[6] Works, I, 228, 578.
[7] Lit. Eliz., 573.
[8] Works: III, 610.

ing in churches, of youths of both sexes, " on the sabbath-days and holydays in afternoons."

The whole subject was one that deeply interested the nation, and was not a mere theological quarrel. Several bills were introduced into Parliament to enforce the Puritan ideal.[9] In 1585 there was a long struggle over this, and with " much dispute and great difficulty " such a bill passed both houses.[10] But when the Queen came down, and was asked to give force to the bills awaiting her, she replied very sharply about their attempted interference with matters of religion " the ground on which all other matters ought to take root and being corrupted may mar all the tree—the presumption is so great as I may not suffer it—nor tolerate new-fangledness. I mean to guide them both by God's holy true rule." Therefore she vetoed that bill, and in the list of thirty which passed into acts that year, this does not appear. It is important to notice this, because in 1620 a member of Parliament referred to it under the impression that the bill had become law; and his mistake has been repeated in recent years. The incident is, however, excellent evidence of the popular interest in applying rules about the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian Lord's Day.

After 1588 there opened a more serious gulf between the authorities and the Puritans. Elizabeth confiscated Puritan books, and set Bancroft on exposing their plans. They in return concentrated their forces on two points, the establishment of Discipline on the Genevan-Scottish model, and the observance of the Lord's day in strict Jewish-Sabbath form. The former point we may neglect. It was in 1595 that a volume of 286 quarto pages was issued by Nicholas Bound of Norton in Suffolk, on the *True Doctrine of the Sabbath.* It called into the lists one Thomas Rogers, who was horrified at its rigour.[11] He mentions how it was preached in Somersetshire, that to throw a bowl on the Sabbath-day is as great a sin as to kill a man. Nor was this a mere clerical extravagance; the justices of the peace at Bridgewater applied to the Judges of Assize for an order to abolish Church-ales, Clerk-ales, Bid-ales; and chief justice Popham did sign this in 1596.[12] Next year the justices of Cornwall ordered wardens and constables to note absentees from service " on the Sabbath day," and to punish them according to the statute; also they ordered householders to keep their servants and youths from unlawful games and alehouses " on the Sabbath days."

Meantime Richard Hooker was maturing his *Laws of*

[9] Cobbett's Parly. History, I. 824.
[10] D'Ewes' Journals, 328; in Prothero, 222.
[11] Works: Oxford Edition, 19.
[12] Hist. MSS. Com. C 9246, page 161.

Ecclesiastical Polity, with constant reference to the teachings of Cartwright. In 1597 he dedicated the fifth book of Whitgift, and had occasion to deal briefly with this question.[13] His language is careful, he restricts the word Sabbath to the Jewish festival; he criticizes Cartwright on many details and shows that the Christian festival is of ecclesiastical appointment, not divine, " their sabbath the Church hath changed into our Lord's day." But on the main point even Hooker agrees with the Puritan that the gospel of Christ requires the perpetuity of religious duties, and he quotes with approval the edict of the emperor Leo, " that on the sacred day, wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and surcease labour."

Hooker's judicious reasoning was not vigorous enough for Rogers, who invited the interference of the government.[14] Whitgift called in Bound's book during 1599, and Popham next year forbade it to be reprinted. None the less the subject had attracted attention, and Sabbath-keeping became a test question as between Puritans and the Government.

The death of Whitgift gave renewed opportunity to publish. George Widley handled anew the doctrine of the Sabbath in 1604, a second edition of Bound's book followed, and a much enlarged third edition in 1606.

The death of Elizabeth and the accession of James led to several measures completing the reconstruction of the English Church. He was a Calvinist in doctrine, but irritated by the Presbyterian discipline of Scotland, and he rejoiced in being legally the Governor of the Church; his chief agent was Bancroft, who was no Puritan and no Calvinist. Yet the ripening of public opinion can be clearly traced by comparing an official homily of 1563 with the thirteenth canon of 1604. When Elizabeth succeeded to the rule of Mary, the people were told that " God was more dishonoured, and the Devil better served on the Sunday, than upon all the days in the week beside."[15] And illustrations are not far to seek; Strype tells how in 1582 Sunday continued to be the favourite day for the Londoners to row over to the theatres at Bankside, or sports in Southwark, and that this was upheld by the Government against the expostulation of the lord mayor.[16] Martin Marprelate was fond of twitting Bishop Aylmer with his habit of playing bowls seven days a week; and the reply admitted that he did so even " upon the Sabboth." But Convocation in the first year of James enacted, with government assent, that " all manner of persons within the Church of England shall henceforth

13 Works: II. 34, 37, 46.
14 Rogers, Oxford Edition, 20.
15 Hessey, Sunday, 277.
16 Hessey: 463.

celebrate and keep the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, and other Holy Days, according to God's will and pleasure, and the orders of the Church of England prescribed on that behalf, e.g., worship, visiting the sick, godly conversation."

