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

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

BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

1930 sees the fifth volume of our *Quarterly* begin. We thank our contributors for their aid. Any member with leisure to do a little search, will be welcomed as a worker, and can have suggestions as to profitable lines of enquiry. Any officer will be glad to help in this direction.

* * * * * *

The Treasurer can help in another direction, and will be glad to send a receipt for the new year's subscription, on receiving the appropriate communication. While membership is open to all who subscribe ten shillings, the larger subscription of a guinea is welcome, and entitles to all publications. Two extras were issued last year, and another is in sight. Mr. Blight still resides at Belstone Tor, Uphill Road, Mill Hill, N.W.7.

* * * * *

The Librarian has in his keeping a large store of rare Baptist books, magazines, pamphlets, manuscripts. They are being re-arranged and catalogued. Meantime members who desire to consult any should communicate with Professor F. E. Robinson, M.A., B.D., at the Baptist College, Bristol. The Society is always glad to receive offers of denominational literature, as requests for information come frequently.

* * * * * *

Dr. F. Townley Lord is removing from Coventry to Bloomsbury, where he will have fine traditions to uphold and to augment. Authors wishing to communicate with him will please note his change of address.

* * * * * *

The Annual Meeting will be held at Liverpool in the first week of May. An excursion is being planned to historic sites in the neighbourhood. Full particulars will be published in our next issue.

The Persecution of Baptists in Russia.

LAST July my attention was called to the persecution of Russian Baptists, and I received a promise from Mr. Arthur Henderson, the Foreign Secretary, that when diplomatic relations with the Soviet were resumed, he would make an appeal to the Soviet Government on behalf of some hundred Russian Baptist Pastors and teachers exiled or in prison.

Since then persecution has continued in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Baptists have been subjected to a more rigorous persecution as part of a general attack on religion.

The whole of Christendom has become alarmed, and we have witnessed official protests by the Pope, the leaders of the Anglican and Free Churches in this country, and by leaders of religious life in America and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, the question has degenerated into a controversy on political and party lines. The result has been the publication of evidence of tortures and murders of Priests of the Orthodox Church in Russia, of pogroms, and of wholesale persecution of all Christians in the U.S.S.R., all alleged to be more or less officially inspired by the Soviet Government. The agitation has reached such dimensions that the immediate severance of diplomatic relations with Russia is demanded.

The reply of the Soviet authorities has taken the form of a denial of any persecution and even an assertion that complete liberty of worship exists. This contention is supported by the head of the Orthodox Church in Moscow in a recent interview with the Press.

What are we to believe? Are we the dupes of Anti-Russian propaganda initiated by White Russians and broadcast from Riga, or have these persecutions any foundation in fact?

It is the purpose of this article to examine impartially the facts so far as they are ascertainable. I will deal mainly with the Baptist aspect of the question. I have an hereditary interest in the well-being of Russian Baptists, and sources of information are available, the genuineness of which can be examined.

First an historical background is necessary. How come there to be any Baptists in Russia? Dr. Rushbrooke, the general secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, in his book, *Some Chapters of Baptist European History,* has given a fascinating review of the growth of the Russian Baptists.

The Baptist Church in Russia is only two generations old. The Mennonites who emigrated from Holland to Russia at the invitation of Catherine II held beliefs extremely similar. German Baptist settlers were responsible for the establishment of Baptist communities in South Russia in the middle of the last century. Their influence spread rapidly. The first Slav to be baptised was Nikita Voronin at Tiflis in 1867, and his converts spread through the Trans-caucasus.

In Ukrainia Baptists appeared, as "Stundists," or "Bible-readers," and soon came into opposition with the Orthodox Church. Years of persecution followed, but the pioneers of the movement were men of great faith and great courage. Such a one was M. Ivanoff-Klishnikoff (father of the present secretary of the Russian Baptist Union), who preached in all parts of Russia for twelve years, until he was finally arrested and exiled. An independent and more intellectual movement, due to the influence of an Englishman, Lord Radstock, resulted in the spread of evangelical Christianity in the North. These "Pashkovites" (as they were called after Colonel Pashkoff) had much in common with the Southern Baptists, though they never actually united with the Russian Baptist Union founded in 1884.

The abolition of the Holy Synod in 1917 and the separation of Church and State led during the early days of the Revolution to greater religious freedom. The Soviet constitution allowed Freedom of Conscience and the right of propaganda for or against religion.

In the years after the War the Baptist community, freed from the old Tzarist persecution and the wrath of the Orthodox Church, continued to expand. There were set-backs, of course, and all Pastors were disfranchised and suffered from the hostility of the Communists to all forms of religion. Nevertheless, the leading Baptist Pastors were not unfriendly to the Soviet, and supported the enfranchisement of the people which the new règime procured. Their simple evangelical faith, in sharp contrast to the ritual of the old Orthodox Church, made a wide appeal. Statistics are misleading, especially in a country like Russia, but Baptist adherents probably numbered several millions.

A Pastors' college, training some eighty students for the Ministry, was established in 1927 under the direction of M. Ivanoff-Klishnikoff, the secretary of the Russian Baptist Union. A friend of mine who attended the leading Baptist place of worship in Moscow was deeply impressed with the fervour of the crowded congregation.

From time to time my father met the leading Russian Baptists who came to this country both before and after the

War. Indeed, he learnt elementary Russian so as to address simple sentences to them. As Eastern Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance he watched the growth of the Baptists in Russia with keen interest, and when occasion demanded protested to the Russian Ambassador here against Tzarist persecution, and mobilised British and American opinion on their behalf. At the successive Baptist World Alliance Conferences, the Russian Baptists sent their representatives. At the last Conference in Toronto in 1928 some twenty Pastors and teachers came from Russia.

At the end of 1928 a distinct change was noticeable. The dispatches of reliable American correspondents in Moscow emphasised the spread of anti-religious propaganda, the closing of churches, the dispersal of worshippers and the imprisonment of Baptist teachers in particular. This witness is confirmed by a study of the Soviet Press. The Baptist teaching had been making great headway among the workers in factories and the town-dwellers. The supremacy of the Communists was challenged and by the beginning of 1929 a great anti-religious drive was launched. The Soviet Government, recruited exclusively from the Communist ranks, was forced to take action. The Baptists were said to be hostile to the labour Unions and the peasants. They must be checked and thwarted.

An amusing commentary of the "Baptist Movement and its Political Significance," is given in a book published in 1929 by the Government Press in Moscow. The author is B. Tikhomirov. I am again indebted to Dr. Rushbrooke for this information. The writer objects to the demoralising methods the Baptists employ. The women's sewing circles is "an exploitation of female labour"; the "maiden circles," whose white dresses and melodious songs have extraordinary fascination, even for young communists, are also suspect; meetings are held for believers and unbelievers, and the latter "are carefully stalked, and then treated in the Baptist spirit." Baptist teaching is the religious ideology of the masses—a swindle. Moreover, they are linked with an international organisation antagonistic to Soviet Russia—an organisation for serving capital. The big four—according to the author—are John D. Rockefeller, Henry Ford, David Lloyd George, and William Green (President of the American Federation of Labour). It is an imposing Triumvirate, especially when Mr. Ford (who, I believe, is not a Baptist) is added. It is clear that the Baptist methods are threatening the spread of communism!

But to continue my review, to say that Baptists were murdered, tortured or even continuously persecuted, is an exaggeration. The method was for more subtle and effective.

Mr. Walter Duranty, the careful correspondent of the "New York Times" in Moscow, wrote in February, 1929, that the Soviet authorities had issued orders for the arrest of Baptist Pastors and Administrators wherever found. Local organs of the Government were cautioned against arresting the rank and file, but were to "strike at the heart of the Baptist organisation."

There followed the notorious Soviet decree of April 8th, 1929. The original constitution was to be amended. Freedom of Conscience was changed to Freedom of Worship subject to specific regulations. Worship could only be conducted in defined places under police registration. All economic and cultural activities were prohibited. The reading of the Scriptures was allowed. Prayer meetings or study circles, Sunday schools or needlework classes were forbidden. Sermons were not encouraged. Religious instruction of children under eighteen had long been forbidden.

The drive continued throughout the year. Worship was free, but Pastors were heavily taxed and harassed. Members of the congregation often lost their civil rights. They were not allowed to continue in labour Unions, and lost their bread rations. Baptist children were expelled from school. The official paper, *The Baptist,* was not forbidden—its circulation was restricted to 2,500 copies. It has now ceased. The printing or importation of the Bible was forbidden. Pastors were reduced to poverty owing to the heavy tax. Over a hundred of the leaders were exiled or thrown in prison. Places of worship were seized for the use of the Communists. Only one meeting place to-day is open in Moscow. The Secretary of the Baptist Union, M. Ivanoff-Klishnikoff, is in prison. The President, M. Odinzoff, is allowed his liberty. Some Pastors were sent to the White Sea Settlement. Others to Siberia. Several of the delegates to the Toronto Baptist World Alliance Conference are in prison. M. Bukreev was imprisoned and lost his reason. The severity of the persecution varies in different parts. In Odessa, there has been a clean sweep of all religious communities. Elsewhere if a place of worship is open (subject to the restrictions of the April decree) gangs of Communist youths with whistles and drums make worship impossible. Pressure is brought to bear on priests to recant. The list of those who do is given great publicity in the press. No Baptist pastor has yet recanted, as far as I have heard.

The situation changes from week to week. Imprisonment is not always for long periods. I know of only one death through exposure. One minister, known to some of us in this ocuntry, has recently been released after a few months' imprisonment. His wife died from heart failure, overjoyed at his sudden return. As I write I have the names of men in front of me—men known

to my father—men who attended our conferences, who have been subjected to intermittent persecution. I have in front of me letters from pastors who have escaped across the border, testifying to the agony and anguish of the last year of terror. These letters are not forgeries—they are in the familiar handwriting of men who are known to the officials of the Baptist Union. Yes, there is complete freedom of worship in Russia subject to the above restrictions. There are no massacres—no tortures—only restrictions. Not even continuous persecutions. It is the method of slow strangulation. The Baptists in Russia need our prayers and our aid, and that the truth shall be known in England and America.