And popular opinion agreed; when in a great frost five unfortunate persons were drowned in their drunkenness in crossing the Thames one Sunday night in October, a doleful dittye was published " for an example to all such prophaners of the Lord's Sabaoth daye."[17]

The Puritan view therefore had gained much ground, and as Hooker had passed away, Rogers rose to the occasion to set forth the official position. Greatly enlarging a former book on the Thirty-nine Articles, he argued against the Sabbatarian doctrine as Bound had elaborated it. A typical sentence of that pioneer is :—" The Lord hath commanded so precise a rest unto all sorts of men that it may not by any fraud, deceit, or circumvention whatsoever, be broken."[18] To this Rogers responded :—" The apostles changed the time and places of their assembling together; the people of God meeting, and the apostle preaching, sometimes on the week, sometimes on the Sabbath-days." But the current was flowing strong against him : George Sprint published on the question this same year. He praised himself for his *via media* in upholding the Christian Sabbath, pointing to the Familists and Anabaptists who esteemed all days alike, and to the " Sabbatary Christians " who held that the Jewish Sabbath of the seventh day in the week from the creation was never to be abolished. This last class, however, he had only read about in the pages of a German, a Frenchman, and an Italian; of such people in England he has nothing to say.[19]

When Bancroft was succeeded by the Calvinist Abbot, the Sabbatarian doctrine, as applied to the Lord's day, soon held the field. But this depended less on central authority than on local; and in towns there are many signs of a rigid spirit increasing. Thus at Southampton in 1608 the barbers welcomed an order " that none of them shall hereafter tryme anie person or persons uppon the Sabothe daye, &c "; and similar bye-laws were made and enforced down to the outbreak of civil war.[20] Details abound in all municipal records, from places as widely apart as Hanley Castle and Longdon in Worcestershire, Salisbury, Canterbury, London, Shrewsbury. A sarcastic English knight in the train of James, wrote about Edinburgh that " their Sabboth daies

17 Shirburn Ballads, page 68, quoted in R.H.S. Trans. 1911, page 42.
18 Rogers, 319.
19 Musculus I. 145-7. Beza, 39 15. Grysaldus Perusinus, De Hereticorum nominibus.
20 Con. Hist. Soc. Trans. 8, 151.

exercise is preachinge in the morninge, and persecutinge their backbiters after dinner (as they walk on) the cragges and mountaines."[21]

While religious men felt thus, others were annoyed, and occasional protests were made. One of the most ingenious was by Edward Brerewood, Professor at Gresham College, who was attracted to the question by Nicholas Byfield, preacher at Chester about 1611. In a learned treatise of the Sabbath, he called attention to the literal wording of the Fourth Commandment, and insisted that those who would adopt the Jewish method must equally adopt the Jewish day—the same *reductio ad absurdum* that Frith had propounded. Brerewood's own conclusion apparently was that the Jewish Law was totally fulfilled, and that the observance of the Lord's day was a matter of human convenience. His two treatises were not given to the world till about 1630, when other champions were to the fore.

Meanwhile the Puritan view had been more emphatically endorsed in Ireland, which was being colonized from Scotland and by English Puritans. When the canons of 1615 were adopted under the influence of Ussher, the fifty-sixth declared that the Lord's Day was to be wholly dedicated to God's service, all leisure being bestowed on holy exercises.

Both Cheshire and Ireland were strongholds of the Roman Catholics, with very pronounced views as to the desirability of making Sunday a happy day, an ideal widely different from the Puritan, in method, at least. In all England, Lancashire was the district where they were most numerous; even under Charles II a tax-farmer offered £12,000 a year for the privilege of collecting the £20 a month levied on rich Papal recusants. Therefore, it may well be imagined that under Elizabeth and James, the conflict of ideas as to the Sabbath came to a head in this county. Some illustrations may be taken from correspondence of the clerks of the peace, preserved among the manuscripts of Lord Kenyon, calendared in 1894 for the Historical MSS Commission.[22] It will be noticed that the name Sunday was all but displaced by the title Sabbath.

On 15th April, 1588, a presentment was made in the parish of Rochdale that "Adam Stolte, gentleman, uppon the Sabbothe daye, in the evenings, being eyther the last Sundaye in December or the fyrste in Januarie, had a minstrell which plaied uppon a gythorne a his howse, with a greate number of men and women dauncinge." Orders were given that the jurors in all the towns in the district were to present people who kept "wakes, fayres, markettes, beare-baites, bull-baites, greenes, alles, maye games,

[21] Hist. MSS. Com. Cd. 5567, page 187
[22] Pages 582, 590, 606, 16.

pyping and dancing, huntinge and gaminge, uppon the Sabothe daye."

Such habits were so common in Lancashire, that the lord-lieutenant, Henry the fourth Earl of Derby, and Sir Francis Walsingham drew up suggestions for reforming the "Enormities of the Saobothe"; and throughout the lengthy document with its stringent orders to all mayors, bailiffs, constables and other civil officers, the churchwardens and other officers of the Church, the name Saobothe is consistently used. Edmund Hopwood about 1591 was deeply concerned about these practices on the Saboathe, and wrote several letters to the Archbishop of York: his positive suggestions are that two preachers should be continually resident in Lancashire, one at Liverpool and one at Preston, because "your honour doeth know how destitute Lancashire is of preachers."

The towns were to some extent supplied, but in the country villages the conservative reaction was strong. In 1609 a letter from Standish to Hopwood proposed that on "Sondaie come sennet" they should confer on the "increase of Papistes' profaning of the Sabboath and other enormityes." The result was that next year a code of eight rules on the point was drawn up and signed by Judge Edward Bromley, to be enforced by the justices. They stopped all selling on the Sunday except of flesh till the second peal stopped, and of ale outside the hours of service; all ale-house keepers to go to service with all the family; every private home to be empty in service-time; every loiterer out of doors to be fined 12d.; while piping, dancing, bowling, baiting of bear or bull, or any other profanation of the Sabbath day was forbidden.

These orders were reiterated often, so that they evidently were not obeyed. At last the Bishop of Chester proposed to drop coercion and try conciliation. He pointed out to King James the peculiar character of Lancashire with its thousands of Recusants, and suggested an attempt to win them over. He was invited to draft a declaration, which the King adopted in 1617, when it was ordered that this Declaration of Sports be read in every parish church of Lancashire.

It fell back on the laws of 1388 and 1409 which enjoined archery on the Sunday, a practice commended by Elizabeth as recently as 1580 in her Admonition. It applied to Protestants only, who had been to service in the morning. They were then encouraged to lawful recreations, such as dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting, May-games, May-poles, Whitsun-ales, Morris-dances and rush-bearing: interludes and baiting were forbidden; bowls were reserved for the gentry.

Next year the Declaration was amended and issued to all England. So from specific local conditions the whole matter in

1618 became a burning national question. And as James ordered this on his sole authority, the subject received renewed attention in Parliament.

Thus on 15 February, 1620, a bill for "The keeping of the Sabbath, otherwise called Sunday" was up for second reading.[23] Thomas Sheppard poked fun at the title, pointing out that as *Dies Sabbati* was the time-honoured name for Saturday, the bill announced that Saturday was otherwise called Sunday. His real objection was that the bill was in the teeth of the Declaration of Sports. He was therefore silenced, and after debate was expelled the House, on the motion of Pym. In the course of the debate the misleading statement was made that a bill even more severe had been passed in 1585: we have pointed out that while indeed both houses did pass it, the Queen disallowed it. Nothing came of this bill, and when in 1623 and 1624 two similar bills were passed by both Houses, King James vetoed both, and addressed a smart rebuke to Parliament for daring to meddle with what he declared to be within his absolute prerogative, and had already dealt with in his Declaration, to the opposite purpose.

Such a position was impossible to maintain. The question continued to excite discussion. Thomas Broad, rector of Rendcombe in Gloucester, published three questions and discussed what it meant to use the Fourth Commandment, whether any sense but the literal could be accepted, and whether there were any law of nature to sanctify one day in seven. Prideaux, divinity professor at Oxford, answered discreetly in Latin, holding strongly that the Lord's Day owed its pre-eminence to the authority of the Apostles.

So far as Parliament was concerned, a settlement was arrived at in the first year of King Charles, by a Sunday Observance Act, apparently the first which was devoted wholly to this one point, and the first time that Parliament was permitted any voice on any detail of church administration. On the whole, the Puritan view gained ground, for it was now forbidden to go out of the parish for any sports or pastimes; and within the parish, it was forbidden to bait bears and bulls or to enact stage-plays.

Here the matter rested for awhile, the same conflict being renewed when Laud attained supreme power in 1633, when another deluge of books rained from the presses. But we turn from the mere to-and-fro movements of Puritan and Government, to note an evolution of doctrine into a new phase, when not only the Jewish customs were pleaded for, but the Jewish day, and the Saturday found its adherents.

W. T. WHITLEY.

[23] Cobbett: Parly. Hist. I. 1190.

Baptists in the Weald.