Needless to say, at the beginning of 1929 the leaders of the Baptist community protested to the Soviet against the restrictions and persecutions to which they were subjected. It was a sad reward, they pointed out, for their loyalty to the Soviet. They had taken no part in political affairs. One cannot perhaps substantiate a general negative. But the persecutions of the Baptists are not regarded by those responsible, as a punishment for subversive propaganda, but as part of a general attack on religion. According to communist doctrine religion is an opiate —a soporific; it teaches contentment with the established order; it upholds tradition; above all, it diverts the energies of reformers into channels of passivity and stagnation.

Every allowance must be made for an inevitable revolt against the pre-war Orthodox Church—a central pillar of the Tzarist regime and the consistent enemy of reform. That Church must bear its share of responsibility for the revolution and the gigantic experiment in communist government that still prevails in Russia. The Church has too often been the enemy of Christianity in all countries.

One can understand the severe reaction in Russia against religion which takes the form of a revolt against all organised expressions of it whether Orthodox or Evangelical. But it is a strange irony of fate that those who suffered most from the Tzarist regime, should themselves suffer most from those who ended that tyranny.

It is not necessary to examine the complicity of the Soviet Government in the Anti-God campaign of leading communists. It may well be that it is powerless to stop it, even if it wished to do so. The " Isvestia " of June 8th, 1929, an official Government organ, contained an article by Lunacharsky, Soviet Minister of Education. It ran :—

" The Soviet Government's mighty hand will support the Society of the Godless," and " religion must be rooted out by the most intensive anti-religious propaganda."

Both the "Pravda" and the "Isvestia" have encouraged the war against religion and made charges against the Baptists to which they cannot reply. There is no right of reply in the Soviet Press. The Bolshevist Journal "Trud" (Jan. 7th, 1930) states that in Moscow there are now 287 churches of all denominations against 675 formerly. During 1929 579 of "God's boarding-houses" were closed in other parts of the country, over 1,000 being now shut down.

In conclusion it should be fairly stated that the persecutions of religion in Russia is no justification for persecuting Mr. Arthur Henderson here, who is as much concerned as anyone at the trend of events. Nor would I urge a break of diplomatic relations. No step can be justified at this time that would intensify the persecution of those we are anxious to help. But it is a time of anxiety not only for the Russian Baptists but for all those here who deplored the attitude of the last Conservative Government, and who have always been ready to give the Soviet Government a chance to make good. One can only hope that their more responsible leaders will realise the immense harm that is done to their own cause by a denial of liberty to those who are one with us in faith but not in nationality. British public opinion—indeed, the public opinion of Christendom—is hardening against the Soviet.

The stage may shortly be reached when public opinion may demand more drastic steps than a public protest. The Red-letter election shows how difficult public opinion is to control or keep within the confines of reason, once a wave of sentiment sweeps the country. Soviet policy is not continuous or stable; it acts and reacts according to the strength of groups within the central executive. Wiser counsels may yet prevail, and on this faint note of hope one may conclude this melancholy review of current persecution in Russia.

GEOFFREY SHAKESPEARE.

THE Annual Meeting will be held on Thursday, 8 May in Liverpool. Members and friends are invited to tea at four o'clock in the Fabius chapel. This site was given for Baptist burials in 1707, and contains many old grave-stones. After tea, reports will be given, and elections will take place. Members will note the existing officers and committee, by the back page of the cover. Additional nominations may be sent to the Secretary within April. Principal Underwood will read a paper on the early relations of the Academy at Horton with the Lancashire and Yorkshire Association.

The Problem of Freewill.

THE subject to be considered—in certain of its aspects—in this article may be justly described as one of the perennial, as it is one of the most important problems of human thought. It is a problem that has engaged the attention, and called forth the dialectical powers, of some of the world's greatest thinkers—one that has often provoked long and bitter controversy (especially in theology) and concerning which much has been written, chiefly from the opposed standpoints of Determinism and Libertarianism. Indeed, the literature of the subject is extensive and voluminous enough to suggest that it is both impossible and unnecessary to add to it. Through centuries of speculation the question of Freewill has been considered by men of almost every school and type of thought—by moralists and theologians, by psychologists and metaphysicians—so much so indeed that one recent writer asserts, with pardonable exaggeration, that "the history of the problem of the will is almost the history of philosophy" itself.[1] It cannot, of course, be said that any generally accepted or completely satisfactory solution of this vexed problem has been propounded. On the contrary, there seems to be no subject of philosophic and religious import upon which competent thinkers have differed so much as upon this one. Ever since the rise of the rival philosophies of Stoicism and Epicureanism (the one championing Necessity and the other advocating Freedom), men whose intellectual ability and critical acumen are above suspicion have, like the fallen angels in Milton's great epic, debated the pros and cons of "fixed fate, freewill, fore-knowledge absolute" and have, too, like their angelic predecessors, "found no end, in wandering mazes lost." Indeed, it is surprising how thinkers of the most diverse schools of thought are to be found occupying common ground on this question; e.g., Christian Theology and Empiricist Scepticism can be one in their attitude to this thorny problem, for Augustine and Calvin, Jonathan Edwards and Thomas Chalmers, seem to fall into the same ranks as David Hume, J. S. Mill, and Alexander Bain; and again, both Leslie Stephen, the Evolutionist moralist, and T. H. Green, the Idealist metaphysician, claim to be determinists, though of course in different senses. It is, therefore, not to be wondered

[1] A. B. D. Alexander, *Christianity and Ethics*, p. 82.

at that, at the present time, there are some who think it futile to give any further consideration to this admittedly difficult topic —and this, not because they regard the controversy between Determinism and Libertarianism as finally settled, but because they believe the problem so intractable as to be beyond solution. In their opinion, we have not sufficient data from which to deduce any certain conclusions; and any consideration of the problem is, so they assert, bound to lead the investigator into a sort of intellectual *cul-de-sac* from which there is no escape save by way of retreat. Indeed, they believe—as William James puts it in a famous essay—" that the juice has ages ago been pressed out of the freewill controversy, and that no new champion can do more than warm up stale arguments which every one has heard."[2] Such people would hardly be enamoured of the suggestion of Milton to the effect that one of the joys of heaven would be found in the opportunities presented by it for full discussion of the mystery of " fate and freewill."

There are others who also consider it useless further to consider this question—but in their case not because no satisfactory conclusion is possible, but rather because the problem has at last been solved. To them the controversy between Determinism and Libertarianism has been definitely ended by the victory of the former, which victory has been made possible by the rise of modern physical science, with its emphasis upon the notion of " the reign of natural law." The Hebrew Psalmist sang, with true religious fervour: " The heavens declare the glory of *God*," but these people say, with the quiet assurance of science: " The heavens declare the glory of *law*." They have felt justified in assimilating the point of view of psychology to that of the physical sciences, and have applied the Law of Universal Causation to mental states as they express themselves in behaviour, with the result that any freedom worthy of the name is banished from the universe in general and from human life in particular. For such, Meinong, the Austrian philosopher, speaks when he says: " It is not however the deterministic controversy which we propose taking up: in my opinion, at any rate, this is a matter which was concluded long ago; for those who believe in the law of causality cannot logically be indeterminists "; [3] and so does Riehl, the German Neo-Kantian, when he boldly asserts that " the sense of freedom is as much

[2] William James, *The Will to Believe*, p. 145.

[3] Meinong, *Psychologisch-ethisce Untersuchungen zur Werttheorie*. p. 209. (Quoted by Rudolf Eucken in *Main Currents of Modern Thought*, p. 431.)

an illusion as the impression that the earth moves round the sun." [4]

Whether or not such dogmatism, which so often characterises the utterances of the champions of what William James so aptly calls "hard-determinism," is justified is a very debatable point which cannot be fully entered into here. Nevertheless, it is not irrelevant to point out that the seemingly barren results of previous discussions of this subject cannot be said to encourage present-day consideration of what appears to be an insoluble problem. As Archibald Alexander says: "The history of the doctrine of the will has been, to a great extent, a history of the dispute about freedom and its opposite, which has an unpleasant notoriety. Anyone who troubles himself or others with this subject is popularly looked upon as the victim of *une idée fixe*, and consigned to the class of zealots who have hopes about the quadrature of the circle." [5] The latter part of this assertion may strike some as an exaggeration, but no one can deny that an "unpleasant notoriety" does attach to the subject, and that reports of past controversies about this topic do not make altogether inspiring reading. Oft-times indeed the controversy seems to have been merely a verbal one. Not only has a vague and unsatisfactory terminology given rise to considerable confusion of thought, but to the ordinary unsophisticated man there appears to have been an unnecessary amount of "hair-splitting" and quibbling about words, to which—as David Hume says—"a few intelligible definitions would immediately have put an end." Yet despite the fact that so many past investigations into the Problem of Freewill have ended in apparent barrenness and futility, the subject both demands and deserves the most careful reconsideration.

(*a*) One reason for this lies in the fact that there are real and important issues at stake, since the problem of the Freedom of the Will ultimately involves the question of moral responsibility; and that is a question to which neither theology, nor ethics, nor metaphysics can, in the long run, be indifferent. Indeed, as Prof. H. Wildon Carr says: "This moral responsibility *is* the freewill problem." [6] Or as Dr. James Welton puts it: "Without freedom there is no responsibility, and therefore no morality. It would be a mockery to show that one kind of life is better than another if man be really an automaton, even though he may be deluded by the belief that he

[4] Riehl, *Philosophischer Kriticismus*, Vol. II. p. 219. (Quoted by G. T. Ladd, *Philosophy of Conduct*, p. 138.)

[5] Alexander, *Theories of the Will*, p. 4.

[6] H. Wildon Carr, *The Freewill Problem*, p. 6.

determines his own conduct."[7] Some thinkers, it is true, are inclined to deny that the problem of Freewill is as important as has generally been supposed, although when they do so they refer to the problem in its practical bearings upon the question of moral conduct, rather than in its purely speculative aspects. D. F. Strauss, for example, in his last important work, *Der Alte und der Neue Glaube* (a book which created an even greater sensation than his earlier and more famous *Leben Jesu*), speaking of the problem of the will, says: "The determination of the moral value of human conduct remains untouched by this problem."[8] Writing only a year or two later, Henry Sidgwick follows Strauss in regarding the question of Freewill as being of no fundamental importance to the constructive moralist. He denies that "a solution to this metaphysical problem is really important for the regulation of human conduct," and adds: "Freewill is obviously not included in our common notions of physical and intellectual perfection; and it seems to me also not to be included in the common notions of the excellences of character which we call virtues: the manifestations of courage, temperance and justice do not become less admirable because we can trace their antecedents in a happy balance of inherited dispositions developed by a careful education."[9] Others have found themselves in substantial agreement with Sidgwick on this point. Thomas Fowler is one of them. In his *Principles of Morals* he writes: "With Professor Sidgwick's opinion as to the unimportance of this question in its bearings on the regulation of actual conduct I entirely concur."[10] Professor A. E. Taylor is another. In his *Elements of Metaphysics* he points out that, owing no doubt to the influence of Kant, there is amongst students of Moral Philosophy a widespread conviction "that ethical science cannot begin its work without some preliminary metaphysical justification of freedom, as a postulate at least, if not as a proved truth." This point of view he cannot accept. He asserts that the greatest achievements in ethical construction, up to the present time, are to be found in the systems of the great Greek moralists, Plato and Aristotle, "yet the metaphysical problem of freedom, as is well known, is entirely absent from the Platonic-Aristotelian philosophy." And he sums up his own position on this point in a personal testimony thus: "For my own part I own I cannot rate the practical importance of the metaphysical inquiry

[7] James Welton, *The Groundwork of Ethics*, pp. 9-10.
[8] Quoted by Rudolf Steiner, *The Philosophy of Freedom*, p. 12.
[9] H. Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, pp, 59, 69.
[10] T. Fowler, *Principles of Morals*, Vol. II, p. 331.

into human freedom so high (as those who regard it as a necessary postulate of Moral Science, if not as a proved truth), and am rather of Prof. Sidgwick's opinion as to its superfluousness in strictly ethical investigations." [11]

Whether or not this point of view can be completely vindicated is to be determined only by a careful analysis of the contents of the moral consciousness, but it cannot be denied that it does seem to be *prima facie* false, since upon the slightest reflection it appears that the problem of freewill has a very intimate bearing upon the nature and meaning of the facts and values of the moral life. The denial of the possibility of real alternatives in human conduct seems to render impossible any adequate and satisfactory interpretation of moral phenomena; such terms as "right" and "wrong," "virtue" and "vice," "merit," and "demerit," "remorse" and "regret," "responsibility" and "punishment," are emptied of all real ethical meaning if our actions are ultimately determined by circumstances and conditions over which we have no sort of control. At least, this is the emphatic conviction of ordinary people; and although the exact thinker cannot consider himself bound by the opinions of the "man-in-the-street," "common-sense" is not always to be treated contemptuously and thrown ruthlessly aside by the philosopher.

Moreover, deeper reflection seems to confirm the view that moral responsibility depends upon the reality of freedom and that with the reality of freedom are "undeniably bound up all the interests of the moral and religious consciousness." [12] Both the moral government of God and the moral status of man are equally involved; how then can we be really indifferent to the problem of the Freedom of the Will? To assert that such indifference is justifiable is to go against the universal experience of the race, and to negate some of the noblest and finest ideas the mind of man has ever entertained. Sidgwick himself—despite his insistence upon "the practical unimportance of the Freewill controversy"—admits that human actions become "less meritorious" in so far as they are determined merely by the pressure of external circumstances or by uncontrolled natural impulses, and confesses that the denial of freedom tends to upset all our fundamental moral notions. He instances, in particular, the notion of Justice and urges that in the determination of what Justice requires a moral agent to do to his fellows it "makes some practical difference whether or not he is to regard those others as having been free agents. . . . For Justice as commonly

[11] A. E. Taylor, *The Elements of Metaphysics*, pp. 359-360.
[12] J. Seth, *A Study of Ethical Principles*, p. 370.

understood implies the due requital of good and ill Desert, and the common notion of Desert, when closely scrutinised, seems to involve free choice of good or evil; so that the denial of such free choice, dissipating our primitive notion of Desert, leaves us with the problem of determining Justice on some different principle." [13] Moreover, even from the standpoint of an empirical study of Psychology the question of Freewill is far from unimportant; as Prof. Guido Villa urges: "The question of 'freewill' with respect to our moral actions, so much discussed in ancient and modern philosophy, is one of the gravest problems concerning the individual and the community, and upon its solution depends our conception of the real character of mental activity as compared with natural phenomena." [14] This is a very salutary reminder in view of the position of psychologists, like Prof. Hoffding, who would foreclose all discussion of the problem of Freewill by their facetious assumption that psychology cannot even begin to do its work without first of all accepting a frankly deterministic attitude. It is true that from the ethical and metaphysical points of view the problem of Freewill has been made to seem insoluble by the construction of antinomies, but, as Prof. G. T. Ladd points out, the cure for this is not indifference to the problem, nor despair of its solution, but a "more thorough, unprejudiced, and profound criticism of the conceptions involved." And he adds: "All this is true whether these antithetic conceptions are evolved by the plain man's thinking, or by the profound but perverse analysis of Kant, or by the brilliant and subtle but fallacious dialactics of Dean Mansel or Mr. F. H. Bradley." [15]

Besides, the ethical importance of the problem of the Freedom of the Will seems to be indicated by the beginnings of the history of man's speculation upon this profound and far-reaching question. Very early in Greek thought the conception of "Fate" arose. "Fate is the counterpart of Fortune. They are two ways of looking at life; both are essentially connected with man. From the point of view of Fortune all is indeterminate; from the point of view of Fate all is determined. And Fate, like Fortune, attains to deity before our eyes during the course of Greek literature." [16] As far back as the Homeric poems we meet with the plain recognition of the supremacy of Fate—though Homer knew nothing of the idea of Fortune—

[13] H. Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, p. 75.
[14] G. Villa, *Contemporary Psychology*, p. 347.
[15] G. T. Ladd, *The Philosophy of Conduct*, p. 135.
[16] Article on "Fate," *Encyclop. of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. V.

and gradually the notion of a "predetermined order of destiny in the affairs of man" permeated the whole of Greek literature and became one of its chief characteristics right down to the beginning of the Christian era. By the time of Hesiod, the popular thought of Greece had pluralised and personified the conception of Fate in the figures of the three weird and stern sisters—the spinning-women, Clotho, Lachesis and Atropos—who together spun and clipped the threads of mortal life. From popular thought the conception of Fate passed over into the Greek tragedies. "Awful," says Sophocles in *Antigone,* "is the mysterious power of Fate," and that is the general belief of the Greek tragedians. Nor is the notion absent from the Greek philosophers. Heraclitus, for example, believed that all things happen according to Fate and that the essence of Fate is "Reason" (λόγος). Plato (who was much influenced by Heraclitus), in his dialogues, everywhere takes for granted that there is a predetermined order of destiny, especially in relation to human affairs. In pre-Aristotelian literature, however, there are to be discovered two rival conceptions of Fate struggling for supremacy. The first regards Fate as a mysterious decree, depending for its effectiveness upon the will of the gods; the second regards it as a personification which stands above the gods, controlling their actions as well as those of men. The latter conception recedes into the background in post-Aristotelian literature, due no doubt to the influence of Aristotle, who rejected the notion of Fate as a principle superior to the gods, and who thus helped to free the idea from the inconsistencies of popular thought. Nevertheless, this conception of Fate as an independent principle or power controlling the actions of the gods themselves, despite its prominence in the mythology of the Greeks, is of the utmost significance in the history of Greek speculation, inasmuch as it is one of the indications of the transition from the mythical to the philosophical view of nature; it reveals the tendency to reach a principle of unity higher than the gods, and is thus an important landmark in the journey from polytheism to monotheism. The Epicureans and also the members of the later Academy flatly denied that there is any such thing as Fate, but the Stoics made much of the idea. Chrysippus, the most brilliant of all the followers of Zeno, asserted that the "essence of Fate is a spiritual power arranging the whole in order" and, following the lead of Heraclitus, identified it with the immanent Reason of the universe. Zeno himself regarded Fate as identical with Providence and with Nature, while Antipater asserted that Fate was God. But here the mythical idea of Fate has been

transformed into the principle of philosophical Necessity; and this was the prevailing conception of Fate in all post-Aristotelian Greek literature, both with those who accepted it and with those who rejected it.

Now the rise and spread of the conception of Fate in Greek thought brought with it the very practical problem of adjusting man's belief in his own autonomy to the idea of an irresistible power which (as we have pointed out above) was often regarded as controlling the actions and destinies of the gods, as well as those of men; and it was in the course, and as a result, of this prolonged attempt to bring about this adjustment between the idea of human freedom and the principle of Necessity—both occult and philosophical—that "the science of Ethics was born. Thus volition was first distinguished as a principle of Ethics."[17] Hence, the statement made above to the effect that the ethical importance of the problem of the Freedom of the Will seems to be indicated and confirmed by the beginnings of the history of man's thought upon this great question. And taking into consideration *all* that has been urged above it will be recognised that there is no inconsiderable evidence against the view that the question of Freewill is irrelevant for ethical—and, we may add, for religious—thought.