KENT is a museum of Baptist antiquity. It is always in villages that the real country flavour remains, and eleven miles south-east of Maidstone is as quaint a group as anyone could want. The old fragrance is rapidly exhaling, new chapels for old meeting-houses, Alexandre harmoniums instead of flutes and bass viols, Sustentation grants instead of ten shillings a week. Shall we try and depict the past, relying for many facts and all local colour on Mr. Halford L. Mills of Smarden, long a trustee and deacon.

Three hundred years ago there were no Baptists in Kent, so far as we know. But there were sturdy descendants of Lollards, and recollections of Agnes Snoath burnt in Mary's days. The soil was capital, if only Baptist seed were dropped in. William Jeffery of Sevenoaks is one of the first to appear. Then the minister of Orpington, Francis Cornwell, preached at Cranbrook to a gathering of his brethren and startled them. Christopher Blackwood, minister of Staplehurst, took the sermon down in shorthand, and they agreed to thrash the matter out another day. In the end, both these clergy became Baptist, and of course quitted the Establishment. Important as their work was elsewhere, the local leadership fell to a family which took its name from the village of Kingsnorth, two miles south of Ashford, but whose head, Richard, was at the farm of Spilshill in Staplehurst, where his fine oak frame house is still to be seen.

An ancient book, jealously guarded at Bound's Cross chapel by a Tilden trustee, shows that the work in and round Smarden had been so effective by 1640, that in that year was drawn up a list of 84 men and women who signed a covenant. From that time onwards Baptist witness has been borne in a large group of villages on the Weald of Kent. The threads are matted together, but it has been possible to disentangle one cluster, and the unravelling may be better followed by noting the knots :—

1640. Baptists of Staplehurst, Smarden, &c., covenant together.
1677. Semi-unitarians of Biddenden, Frittenden, Headcorn, separate.
1705. Calvinists of Smarden exclude the General Baptists, who organize afresh and are recognized as the original church.

1817. Church quits the General Assembly, and next year joins the New Connexion.
1892. Church joins the Baptist Union, and the Kent and Sussex Association.
1902. Some leave and form a church, which joins the Old Baptist Union.
1905. The original church disbands, handing over the property to the Association.
1908. The Association promotes a new church to use the premises.

Practically, therefore, the story of the ancient church falls into three sections :—

Gathering and Sorting.
A Century of Testifying.
A Century of Feebleness.

But there are also offshoots to be noted; Headcorn, Smarden Tilden, Smarden Bethel, besides several Calvinists at Bethersden, Bounds Cross, Biddenden, Frittenden.

I. GATHERING AND SORTING.

In the first period there was eager evangelization in every direction for scores of years. Every village near heard of Christ, and most villages had some converts, all Baptist. Vital religion had been at a discount; the drill of Archbishop Laud had chafed clergy and laity alike, men were ready to hear the gospel and to spread it. The members were too busy to stop and write down what they were doing, and the surviving books have only fragmentary notices. From the fly-leaves of old Bibles, entries of births and other family events were gathered up later on, and show a wide circle in 1654. A careful but obscure formula of doctrine shows that men were exercising themselves in thought: another entry shows careful watch kept over morals, so that a builder suspected of supplying inferior material had to clear himself. But till 1661 the flashes of light are few. Then came persecution, for Sheldon and Clarendon were worthy successors of Laud. It soon was illegal for five visitors to meet with a family for worship; if they were caught, heavy fines could be imposed, and in default of cash, farm and house would be stripped by merciless distraint. This lasted till 1672, when Charles issued a Declaration of Indulgence, and as a result, a group of these men applied together for licenses: James Blackmore for his house at Tenterden, Francis Cornwall for his house at Marden, Richard Gunn for the house of Theophilus Beath at Cranbrook, George Hammon for the house of James Harding at Biddenden, Daniel

Kingsnorth for the house of Thomas Hills at Charing, Henry Kingsnorth for the house of Walter Gilham at Smarden, Richard Kingsnorth for his house at Staplehurst, Thomas Kingsnorth for his house at Frittenden, Daniel Kingston (?) for the house of John Heniker at Lenham, Robert Knight for the house of John Hopper at Headcorn, Nathaniel Row for the house of John Miller at Cranbrook, Henry Snoath for the house of Thomas Hooker at Boughton (Malherbe). Thus we see how strong and how wide-spread was this brotherhood.