(*b*) Another reason why this question should be re-opened is to be found in certain tendencies of twentieth-century science. The science of the last century was frankly deterministic in outlook and point of view. Taking as its fundamental category the notion of the reign of natural law it tended more and more strongly towards the mechanistic interpretation of human personality. Mechanical theories of life were almost everywhere in the ascendent, and a theoretical materialism, which in the preceding century (with the exception of the very definite materialism of Hobbes) had been a very mild affair, rapidly gathered strength and became dominant. The tendency in almost every quarter was to regard man as a kind of very complex and delicately constructed machine—the highest point yet reached in the evolutionary process. The substantial existence of mind was blatantly denied, and all mental activities were treated merely as functions or products of the material organism. This view was well expressed by Vogt. "In my opinion," he says, "every investigator of nature will, in the use of consistent thinking, come to the view that all those capabilities which we include under the name of activities of soul are simply functions of the brain substance, or—to employ a somewhat rude expression—that thoughts stand in the same

[17] A. Alexander, *Theories of the Will*, p. 8.

relation to the brain as gall to the liver or urine to the kidneys." [18] Thus we see that mind was entirely ruled out of the universe, and the human organism looked upon as merely a mechanical combination of chemical and physical constituents. Now a necessary corollary of the mechanistic interpretation of personality is the denial of the reality of freedom. Those who espouse the cause of scientific materialism cannot logically regard Freewill as being anything other than an illusion, and nobody knows this better than the materialists themselves. Hence, the nineteenth-century materialists—despite their differences of opinion on several important points—were one in their assertion of the groundlessness of the notion of freedom. Their general attitude was well summed up in the words of Moleschott: "Man is the sum of parents and nurse, of time and place, of pleasure and weather, of sound and light, of food and clothing. His will is the necessary result of all these causes, bound to a law of nature, like the planet in its course, like the plant in its soil." [19] Such a conclusion seemed to be forced on them—so they asserted—by the universality of the reign of natural law; if man is a part of the universe, then he must be subject to the same laws of cause and effect as the rest of the universe. Moreover, both the new biology and the older psychology seemed definitely to support this point of view—the one with its insistence on the importance of the interaction between inherited and environmental factors in the development of life, the other with its doctrine of the "association of ideas." There seemed to be no room in the universe for the creative activity of mind; all was determined by a Fate that was none the less inexorable because it was scientific rather than occult.

In the thought of the present time there are indications of tendencies in the opposite direction. Only one of these can be noted here—and that but briefly.

(i) The mechanistic interpretation of life is based upon a law which belongs to the whole domain of science, viz., the law of the Conservation of Energy. Stated in its most general terms this law asserts that the total sum of the energy of the universe is a constant which is never increased nor decreased; although changes may take place in the distribution of this energy its quantity is strictly determinate. This principle was first recognised by Kant as a general concept, but its modern formulation as a category of natural science is due to Mayer, Joule and Helmholtz. Now it is obvious that if the sum-total of the energy in the universe is constant and invariable (even

[18] Quoted in H. C. Sheldon, *Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 64.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

though its form is constantly changing), anything in the nature of the creative activity of mind is ruled out. From any point of view, such creative activity would be a miracle, and "miracles do not happen" in a mechanistic universe, for the simple reason that they would be a denial and abrogation of the principle of the conservation of energy. For a long time, this was the general point of view of the physicist; he was so certain of the universal applicability of this fundamental concept that he felt more than justified, by a rigorous logic, in denying the reality of mind, and with it the reality of freedom. Present science, however, is not quite so sure on this point. In his earliest work, McDougall attacked this doctrine—or rather its application to the realm of life and mind—as an unjustifiable extension of the law of the conservation of energy. He urged that it begs the question at issue "by assuming that the physical energy of the universe is a closed and finite system," and pointed out that "in many cases of transformation of physical energy a part of the energy disappears, or becomes latent, though by a convenient fiction it is said to become potential energy," all that we know of this potential energy being "that it is recoverable and capable of giving rise again to a quantity of energy equal to that which disappeared." [20] A few years later, McDougall wrote "one even hears whispered doubts about the law of the conservation of energy," [21] and more recently Prof. A. N. Whitehead has stressed the same point.[22] And that they are correctly interpreting the trend of modern physical science may be seen by reference to some leading physicists. Prof. Bohr, for example, in his theory of the structure of the atom finds that he can give a more adequate explanation of certain facts, if he rejects the mechanistic hypothesis and makes non-mechanical assumptions.[23] Again, Prof. Frederick Soddy—another physicist who is seeking to explore the structure of the atom—in his *Cartesian Economics,* says: "I have no claim to call or express an opinion on the reality of the existence of intelligence apart from and outside of life. But that life is the expression of the interaction of two totally distinct things represented by probability and *freewill* is to me self-evident, though the ultimate nature of these two different things will probably remain, a thousand years hence, as far off as ever." [24] Yet again,

[20] W. McDougall, *Primer of Physiological Psychology,* pp. 8-9.
[21] W. McDougall, *Body and Mind,* p. 216.
[22] In his *Science and the Modern World.*
[23] & [24] See *The Battle of Behaviorism,* by J. B. Watson and W. McDougall, pp. 74 and 83.

another physicist, Prof. A. S. Eddington, in his recent "Gifford Lectures" shows that the developments of the quantum theory —i.e., the theory that it is part of the character of the atom that its behaviour shall be to some extent indeterminate—are leading physicists to reject the principle of strict determinism in their world. He denies that there is any known primary law of universal application (not even the law of gravitation) and urges that "it is difficult to see now any justification for the strongly rooted conviction of a deterministic system of law."[25] It seems as if the old nightmare of a rigid mechanism and a universal determinism that so often has disturbed the minds of men is on the point of vanishing away; and if so there is some reason for a reconsideration of the problem of freedom. Certainly there are no adequate grounds for saying that the age-long controversy on this question of Freewill has been definitely concluded in a victory for scientific Determinism.

Further proof of this latter contention could be obtained by a consideration of the doctrine of Emergent Evolution (so closely associated with the names of Dr. C. Lloyd Morgan and Prof. S. A. Alexander) and by a consideration of the doctrine of Teleological Determination (so ably advocated by Dr. William McDougall), but space forbids. Nor have we space to show how the discrediting of that bulwark of Determinism known as the old "Associationist Psychology" (which received its death-blow in Mr. F. H. Bradley's *Principles of Logic,* and only awaits decent burial) has increased the logical difficulties of those who wish to deny the reality of human freedom. But it is worth noting that in each case there has been a departure from the mechanistic interpretation of life, and any departure from such an interpretation means that another breach has been made in the defences of the Determinists. And this means support for the Christian philosophy of life. After all, the problem of Freewill is not an indifferent one for the Christian believer—it is a doctrine of vital importance. Whatever may be said in favour of Augustinian or Calvinistic Predestinarianism, it is perfectly clear that if the mechanistic interpretation of life is justified Christianity is nothing more than a "cunningly devised fable." The reality of human freedom is an integral part of the Gospel; indeed, as Dr. H. Wildon Carr says: "The idea of freedom originated in the Christian conception of man's relation to God, and the problem of freewill first became explicit in the development of Christian doctrine."[26] Anything, therefore, which helps to destroy the citadel of modern scientific determinism is a welcome ally of the Christian thinker.

JOHN PITTS.

[25] A. S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World,* p. 331.
[26] H. Wildon Carr, *The Unique Status of Man,* p. 8.

Some Modern Views of the Soul.

By F. TOWNLEY LORD.

TO denote the spiritual factor in human personality many psychologists prefer the terms self, or mind, especially as soul "breathes the rarified atmosphere of poetry and theology."[1] The associations of the term soul are clear from Baldwin's definition: "Soul is used of the mental principle considered as a substance separate from the body, having personal individuality and identity, of which the individual mental life and development are manifestations."[2] The substantial fairness of this description is seen if it be compared, e.g., with the Augustinian conception. For our purpose here we retain the term soul, without necessarily committing ourselves to all the elements in the ecclesiastical conception. We follow Laird when he says: "Generally speaking, the words person, soul, or mind, may be regarded as synonyms for the self, and it would be mere pedantry to avoid using them as synonymous, unless there is some special liability to ambiguity in the particular context in which they are employed."[3] And our use of the term soul has significance as against the movement which is often designated "psychology without a soul."

The idea of the soul as spiritual substance was emphasised in ecclesiastical thought, and Hume's strength was directed against the conception. Although much of the philosophic thought after Hume was emphatic on the metaphysical reality of spirit, we have to take account of a tendency in modern psychology which is really a new insistence on the validity of Hume's work. Bradley sums up this tendency in a passage where he says that a view of the soul "that pretends to be anything either before or beyond its concrete psychical filling is a gross fiction."[4] William James declared his position in clear and frank language. The opening chapter in his *Essays in Radical Empiricism* is entitled, "Does Consciousness Exist?" and the main thesis of that chapter is the contention that consciousness does not stand for an *entity* but for a *function*. "For twenty years past I have mistrusted consciousness as an entity; for seven

[1] John Laird, *Problems of the Self*, vii.
[2] Dict. of Phil and Psych. ii. 557.
[3] *Problems of the Self*, 7.
[4] *Appearance and Reality*, 89.

or eight years past I have suggested its non-existence to my students . . . it seems to me that the hour is ripe for it to be openly and universally discarded." [5] The metaphysical basis of James' view is that the world is made up not out of raw material of two sorts, matter and mind, but that the prior and neutral stuff is arranged in different patterns by its interrelations, some arrangements being called mental, others physical. Paint, for example, in a paint shop is so much saleable matter. When spread on a canvas it represents a feature in a picture and performs a spiritual function. " Just so, I maintain, does a given portion of experience, taken in one context of associates, play the part of a knower, of a state of mind, of ' consciousness '; while in a different context the same undivided bit of experience plays the part of a thing known, of an objective ' content.' " [6]

James has been followed very closely by a more recent writer, Bertrand Russell. In his *Analysis of Mind,* in the section " Recent Criticisms of Consciousness," he quotes Meinong's analysis of thought into three elements, the act of thinking, the content of thought, the object. Meinong supposes that the act of thinking is the act of a person. " It is supposed that thoughts cannot just come and go, but need a person to think them. Now of course it is true that thoughts can be collected into bundles, so that one bundle is my thoughts, another is your thoughts, and a third is the thoughts of Mr. Jones. But I think the person is not an ingredient in the single thought: he is rather constituted by the relations of the thoughts to each other and to the body." [7] Bertrand Russell's ground for this view is that the person in thought is not empirically discoverable, nor can it be deduced from what we observe. It is clear that on this point he is in sympathy with the Behaviourists, who, able to account for the behaviour of animals without, they claim, resorting to consciousness, apply the same principle to the study of human behaviour. The result is, they claim, that we make an unwarranted inference when we infer that other people have something non-physical, called mind or thought. Bertrand Russell does not limit himself to thought, but goes on to say that it might be maintained that desire is really most characteristic of mind. Desire, he says, is of the nature of a convenient fiction for describing shortly certain laws of behaviour.[8] He agrees with Freud that a man's actions and beliefs may be wholly dominated by a desire of which he is unconscious. Nor does he give much place to moral considerations in the investigation of the matter, for " moral considerations

[5] Page 3. The essay was first printed in 1904.
[6] 9, 10.
[7] 18.
[8] *Analysis of Mind,* 32.

are the worst enemies of the scientific spirit, and we must dismiss them from our minds if we wish to arrive at truth."

This, at least, has the merit of frankness, but it is frankness that has little in common with the implications of the Christian view of man. As far as the Christian conception of the soul is concerned, it would be suicidal to eliminate the moral values and their considerations, for these are the highest considerations of all. We see here a suggestion of the tendency in some quarters to subvert the Christian standard of values, and this tendency calls for careful examination.

It must not be supposed, however, that " psychology without a soul " is in clear possession of the field. In spite of attacks of which we have quoted types, the idea of the soul an an entity has eminent defenders, and a brief survey of one or two of them will serve the double purpose of exhibiting both the strength and the weakness of the ecclesiastical conception.

In Professor John Laird's *Problems of the Self*[9] we have an interesting presentation of the problem. He admits that psychology without a soul is theoretically conceivable, but remarks that to ignore the problem of the soul is not to solve it.[10] He sets himself to examine the content of the soul or self at any given time, and finds that any cross section of conscious life contains a unity of cognition, feeling and endeavour. Introspection reveals psychical experiences: these experiences are real; they are substances, having stuff in them—they cannot be regarded as mere qualities of anything else. "We have no evidence, or at least very insufficient evidence, to prove that any experience whatever can exist except as part of a self . . . this unity of experience is the soul. Its substantiality is the ultimate fact that any given experience must form part of a distinctive unity of experiences. It is therefore a substance in the same sense as other things are substances, though it is a distinctive kind of substance whose parts are experiences."[11] "When I say that I resolve, I mean that any given resolve is part of that unity of experiences which is myself."[12] Referring to immortality, he says, "Unless there is a unity and continuity of experiences, and the kind of unity which is personality, there is no soul."[13] "The simplest expression of the nature of a substance is to say that it is an xa, or an xb, where x stands for the stuff, and a or b for the form of the substance."[14] The stuff of the soul is experiences, and these experiences gathered

[9] See also his *Idea of the Soul.*
[10] *Problems of the Self,* 337.
[11] 359f.
[12] 367.
[13] 369.
[14] 348.

together in essential unity form the substantial soul. "If there is a soul, it must be a substance, immaterial, and existing in time. When any of these features is lacking there is no longer a soul, but something else." [15] Laird deals with the same issues in his *The Idea of the Soul,* and we make the following illustrative points from that book. He makes it clear that we must not regard the soul as something unchanging. "The self is a changing thing, a continuant, not an invariant or a permanent, and in this it resembles other changing things." [16] Moreover, the unity of the self is a thing of degrees. There are exceptional cases of "dissociated personality," grounds for supposing that there are many selves in place of a single one. "Violent inexplicable changes, sudden astonishing lapses of memory, states of weariness and sleepiness, where thought seems a jumble and mere consecution of fragmentary experiences tending nowhither and not united—something of the kind is found in all of us, and is plainly a menace to our singularity and integrity." [17] Yet "What I am asserting is that, so far as we can determine, every experience forms part of some self. A person or mind or soul or self—for there is no great difference between these terms, although they look at their subject from a different angle—is a genuine continuant which has a peculiar tenacity in its texture, and is therefore a substance or a thing. Our ordinary notions have not misled us in this particular. We are justified in calling ourselves 'I,' and in treating our fellows accordingly." [18]

McDougall, in his *Body and Mind,* has urged the inadequacy of mechanism in physiology, in evolution, in human behaviour. We cannot do better than quote his own words: "The Animist who believes that the soul is something more than the fleeting stream of consciousness maintains that the consciousness of any individual is or has a unity of a unique kind which has no analogue in the physical realm, and that it cannot be properly regarded as consisting of elements, units, or atoms of consciousness, put together or compounded in any way. He maintains that the unity of individual consciousness is a fundamental and primary fact, and that we are logically bound to infer some ground of this unity other than consciousness itself; he holds that each man's consciousness is a unitary whole, and is separate and distinct from the consciousness of every other organism just because it is a state or activity of a psychical subject, the ego, soul or spirit, which is essentially a unitary and distinct being." [19]

[15] 337.
[16] *Idea of the Soul,* 152.
[17] *Ibid.,* 160.
[18] *Idea of the Soul,* 162f.
[19] 282f.

McDougall, however, hesitates to designate this unitary soul as spiritual substance. The word substance retains, he thinks, a scholastic flavour, and he cannot accept the scholastic sense as implying a core or substratum underlying and distinct from all the attributes of a thing.[20] He prefers to avoid the term substance and use in place the term being or thing. Thus he defines the soul as a being that possesses or is the sum of definite capacities for psychical activity and psycho physical interaction, of which the most fundamental are

> . . . the capacity of producing the whole range of sensation qualities in response to physical stimuli.
>
> . . . the capacity of responding to sensation complexes with the production of meanings, such as spatial meanings.
>
> . . . the capacity of responding to these sensations and meanings with feeling or conation or effort, under the spur of which further meanings may be brought to consciousness in accordance with the laws of reproduction of similars and of reasoning.
>
> . . . the capacity of reacting upon brain processes to modify their course in a way which we cannot clearly define, but which we may provisionally conceive as a process of guidance by which streams of nervous energy may be concentrated in a way that antagonises the tendency of all physical energy to dissipation and degradation.

The view that the soul is this sum of psychic capacities we express by saying that the soul is a psychic being.[21]

In addition to this insistence on the reality of souls as psychic beings there are certain points in McDougall's treatment which merit close attention. We may refer to four points. (*a*) the important part played by the body in the development of the soul—" the soul is a system of capacities which are fully present as latent potentialities from the beginning of the individual's life; and these potentialities are realised or brought into play only in proportion as the brain mechanisms become developed and specialised." [22] (*b*) our evidence at this stage only allows us to say that the soul thinks or is conscious when interacting with some bodily organism—an interesting point when related to the Hebrew conception of the unified personality. (*c*) " though it is not possible for us to say just how much of what we call personality is rooted in bodily habits, and how much in psychical dispositions, yet it is open to us to believe that the soul, if it survives the dissolution of the body, carries with it some large part of that which has been gained by intellectual and

[20] 364.
[21] 365.
[22] 370.

moral effort" [23]—a suggestion which may be compared with the idea of Eckhart that the soul may gather up into itself the powers of the bodily life. (*d*) McDougall regards it as conceivable that in connection with the future life the soul "might find under other conditions (possibly in association with some other bodily organism) a sphere for the application and actualisation of the capacities developed in it during its life in the body." [24]

Laird retains the conception of soul as immaterial substance. McDougall, while preferring to drop the term substance retains the idea of the soul as a psychic being. We proceed to Pringle-Pattison, who attacks the notion of substance as applied to soul, and dismisses it altogether from his system. This antipathy to the soul-substance conception is strongly expressed in his *Idea of Immortality*, and owes much to Hume's analysis of the self which, says Pringle-Pattison, contains far more truth than is commonly conceded to it.[25] "As for the churchly doctrine of a rational soul implanted in each individual organism, by all means let us think of the individual life history, no less than of the cosmic development, as a divinely directed process, to which, in view of its issue, no fitter word than creation can be applied. But do not let us imagine a divine figure standing by to inject a bit of supernatural stuff into the bodily mixture at the appropriate moment."[26] His objection to the soul as a bit of supernatural stuff rests on two main grounds: such a view regards the soul as unchanged throughout the changes of experience, and it retains a materialistic flavour. The idea of soul-substance represents an animistic survival, and many thinkers are doubtless led to it by their interest in human survival. He accepts Locke's demonstration of "the futility of such a substance as the bearer or support of the conscious life during our earthly span." [27]

But Pringle-Pattison is just as keen about human survival as any of those thinkers who have urged the simplicity of the substantial soul as the way to it, and therefore he must find some satisfactory theory of the soul. He finds help in Aristotle—the conception of soul as the entelechy of the body. We may almost say that the body grows itself a soul, and the concrete reality with which we have to deal is the living body. "If we start with the living body as the embodied soul, the problem of interaction ceases to exist, and laboured schemes of parallelism become unnecessary." [28] If we take these (and similar statements) as they stand, we might almost assume that for Pringle-

[23] 372.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Idea of Immortality*, 96.
[26] 72.
[27] 74.
[28] 92.

Pattison the soul is merely a function of the body. So, for instance, the statement, "if we must indulge our imagination with the picture of some bearer of the conscious life, let us be satisfied with the body, in which that life is certainly rooted in a very real sense."[29] But it is clear that Pringle-Pattison does regard the soul, when it is produced, as something other than the body and capable of surviving it. "The body, ceasing to be a living body, may relapse into its elements when it has 'fulfilled' itself, while the true individual, in which that fulfilment consisted, pursues his destiny under new conditions."[30] "A man's self will then be for us the coherent mind and character which is the result of the discipline of time, not some substantial unit or identical subject present in his body all along."[31] "The self conscious life is the pre-eminent reality which the body in its structure and organisation exists to actualise."[32] From this it is clear that his main anxiety is to avoid the idea of the soul as a static unity which remains purely static during the changes of conscious life. But this should not blind us to the fact that he retains the idea of the soul as possessing an internal unity as a single self or subject. Witness his remarks, in another connection, in his Gifford Lectures on the Idea of God. In criticising the views of Bosanquet and Bradley (who "insist on taking the individual as an adjective, thereby reducing it to a conflux of universals or qualities") he says: "The self or subject . . . is not to be conceived as an entity over and above the content, or as a point of bare existence to which the content is, as it were, attached, or even as an eye placed in position over against its objects to pass them in review. The unity of the subject, we may agree, simply expresses this peculiar organisation or systematization of the content. But it is not simply the unity which a systematic whole of content might possess as an object, or for a spectator. Its content . . . has become a unity for itself, a subject. This is, in very general terms, what we mean by a finite centre, a soul or, in its highest form, a self."[33]

It may be doubted whether Pringle-Pattison is quite fair to the historic notion of soul-substance. His objection to soul substance as something which persists unchanged throughout the flux of our mental experiences would not hold against all the ecclesiastical writers. As McTaggart says,[34] "Those philosophers who thought that there was time and change have always accepted the fact that substances changed, while preserving their identity

[29] 103-4.
[30] 105.
[31] 105.
[32] 105.
[33] *Idea of God*, 285.
[34] In *Mind*, 1923, p. 221.

through change." Nor is it a fair reading of the scholastic period to say that the idea of soul substance retains a materialistic flavour. The great scholastics who believed in the substantial soul were far from being corporealists, nor does their argument re the incorruptibility of the substantial form necessarily rely on the conception of an indiscerptible atom.[35] Some of the scholastic writers, Aquinas, for example, took pains to show that the development of the soul depends on its commerce with the body: it is a separable form, created as a potentiality, depending for its actuality on its association with a material organism. In any case, whether Pringle-Pattison's criticism of the scholastic view is fair or not, it cannot be regarded as destructive of the Christian view of the soul. The New Testament does not commit us to any particular philosophic theory; in its pages there is no philosophic presentation at all. We are not concerned to regard the soul as a kind of metaphysical atom, quite distinct from its experiences, a looker-on, so to speak, at the ebb and flow of conscious life. Nor does it matter whether we refer to the soul as "substance" or not. All that the conserving of New Testament values insists upon is the notion of the soul as a real subject, personal, developing through its experiences, and persisting after death. This Pringle-Pattison appears to accept, and there is much value also in his argument that soul and body are presented as a unity in the actual commerce of life.