The leader was Richard Kingsnorth. Early Baptists had a strong sense of the duty of teaching sound doctrine, and had the inspiration that the doctrine could be put into verse for people to sing and learn; it was this which caused the rise of modern hymns as distinct from psalms and of congregational singing. Soon after 1657, when he published a little book, Richard felt moved to deliver himself with care, and he entered his poem into the church book. With a little editing of punctuation and spelling it runs thus :—

THE CHARACTER OF THE MIND OF MAN,

as it is depraved in Adam's fall, as it is made worse by Satan's temptations and actual sin, and as it is renewed again by the gift of God giving it mind to loathe sin. Whereby a soul may see itself, whether it be in a state of reprobation or salvation. . . . The mind and will are one thing; and reprobation, Romans i. 28, and renewing, Ephesians iv. 23, begin both in the mind; Christ is He that hath done all for man of free grace; man's duty is only to bend and set his mind to believe in God through Christ the Lord, and all is sure.

Mind first is nought, if after worse;
Then mind and thought are both accurst.
Mind the depraved mind of man;
First to mind God, it no whit can.
Mind both the mind and will are one;
And mind and will from God is gone.
Mind that's the judgment and the strife;
Man will not mind God in this life.
Mind how the judgment first came in;
The woman's mind was won to sin.
Mind how the serpent brought this grief;
He won her heart in unbelief.
Mind reprobation doth begin
When as the mind is won to sin.
Mind renovation's come again;
When as the mind is won from sin.

Mind renovation's always true
When love to God doth mind renew.
Mind; while thy mind is won to sin
Thy mind in reprobation's in.
Mind both the new and old begin
As mind doth love, and loathe, its sin.
Mind what's the mystery, the knot;
Man must mind God, yet can he not.
Mind that the reason of it all;
Man's mind depraved in Adam's fall.
Mind God's fustis, therein thou'll feel;
The serpent's power to bruise the heel.
Mind's fallen many a willi else;
That cannot mind God of himself.
Mind yet, thought man, God cannot mind;
Yet God minds man, for God is kind.
Mind God gives means, man's mind to win
And mind the things of God again.
Mind God's grace and power has known;
By these things God to man hath shown.
Mind, as the serpent won the mind
By outward objects, made man blind.
Mind that when man thought more to see,
Then all his word was misery.
Mind, faculty, reason to do,
God gives when He requireth to,
Mind, thus God sets before man's sight
The equal way of death and life.
Mind God gives talents for man to use,
And justly damns that it abuse.
Mind godliness, godly contents,
The mind renewed made innocent.
Mind still thought weakness, be within;
Yet is the mind renewed from sin.
Mind, Christ is He that all hath done;
Mind faith only to make't thine own.

Richard Kingsnorth, Senior,
Spillshill, Staplehurst.

Richard published two more books in 1670, and held the whole community together till his death seven years later.

Hitherto the church had been kept at peace by its evangelistic fervour within and by persecution without. But now appeared disruptive tendencies on points of doctrine. The opinions of Matthew Caffin at Horsham had their followers here, and it was found the wisest course to separate into two groups. Those

who adopted Caffin's Christology henceforth held their meetings at Biddenden, Frittenden, and Headcorn. The other party, whose destinies we follow first, met at Staplehurst and Smarden.

But a second line of cleavage presently appeared, as to the opinions of Calvin and Arminius. Hardly in any other case had these counter opinions been held within the same church; but perhaps the width of the brotherhood had prevented much tension. Once, however, that toleration became the rule under the act of 1689, and evangelization ceased, unrest developed, and it was felt wise a second time to part company. On this occasion manners were not amicable; one Elder, Thomas Gilham, closed his house to the preachers of universal redemption. By the end of the century there was open quarrel, and an attempt to reconcile by visitors from the outside failed. A deputation of Thomas Deane, Messenger, William Woodham, of Deptford, Joseph Jenkins of High Hall, Abraham Mulliner, of White's Alley, James Fenn, of Deal, David Brown, of Maidstone, finished by ordaining Vincent Jennings and Daniel Kingsnorth as Elders, Daniel Austen as Deacon: fifteen other men signed the documents. Apparently a large number held with Thomas Gilham, avowing Calvinism. Their fortunes again we postpone, and follow the ancient church, attending regularly at the General Baptist Association meetings, before and after this division. It will be borne in mind that the question of continuity was not complicated by the question of title to property, for of this there was at that date next to none. No meeting-house had been erected, the barns or houses of the members sufficed. The only piece of property belonging to the church was probably the minute-book, and this was retained by Thomas Gilham; it still is in the possession of the Calvinists.

II. A CENTURY OF TESTIFYING.

With 1706 the General Baptist Church of Staplehurst and Smarden had defined its position, orthodox and Arminian. But the eighteenth century was not one of religion; the energy which a hundred years earlier was thrown into theology and evangelizing, was diverted now to empire-building, and industrialism as the century wore on.