If we take our stand upon the ground of New Testament values, we cannot regard it as illusory that we are real agents. A conception like that of Professor Holt that mind is merely the integration of the organism's motor response to stimuli[36] will not suffice. The soul, however it may have been formed, is *sui generis,* a self-contained entity, as Tansley points out.[37] No conception less than this will satisfy the demands of Christian experience. To quote James Ward: "Experience . . . is always owned. To talk of motives conflicting of themselves is as absurd as to talk of commodities competing in the absence of traders."[38] "Let us then make bold to regard our self-conscious life not as a flux of accidents, pertaining, with we know not what all beside, to some substratum or other, but as the actions and reactions of a thing *per se,* or rather of a subject in a world of such, as the intercourse of such a subject with other subjects."[39]

[35] Cf. A. E. Taylor in *Hibbert Journal,* xxii. 3, 599.

[36] E. B. Holt, *The Freudian Wish.* Chap. 2. "Thought is the labile interplay of motor settings, which goes on almost constantly and which differs from overt conduct in that the energy involved is too small to produce gross bodily movements."

[37] *The New Psychology,* 30, 32.

[38] *The Realm of Ends,* 290, 291.

[39] 391, 2.

Charles-Marie de Veil.

JEW, Catholic, canon regular of St. Augustine, prior of Ste. Genevieve, Huguenot, Anglican clergyman, Baptist minister —Dieu veuille qu'il ne fasse pas, comme le soleil, le tour du zodiaque![1] Such was the comment in 1685 of Pierre Bayle on Charles-Marie de Veil, whose life was just ending, so that he did not complete the circuit. Bayle might have thrown in also a Professorship, S.T.D. at Angers, and some amateur doctoring.

For several years this remarkable career has interested Mr. Wilfred S. Samuel, who has spared no time or expense to obtain contemporary information; this he places at our disposal. Especially he acknowledges much research by Dr. M. Ginsburger of the University Library in Strasbourg, both generally in the *Revue des Etudes Juives,* 1905, and expressly for this enquiry.

METZ.

The story begins at Metz about 1630. Greatly as this city has been altered by new courses of the rivers, and by demolition of old ramparts, yet it is possible still to find many memorials of that age. The modern visitor need not go, indeed, from the railway by the Rues d'Austrasie and Charlemagne and Verlaine to the cross-streets named after Bossuet and Paul Ferry; those great antagonists did not live there. Let him go north by the Rues Vauban, des Augustins, the Place St. Louis, through the ghetto of the Middle Ages, toiling up the Rue Jurue, and by the Rue St. Trinitaire past the modern Protestant Temple; so will he reach the Rue St. Ferroy, beyond which is a synagogue built in 1848 on the site of an earlier one erected in 1619, whence he may look over the Arsenal eastwards to the little Seille river, or down the steep, over what was till lately the Quai des Juifs, to a branch of the Moselle. In this narrow corner were herded within the old ramparts scores of Jewish families, whose buildings crept higher and higher as they multiplied, till their sky-scrapers vied with the cathedral three furlongs up-stream. In this second ghetto, our hero spent nearly half his life, and its conditions deserve pondering.

The city had once been Free, within the Empire. But when in 1553 the doctrines of Calvin made some progress here, and the emperor designed to coerce it, France offered protection both civil and religious, and it admitted a French garrison, with the

[1] *Nouvelles de la republique des lettres*: XI, 1029.

approval of many German Protestant princes. From that time onward, Lotharingen and Elsass became Lorraine and Alsace, except for 48 modern years. But at the time, Metz did indeed withstand a siege, yet it shrank rapidly in size and importance, losing all its privileges. By the treaty of 1648 it was formally incorporated with France: Neustria had annexed Austrasia, and the empire of Charlemagne was crystallizing afresh around Paris rather than Aachen.

The government of the city, the bishopric, the district of Metz Toul and Verdun, was confided to Charles Schonberg, of a Saxon family which for three generations had lived in France. He had married Marie, duchess of Hallwin, and had become a marshal of France. He is to be distinguished from a distant relation, also at this time a marshal in the French service, though a Protestant, known to Englishmen as that Marshal Schomburg who fell at the battle of the Boyne. The governor of Metz died much earlier, in 1656.

There was a cathedral. The bishops had ceded their civil rights to the crown of France. And as the kings had bargained with the popes to appoint to every high office in the church, the bishop at this time was Henri de Bourbon, illegitimate son of Henri IV, who had been elected at the age of six, assumed jurisdiction at the age of twenty, struck his own coin, but never saw his diocese, and married in 1668. He lived in state at St. Germain's Abbey near Paris, and he sent suffragans to do his duty at Metz. Scandalous intrigues went on between the cathedral clergy and the barons, especially when from 1644 to 1649 there was no suffragan at all; then between bishop Henri and cardinal Mazarin, with quarrels as to concordats: the Catholic situation must have been laughable to outsiders.

And in the city, the Calvinists were strong, having had leave to build a Temple as early as 1576, though it soon had to be abandoned, and at this period they had to worship outside the fortifications. They held six places in the *parlement* which Richelieu had created; they had most of the advocates, doctors, surgeons, militia officers, at least half the rich men, and all the tax-receivers in the district.[2] Of their ministers, Paul Ferri was chief, installed in 1610 at the age of nineteen, and now respected over most of France and other Huguenot lands; in concert with Durie of Scotland, he sought to unite Calvinists and Lutherans. On 17 May 1654 he preached a remarkable sermon summarising all the points of the Reformed religion, which was by general demand expanded and printed at Sedan the same year as a General Catechism. While he looked chiefly to the differences from Rome, he also remembered the Jews in his city, and as

[2] A. Floquet: *Vie de Bossuet,* edition 1855: I, 305, 306.

early as 1623 he was in touch with them, buying Hebrew books for his foreign correspondents.[3]

When the French obtained control in 1565, only three families of Jews were allowed to live in the city, but frequent permits were given to increase the number. Constant movement of French and German troops, famine, pestilence, showed the need of moneyed people with a flair for trade. By 1619 they had a synagogue, and a cemetery on the river-bank. Louis XIII when he visited the city in 1632 to oppose Gustavus Adolphus at Mainz, gave an important edict confirming many privileges to the Jews, and allowing 76 families to reside. Two years later, a parlement, newly established, added its confirmation.[4] However many actually resided, they were all cramped into the quarter of Saint Ferroy, so strait that they built five or even six storeys high. Into the rest of the town they might never come on Sundays or holidays; and even on other days, only a few streets were open to them. Out of doors, they had to wear yellow caps. They might not manufacture, nor open ordinary shops, and were allowed to deal only in second-hand goods.[5] Within these restrictions they developed a trade in jewellery, and they were in practice the bankers of the city, the horse-dealers for the garrison.

Every week they had to attend in the cathedral and in the church of St. Paul, to listen to sermons aimed at converting them.[6] We may compare the verses of Browning, Holy-Cross Day, on the similar situation at Rome:—

> By the torture, prolonged from age to age,
> By the infamy, Israel's heritage,
> By the Ghetto's plague, by the garb's disgrace,
> By the badge of shame, by the felon's place,
> By the branding-tool, the bloody whip,
> And the summons to Christian fellowship,
> We boast our proof that at least the Jew
> Would wrest Christ's name from the devil's crew.

Yet within the ghetto, there was absolute home-rule, confirmed by many edicts of the kings and their governors.[7] The grand rabbi was usually brought from a distance, to avoid local complications.[8] In 1643 this office was held by Rabbi Nathan, from Frankfort; seven years later he was succeeded by Moses Cohen, surnamed Narol from a Polish town where he was born, his

[3] *Revue des études Juives*: VIII, 76.
[4] *R.E.J.* L, 127.
[5] Calmet: *Notice de la Lorraine* (Luneville, 1856): II, 67, 68.
[6] Floquet: I, 272-274: Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, VI, 706.
[7] *R.E.J.*, 775: *Une Erreur Judiciaire*, par J. Reinach.
[8] *R.E.J.* XIV, 216 (1883).

father having lived at Safed on the lake of Tiberias in Palestine. There was an elaborate organization, a Council, a Rabbinic tribunal, with all the families classified into three groups for voting purposes; two doctors and a Burial Brotherhood were also conspicuous.

The doctors held indeed an exceptional position. Isaac Wallich, son of Josiah Moses, was chosen fourth rabbi in December 1620. He paid no taxes, was a citizen of Metz, and had Gentile patients, becoming widely famed.[9] His eldest son again became a doctor, and when he was converted to Christianity in 1651, a special sermon was preached to the Jews, and published; henceforward he was known as Paul Du Vallier, or doctor Paulus. Another member of this family, Abraham Wallich, graduated at Padua on 14 November 1655. But the succession to Jewish office was not hereditary. When Isaac died in 1637, he was succeeded by Asher Lämmlein, son of Jequtiel David the Levite, another graduate of Padua, of whom it was recorded in the Memorbuch at his death in 1650 that he showed loving-kindness to all with his healings, bleeding poor people free, giving drugs, ointments, bandages, and physic free to the poor. This man's family deserves attention, since from it sprang our man.

THE FAMILY.

In 1628 a roll was drawn up, of Jews resident at Metz. It shows Moses Asher the Levite, head of a family. He had a son Jeqel Jacob the Levite, who figured in an earlier roll of 1595. Jacob's great-grandson published a tribute to him in 1672, saying that Buxtorf and the bishop of Lodovensis acknowledged his rabbinic learning. The Memorbuch of the synagogue at Metz recorded at his death that he had long been president, that he behaved well, showed much charity, and did many good works, that his house was always open, that he maintained and aided young men who wished to study the Law. One of his sons was Jequtiel David, of whom the Memorbuch recorded that he went early and late to synagogue, and that his sons gave charity on his behalf; he died 5439, equivalent to A.D. 1679. The sons in question were rabbi Asher, the doctor of whom we have spoken, and rabbi David, father of our man. To David two tributes were paid, by a son and by the synagogue. A son Daniel, of whom we shall hear incidentally, said that he presided first over the synagogue in Metz, then over many others in Germany. He evidently returned hither, for when he died on the sixth night and the next day, the first day of Hanukah 5405, it was recorded in the Memorbuch that he was a righteous and liberal magnate.

[9] *R.E.J.* VIII, 259.

honoured; he acted as Mohel, and also blew the ram's horn for the New Year over a long period; he occupied himself in charitable works, buried the dead, fixed times for the study of the Law; he went early and late to synagogue; and his heirs gave charity on his behalf to the congregational fund. They might well do this, for Daniel acknowledged the remarkable care spent on his education, up to the age of 16, so that he then began to expound the Talmud.[10]

This whole family had migrated into Metz from a village known as Weil. This we learn from the fact that when in Christian circles a surname was needed, it was coined from the place of origin. And Jeqel Jacob of 1595 was known to Buxtorf as Jacobus de Veil—the man from Weil. There are many villages of this name in the neighbourhood; one near Colmar in Elsass seems to have been the home of many Jews. Each of these would be known, anywhere else, as "the Weil man," Weiller, de Veil. Hence there is no presumption that men with this surname were related, only that their ancestors had once lived in some village called Weil. This caution will be important when we stumble across two men of this name, in Holland.

JEW.

The David Weil with whom we are concerned married a woman whose name was transmuted by Christian officials at a distance into Magdelaine; this probably represents a German Magdel-lein. They had at least two sons, of whom it is the elder we wish to trace. He was born in Metz about 1630[11]; the Jewish records do not enable us to trace his name, nor any marriage, which would be highly probable before he came to be 24 years old, at which time the Christian records about him begin. We do know from them that a year later he was an orphan; while from his brother's books we learn that he had been fatherless since the age of fifteen, though his uncle, one of the two Jewish doctors, and his grandfather, were yet alive. The younger brother was born in 1637, and was named Daniel.[12] Both lads were precocious, and studied diligently. The university of Padua was then very liberal, admitting many Jewish students, especially for medicine; but its records do not disclose anyone to be identified with the anonymous elder brother. Yet there is some probability in this direction, for Asher Lämmlein was known even among Gentiles as Docteur Lambert, and his brother David was a circumcisor, and we shall see that our man in his later days evinced a certain medical skill.

[10] *R.E.J.* VII, 204; VIII, 255; XII, 283; L, 115.
[11] Floquet: I, 284, 285 note, 287.
[12] Floquet: I, 290 note.

Now the Qabbalists had calculated that Messiah would appear in 1648. A young Jew of Smyrna, Sabbatai Zevi, announced himself as the Messiah, and in many Jewish circles attention was focussed on him. Pilgrimages were organized to him, a book of prayers was compiled. He visited Cairo and married, settled down in Palestine, but hesitated to act. The synagogue at Metz sent a deputation to acknowledge him and to hand over a large sum of gold. All the Jews of Metz were thus set on studying the prophecies relating to the Messiah, and many were prepared to join him in the Holy Land.

But a very different turn was given, when there came to the cathedral in 1652 a brilliant young archdeacon, three years older than the elder De Veil, Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet. He was a close student of the Bible, using not only the Vulgate, but a new Latin version by Leo Juda with notes from the lectures of Vatable, regius professor of Hebrew at Paris. He was also a most eloquent preacher, and he at once seized the opportunity of the weekly sermons to the Jews. It was not long before a convert was made, who took the name Paul du Vallier, an ignorant or malicious man whose misreading of German in after days helped send Raphael Levy to be burned alive.[13] The popular prejudice thereby raised was quelled only by direct intervention of the king, on the representations of a young Oratorian, Richard Simon, whom we shall meet again.

Such a defection from the brotherhood in the ghetto must have impressed all its dwellers. Roman Catholics to-day say little about those who leave their communion, but Jews then were outspoken. A sentence of excommunication was no light thing, nor was there anything private such as the mere deletion of a name from a roll; it was not in silence that Spinoza was expelled from the Amsterdam synagogue in 1656; so we may believe that the exodus of du Vallier was canvassed in every household of the ghetto.

Now what had young de Veil to look forward to? He could earn his living by dealing in second-hand furniture and selling remounts to officers. He could follow in the footsteps of some ancestors, study, and win respect as a rabbi. He could turn his back on Metz, make his way to the East and support the Messiah. In this juncture, a young man of 24 was bound to frame some plan for his future. He never in after days wrote any Apologia, and we may fail to discern the governing motives; but at least we can appreciate the external circumstances, and his choice.

Both Ferri and Bossuet were mindful of their Jewish neighbours. He talked with both, and at length decided to break with the faith of his fathers. How they took it we do not know;

[13] *R.E.J.* 786: *Une Erreur Judiciaire,* par J. Reinach.

the tale that an Englishman wrote down sixty years after is demonstrably false, for his father had been dead for years.[14] He would of course quit the ghetto, and he soon lived south of the cathedral in the parish of Saint Victor. If du Vallier's conversion was noted, this second was esteemed remarkable, as he was full of promise, and it was advertised to the utmost. The governor, Marshal Schonberg, and his wife, became his sponsors. He therefore took their names, Charles-Marie.[15] The cathedral itself was chosen, rather to the chagrin of the parish priest; the bishop-suffragan himself performed the ceremony, and this was fixed for the great day of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, on Tuesday 8 September 1654. There may still be seen the great porphyry baptistery, in which, if the Roman custom with a converted Jew was followed, he was immersed.

His brother Daniel was converted next year by Bossuet, and at the age of 18 was baptized by another bishop with even greater éclat. The sponsors were King Louis XIV and his mother Anne of Austria, and as the baptism was in the chapel of the Jesuits at Compiègne, he took the names Louis-Compiègne.[16] He had a most illustrious career, which deserves narration at length; he will however be noticed here only when necessary to avoid the confusion between the two brothers into which many writers have been betrayed.

These incidents were widely reported. The famous duchesse de Longueville, who had led fashion and politics, had retired to Rouen with her husband, the governor of Normandy, and had taken up religion. Rhymed newsletters were sent her regularly, and two of them recount these baptisms. The first letter was dated Saturday 19 September, and contains the following lines:

Le mardy de l'autre semaine,
Un homme de Mets en Loraine,
De la nation d'Israël,
Nommé Jacob ou Raphael,
Sadoc, Ebraim, ou Michée,
Zorobabel, ou Mardochée,
Gamaliel, ou Salomon,
—Enfin, je ne sçay pas son nom—
Se soûmetant à l'Evangile,
De la synagogue fit gile,
La foi catholique embrassa,
Et la chose ainsi se passa:

[14] Crosby; *History of the English Baptists* (1740); IV, 252. From MS of Benjamin Stinton about 1718; copied by Walter Wilson, &c. All untrustworthy.

[15] Official register, quoted by Floquet, I, 285.

[16] Official register, Floquet, I, 290.

Pluzieurs messieurs du sacerdoce,
Pour accomplir ce saint négoce,
Sçavoir, vicaires et curez,
De leurs blancs surpelis parez,
Marchands de la belle manière
Avec la croix et la banière,
Allèrent chez le Gouverneur,
Le duc de Schonberg, mon seigneur
(Homme d'adorable mérite),
Rendre ledit israëlite,
Qu'ils menèrent, à pas posez,
Comme l'on fait les épouzez,
En la grande église tout juste,
Auquel saint lieu monsieur d'Auguste,
Le sufragant de l'évesché,
Après l'avoir un peu presché,
Prézens le Chapitre ou chanoines
Et quelque quantité de moines
L'oignit, aroza, baptiza,
Et, bref, le des-judaïza.
Ledit duc, avec joye extresme,
Le tint sur les fonts de baptesme;
Et cet objet par tout chéry
Dont il est l'illustre mary,
Cette dame que chacun prize,
Dont l'absence me martyrize
(Si l'on ne m'a point abuzé),
Fut marraine du baptizé.
Ainsi, ces deux chères personnes,
Si nobles, si sages, si bonnes,
Cultivans avec grand bon-heur
La vigne de Nôtre-Seigneur,
Tant ledit monsieur que madame,
Ont déjà ramené mainte âme,
Par leurs soins et leur charité,
Au sentier de la vérité,
Les dégageant du judaisme,
Du lutérisme et calvinisme,
Dont plaize à Dieu les guerdonner
Et toûjours santé leur donner.