There are interesting notes as to the care exercised over one another, in discipline meetings. These had to deal with errors both grave and gay; for one brother was brought to acknowledge his sin in wearing a wig! One rule of the denomination was that marriages should be within it, a rule hardly enforced to-day except by Roman Catholics and the Society of Friends. We can see that though again and again the rule was re-considered, and though again and again it was ratified, yet the administration was tending to laxity. In 1708-9 Mary Huggins was charged, and

signed a memorandum. " I have sinned and offended God and you my brethren, in marrying out of communion, the which error I acknowledge to God, and now to you my brethren; and do promise by God's assistance to avoid the like evils for time to come." What we should like to know is, did Mary induce her husband to join the church; if not, was it not unreal to make her say she would avoid the evil, when she did not quit him. No case has yet been found where a church had the courage to insist on this, or boldly to alter the rule. Another kind of case is much more valuable, when on 16 December, 1716, Daniel Kingsnorth acknowledged he had been wrong in threatening to go to law with his brother before making application to the church. This was witnessed by George Kenhelm, John Austen, John Cromp, Thomas Bassett and Daniel Austen. This is remarkable, for Daniel was apparently the Elder, and the church did not flinch from disciplining its officers. Next year George Kenhelm was ordained Elder, and we may assume that Vincent Jennings was now dead.

In 1726 we hear for the first time of any public premises. Daniel Hosmer had sold a patch of ground hard by a pond, half a mile south of the parish church. Here they built a little meeting-house, containing a baptistery; the place came to be called Bell meeting; it cost them £149. It may be that it was about this time a meeting-house was fitted up at Staplehurst, which they rented for £5 yearly. Certainly in 1726 the Calvinists were erecting at Gilham Quarter their little meeting, half a mile north-west of the parish church.

John Austen was associated with Kenhelm in 1732, and as the rival General Assemblies united soon afterwards, Smarden began sending representatives annually, and came into a wider current.

Thus the General Baptist Fund sent a gift of stiff theological books for the use of young ministers; this prompted a private donation; and the G.B. fund made two more grants. Some of the books are still in the church's possession. They were well used then, for the church grew. A roll of 1741 shows 188 members, and we see ministers being supplied by Smarden to Canterbury, Brede, Dover, Headcorn, Chichester and Portsmouth. A register book was opened for births, since the parish clergyman would register only christenings, and had none from his numerous Baptist parishioners. We can trace minutely the succession of officers, the enlargements of the burial-ground, the appointment of new trustees.

A really significant thing should be noted in 1772. Attendance at the General Assembly had dropped with 1758, when both Elders were ageing. In 1770 most of the evangelicals drew off,

and joined the New Connexion. The Assembly at once woke up and beat round for recruits. Daniel Austen of Portsmouth was ordained Messenger, and he set to work to revive old friendships. He had been sent to Portsmouth from Smarden, so in 1772 it is easy to trace his influence, and that of Messenger Boorman at Headcorn, in that Smarden appeared afresh. But whereas in the previous generation its adhesion signified that it was orthodox, its adhesion now meant exactly the opposite, when the Southern Association of the New Connexion was linking such orthodox churches as Deal, Eythorne, Bessels Green with Park and Whitechapel, and when it was actually meeting at Bessels Green, where John Stanger was champion. Joseph Seaton, from Leicester, was now the senior Elder of Smarden, and his attendance at Assembly was regular till 1803, when he removed to the G.B. church at Chatham. The church flourished under his care, enlarged its burial-ground again, bought the meeting-house at Staplehurst outright for £82. As this period draws toward its close, a list shows 105 on the roll, and though some indeed were non-resident, and even the names of some in America were retained, there were thirty in or near Smarden, forty in or near Staplehurst. Every Sunday the lanes were full of people going to worship, churchmen known by their prayer-books, Baptists by their dinner-baskets. Bell meeting vestry had a copper to boil for tea, but otherwise the meals were cold. Stabling was near for the horses, and the scene must have been as it is in the Australian bush to-day. With 1813 we hear of a Sunday school, and its sand table for teaching writing is still preserved.

But the Assembly was fast plunging to Unitarianism. In 1802 it admitted a universalist church with unbaptized members, whereupon the New Connexion severed its last link. A quarrel soon developed. Smarden evidently felt doubtful; no messenger went after 1807, subscription was stopped in 1809, letters were sent next year which seem to have gained no satisfaction; and in 1811 communications ceased. With 1817 there was formal withdrawal; fellowship with Unitarians had come to an end.

III. A CENTURY OF FEEBLENESS.

The New Connexion was now showing much life. In 1816 it had formally instituted a Foreign Missionary Society, had approved of the Home work done on itinerant lines, and had said it would welcome any church whose views substantially accorded. Next year Smarden and Staplehurst sent in an application, with a statement of doctrine, including "the divinity and atonement of Christ." In 1818 it was admitted, Chatham and Wrotham being its nearest neighbours, while Sevenoaks was encouraged to apply also. The report said that work at Smarden was growing, with

prayer-meetings well attended; but the branch at Staplehurst was in not so good a state; 71 members were on the roll. This new friendship caused the resignation of Elder Benjamin Austen; for awhile he conducted worship in his home for a few Unitarians, but this cause flickered out.

Staplehurst indeed slid down hill; the minister fell ill, died, and could not be replaced; Smarden had no one to spare, and Wesleyans were allowed to use the meeting-house fortnightly. With 1824 discipline meetings ceased, three years later it was reported that there was often no service for weeks together, and in 1829 it was acknowledged the cause was extinct, despite the possession of a neat and comfortable little meeting-house.

The country-side was now changing. Turnpike roads were built; one came down from Maidstone to Tenterden, through Headcorn and Biddenden, where another joined it from Charing and Smarden. It was felt that old Bell-meeting was now off the main track, besides being small; so a new site was chosen in Smarden Town, and in 1841 at the cost of £896, Zion appeared, with stucco architrave, a singers' gallery on Tuscan columns, no longer a meeting-house, but a "chapel," even now the finest erection in the Weald for free church service. More than that, the minister ought to be paid: and a salary of £20 was promised, which soon after the opening was doubled. Of course, a man could not support a wife on £40; Thomas Rofe, "pastor" now, not Elder, kept a boarding-school. Many new features appeared; a bazaar to clear off debt, for despite the sale of the Staplehurst premises and large contributions by Deacon Dawson, sufficient money was not forthcoming; then a library for the school, a benevolent society.

A venerable member still remembers the style of worship when Zion was new. The singing gallery was a great feature, with violins, bass viol, flutes. One deacon dictated two lines of a hymn from the corner pew below, the other deacon with his bass viol led the singing; everybody sat during the first two hymns, women in the gallery, men below, the boarders in the table pew with the superior labourers. At prayer the men stood. For the last hymn all stood and faced the gallery when the singing deacon led them merrily, while the servant maids slipped away home to boil the potatoes for those who lived in the village. Collections were quarterly, "the ordinance" on the afternoon of the third Sunday. The ordinance of baptism was administered by Deacon Hosmer as required, perhaps eight times a year at best: on all candidates hands were laid in the style of the apostles and the old General Baptists.

In 1859 three members obtained leave to place an Alexandre harmonium in the gallery; five years later the bass viol gave its

last solo. And so modern fashions came in, ancient customs dropped away. The old Bell meeting-house was taken down, and its site can only be traced by the line of older graves as distinct from the newer. But a manse was built, Zion was re-seated, a schoolroom arose. When the New Connexion merged into the Baptist Union, Smarden formally joined both this and the Kent and Sussex Association.

The pace was evidently too fast for some people, and when a new pastor fell out with the trustees, he quitted the premises, and with several adherents formed a new church, which cast in its lot with the Old Baptist Union, a body transplanted by Americans, founding itself on the position of 1660, the very original basis of the church. Poor Zion felt dazed at this putting back the hands of the clock, and called in the Association, which was more modern, dating only from 1779. Under its auspices a reconstruction was effected, and Smarden Zion has entered on a new phase.

It remains to take note of the other societies which have branched off from it.

IV. THE TWIN CHURCH OF HEADCORN.

Headcorn village is but four miles from Smarden, on the way to Staplehurst; yet for 250 years Baptist life in it has been organized separately. After the friendly separation of 1677, it lived a fairly quiet and obscure life.

In those early days, when no special building existed, the General Baptists of Biddenden and Frittenden esteemed themselves one with Headcorn. Representatives were sent to the Assembly soon after the first crisis on Christology, John Saunders, Nicholas Rich, James Cooper, David Chapman, supporting Caffin's views pretty steadily; they gave the name of the church as Biddenden. John Tassall and William Tempest also appeared, from Frittenden; and it is a mercy that the latter abstained from further tangling the threads by ventilating his ideas on the Seventh-day.

Meanwhile Headcorn had been quite in the background, though we know that an acre of orchard was sold to a Smarden clothier in 1704, and that a lodge was erected on it about 1736, when George Kenhelm witnessed a deed of sale to Richard Furnell. This was apparently the beginning of the "Rumpton" chapel, as it came to be known, though only in 1748 was the next building erected, and the whole clearly put in trust for Baptists.

In 1736, however, Daniel Buss attended Assembly, then Samuel Pyall, Elder by 1755, with James Cooper two years later. Thomas Clarke and James Hosmer attended the Association at Bessels Green in 1760. Eight years later Elder John Boorman

came to the front, and started a new church book. At the critical Assembly of 1770 he took two representatives up, and made such an impression that he was chosen and ordained Messenger. It was evidently due to him that the twin church of Smarden Bell-meeting returned to Assembly. His own church flourished, and as he now had wide duties, we find Robert Pyall and Benjamin Marten associated as Elders by 1797, with perhaps John Iggelden as a fourth before the century closed. Pyall devoted himself especially to the members at Biddenden till his death in 1820. There were in all the villages 101 members. Although John Coupland attended the London Conference of the New Connexion in 1810 after the third crisis, yet the church had made up its mind. It built a new chapel in 1819, and placed upon it the uncompromising inscription, UNITARIAN BAPTIST CHAPEL. There were indeed Baptists of the ordinary General type in Headcorn, but they walked or drove to worship at Smarden in Bell meeting-house.

The Unitarian cause undoubtedly flourished, for in 1834 Lawrence Holden of Tenterden was made trustee of a new chapel at Biddenden. His successor, Edward Talbot, garnered up some of the past history, which was used in 1901 for a book on *Old Tenterden*. But long ere that, the Biddenden worship had ceased; a wheelwright named Colebrook was the last preacher. The building tumbled down, and its materials were used up for a secular edifice erected 1868.

Frittenden also saw strange changes. The last note of the General Baptists here was their attending an Association meeting at Biddenden in 1771. At the close of the century a farmer named Mitchell did indeed build a little chapel on Pound Hill, but at his death this was sold.

The story of the Unitarians at Headcorn itself can be traced in detail, and it is clear that again and again there were stirrings of a richer life. When in this century a clear issue was presented, the church did at last part company with the Assembly and the Unitarians, and did cast in its lot with the Union and the Kent and Sussex Association. But the long estrangement has not made it practicable yet to re-group with its twin-sister at Zion.

V. THE CALVINISTS OF TILDEN.

In 1705/6 the old church sent off a swarm of General-redemptionists, as we have already seen; the remainder, with Elder Gilham declared themselves a Particular Baptist church. This was the only one known to Dr. John Evans of London nine years later. In 1726 James Tilden built them a meeting-house, which has impressed his name on the church. In 1741 there were 58 members, and their rolls are continuous, though there seems no

progress to record. When the Kent and Sussex Association was formed in 1779, they joined, but withdrew in 1793, when they reported 99 members. The Association had its ups and downs, but when in 1838 it was decidedly Calvinist, Tilden rejoined with 110 members. Members came from many villages, including Biddenden. There set in an era of Calvinist chapels. The building at Pound Hill, vacated by the Generals of Frittenden, was first rented, then bought by James Hickmott and put in trust for the Particular Baptists. At Lashenden, where the bounds of four parishes converge, and a turnpike crosses the old pilgrim way, Hickmott marked off a site in 1870, thus evolving Bound's Cross. Ten years later he opened " Ebenezer " there, to seat two hundred; a school was built in 1907. At Flimwell near Hawkhurst, there arose " Providence." These three places are served by a minister living at Bound's Cross, who is a trustee of many Calvinistic chapel estates. Another " Providence " stands at Staplehurst, able to accommodate four hundred worshippers. At Smarden itself the old Tilden meeting was replaced in 1893 by a new building in Gilham Quarter. This church now esteems the Kent and Sussex Association not sufficiently Calvinist for it to join, especially as Zion belongs to it. The favourite musical instrument for this group is the pitch-pipe.

VI. THE CONSERVATIVES OF BETHEL.

In 1898, R. J. La Vander was appointed at Zion, but within four years he led away those who preferred the doctrines and the methods of 1660. They built a new chapel with a new manse, and united with that shadowy body, the Old Baptist Union. He died in 1919, his widow trained A. E. Basset, of Horsham, who succeeded him.

A COMPANY of persons were on 7 July, 1654, about to baptize some women in the water on Devizes Green, in the exercise of their religion: they were assaulted by several persons who endeavoured to throw them all into the water together. They complained to Quarter Sessions, but apparently had no redress.

* * * * * *

THOMAS PALMORE, of Stratford-under-the-Castle, was presented at the grand inquest for Wilts. in January 1643/4 for refusing to come to church, he being a Brownist or Anabaptist.

The Baptist Quarterly

incorporating the Transactions of the

Baptist Historical Society

NEW SERIES, VOLUME II.

1924—1925

London

BAPTIST UNION PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT

4, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, W.C.


BAPTIST
SOCIETY
HISTORICAL

Index.

To Persons, Places, and Incidents connected with Baptist History.

List of Contributors.

Contents.

Essays.

Baptist History.

Book Notices.