The second letter was dated Saturday, 12 June, 1655, and gives the following account; the writer apparently did not know that this was the brother of the former :—

Un amy, que Dieu gard de teigne,
Me manda, Mardy, de Compiègne,

Qu'un jeune Israëlite, ou Juïf,
De la Ville de Mets, natif,
Qui pouroit faire des harangues,
Du moins, en trois ou quatre Langues,
Parlant Hébrew, facilemant,
Comme je parlerois Normand,
Et la Langue Arabe et Caldée,
Encor mieux qu'une possédée:
Enfin, ce jeune jouvenceau
Que l'on dit avoir l'esprit beau,
Et que Schonberg, Duc et Duchesse,
Avoient converty pour la Messe,
Etant à la Cour arivé,
Fut si sage et prudent trouvé,
Que têmoignant un zèle extrême
Pour le Sacrement de Baptême,
Et renonçant, d'un sens-rassis,
A la Secte des Circoncis,
Il eut pour Parrain et Marraine,
Le Roy, nôtre Sire, et la Reine;
Ce fut l'Evesque de Soissons
Qui le baptiza sur les Fonts:
De Gens, une troupe infinie,
Voyans cette cérémonie
Qui dans ce saint et sacré Lieu
Réunissoit une ame en Dieu,
La metant en la bonne voye,
En furent tous ravis de joye:
Mesmes, Sa Majesté voulut,
Pour mieux opérer son salut,
L'envoyer chez les Jézuistes,
Où les ames sont bien instruites,
Donnant un fonds à l'avenir
Sufizant de l'entretenir,
Assavoir, pour l'heure prézente,
Soixante Louïs d'or de rente:
Et puis, selon ce qu'il sera,
Du bien, encor, on luy fera.[17]

CATHOLIC.

Charles-Marie soon turned his attention to scripture and theology, under the guidance of Bossuet. At first he lived in close association with him, and both profited by their common studies. But it was obviously desirable to plan out some course of life.

[17] *La Muze Historique*, par J. Loret, Paris, 1857; I, 543; II, 60.

For a century, the gift of every important post in the Gallican church had been in the hands of the king. And as Louis-Compiègne was his godson, while Bossuet was climbing the court-ladder, there were clearly great prospects of promotion. The Congregations led naturally to high office. These were groups of men, living together under rule and therefore called Canons, who collectively undertook the charge of a town or of some large parish, both preaching and discharging pastoral duties. They were not monks, but active clergy. The system was popularised by the great Augustine of Hippo, and one of the oldest Congregations was proud to take his name. In Metz the Rue des Augustins perpetuates the memory of their work. Into this Congregation the young convert sought entrance.

A postulant with his peculiar antecedents needed peculiar treatment. He would require a thorough grounding in Latin and in Christianity, he would require training for the cure of souls, he might evince special powers that could be specially trained. It was decided to send him to Angers, capital of Anjou, where Loir and Sarthe and Mayenne flow together. For here the Congregation had a theological seminary, and here was a university. The seminary was housed in the Abbaye des Toussaints, once an ordinary Benedictine house, but for a generation past handed over to the Augustins.[18] Here all the candidates would live together under discipline; and it was fortunate for Charles-Marie, at the age of 24, that he had been accustomed to something of the same kind in the ghetto. The rule was strict that no student might stir outside the abbey except in the garb of his order—and this too had been paralleled at Metz in the yellow cap, &c.[19]

The university however had its four faculties; and even if the medicals and the jurists and the arts held a trifle aloof from the theologs, yet at least all were undergraduates together, and there must have been some kind of social intercourse that could do what to-day is done at the river, the wicket, the goals, and could somewhat widen the horizon. The students were organized in six Nations—a sign how France was not yet integrated into one homogeneous kingdom; and there were four colleges, built by the town.[20]

For the next few years we can imagine a strenuous intellectual discipline in the refectory of St. Meurice. Subsequent results assure us that the two theological professors of the university, or the tutors of the Augustins, were teaching

[18] *Revue d'Anjou*: XIII, 304.

[19] Raymond Duellius: *Antiqua statuta Can. Regg. S. Augustin* (1723). Rule 30.

[20] *Angers ancien et moderne*, par E. L. (1853), page 161.

on most enlightened lines.[21] The old abbey cloister, now in ruins, must have heard lively lectures and disputations. They could not afford to idle; not far away was Saumur, where the Huguenots had a fine Academy; and it was not the time to let all the learning be in the minds of heretics.[22]

Moreover, within the Catholic Church there were many schools of thought. Bishop Jansen of Ypres had been dwelling on Augustinianism in such a way as to win many adherents, including Henry Arnauld, bishop of Angers. In 1663 a second theological seminary was established in the city on La Flèche, to train poor scholars for the priesthood on these lines.[23] In the university itself, the divinity professors seem to have taken different sides. Imagine Ridley Hall and Mirfield sending students to the same university theological lectures, and these young men when seeking a degree having to defend two theses against all comers! The wrangling must have been as interesting as a good debate at the Union.

The seminary course ended with credit, and Charles-Marie was duly ordained priest. Thenceforward he was a member of the Order, not merely a novice under its training. But he became a canon Regular, under rule; and the rule was very strict. Thus when he was assigned to a given house, he had to obey the rules of that house as laid down by the Rector. Nearly all property was held in common. He might never go out alone, or without the habit of the Order, or at night. He might never talk to a woman alone. The house would serve some parish church or churches, and the rota of service would be drawn by the Rector.[24]

So long as the university course lasted, he would almost certainly be a member of the chapter at Toussaints, where he had been trained. And as he bore the title Professor by 1672, it is probable that his superiors set him to lecture in the seminary rather than serve the outside world. He himself printed in 1678 that six years before he taught theology in "Academia Andegavensis."[25]

In the university arena he had to offer successively two theses, which he had to expound, and to maintain against the professors and any others who chose to challenge him. The former or "Tentative" was sustained creditably. By the time that the time arrived for the second, the doctrines of Jansen were quite burning. As professor Martin Luther had offered to maintain against all comers not one only, but 95 theses on the

[21] *Revue d'Anjou;* XXII, 302.
[22] *Ibid.* XXIII, 161.
[23] *Ibid.* XVI, 54, 60-62.
[24] *Antiqua Statuta*: 27, 33, 35, 64.
[25] Preface to *Matthew and Mark*

live topics of the day, so professor Charles-Marie chose a thesis which he knew would win the support of Antoine Arnauld, brother of his diocesan, and leader of the Jansenists. He sustained his trials with honour on 16 April 1674.

That enabled him to "prendre sa bonnet" as docteur in the fashion that Scottish universities still preserve, capping the graduate. Many a minister who wins his doctorate to-day will have his robes presented by admirers. And at this crisis Bossuet claimed the privilege of old friendship. Indeed, although through this long period of twenty years at Angers, the Congregation of St. Augustin was responsible for all expense, Bossuet had again and again helped, and it was only fitting he should appear at the climax.[26]

[26] Floquet, I. 286; citing Bayle: *Nouvelles de la république des lettres,* dec. 1684.

(To be continued.)

THOMAS WATTS, gentleman, of Radnage in Bucks., had three children; Thomas born June 1656, John born 1659, Rafe born 1660. He and his wife Sarah were Baptists. After the Restoration pressure was brought to bear, and the parish register for 1662, October 8 contains the entry:—"All these 3 children baptd. in one day, being not brought to Baptism (out of an anabaptizer Persuasion) till that age; and then (the Byshops being restored) were thereunto compelled." Of this family not much else is known, but John Watts who in 1660 and 1661 complained of bad treatment, was thrown into Newgate 1676, and there received help from Amersham General Baptist church.

JOSEPH STENNETT of Hitchendon, or Hughenden, in Bucks., married on 8 April 1714 at Radnage, Rebecka Davies of that village. This is presumably the Joseph whose father Joseph had died the year before. The bridegroom settled the same year at Leominster, went to Exeter in 1719, to Wild Street in London 1737, became D.D. 1754, died 1756. His connection with Hughenden has been forgotten. It may have had something to do with the colony of Seventh-day Baptists from Wallingford, to which his grandfather Edward ministered.

THIS day Nov. 13, 1682, one Elizabeth Hoke was burnt for clipping [coin]; in Bunhill Fields, a place never used for that purpose; but the sheriff chose it as a void and spacious place.

THOMAS WOODCOCK.

Sidelights from an old Minute Book.

THE substantial demy volume in which the early minutes of the church now worshipping in Spurgeon's Tabernacle are contained, was in use from 1719 to 1806. These years, eighty-seven in number, cover an important period in both national and religious life. Their beginning is almost coincident with the accession to the throne of the House of Hanover; their closing with the establishment of Britain's sea supremacy off Cape Trafalgar. The middle years witnessed the spread of the Evangelical Revival; the afterglow of this Revival brought with it various home and foreign Missionary Societies. Further, the period is noteworthy in the history of this London church, as it covers the whole of John Gill's pastorate of fifty-two years, and more than half the sixty-three years during which John Rippon ministered to the congregation.

This old minute book is, therefore, a valuable mirror of church life during more than eight decades. In it we find many pictures from which it would be possible to prepare an eighteenth century church manual or year book. Sidelights abound, and with these sidelights this article is concerned.

PRAYER AND VISITATION.

7th March 1721. "It being proposed to the Church by our Pastor, Mr. Jno Gill, That he thought it expedient that one day in every Quarter should be appointed and sett apart as a day of humiliation and prayer It was agreed That such a day be quarterly kept."

14th November 1721. "It being thought expedient for the preservation of that sweet Union and Concord that ought to be in the Church in sympathising with the afflicted, succouring the Tempted, releiving the Poor and Distressed, Rejoycing with them that rejoyce and mourning with them that mourn That some persons be appointed by the Church once in every year at the least to visit every member thereof, Ordered that a list of all the Members be drawn out with their place of abode in four divisions and that two of the Brethren be appointed for each Division once in every year to visit every member in their said Division."

7th November 1727. "It was agreed yt ye Quarterly Meeting of prayer should be for ye future on our Church Meeting days and to begin the next Church Meeting at one o'clock."

It is evident the church meetings were movable feasts. The last minute mentions one o'clock, but in February 1731 it was agreed to hold them on Mondays at five o'clock, and in the following November two o'clock was appointed for the next " in order to spend some time in prayer."

COMMUNAL BAPTISMS.

14th November 1721. " Bro. Crosby from the Proprietors of the Baptisterion upon Horselydown informed us of an Assessment upon all the Churches concerned there of thirty shillings. Each Church to defray the Deficiency of building and finishing the same Agreed that Bro. Crosby do pay the said thirty shillings and place it to the Churchs accompt and also that Bro. Gill be Trustee in behalf of the Church for the security of their property and management of their affairs there."

Another thirty shillings was paid in 1725, fifty shillings in 1729 and forty shillings in 1735. Apparently baptisms at the Baptisterion took place on weekdays, as one was arranged for Friday, 21st June 1733, at six in the evening.

27th September 1779. " Sister Martha Tipping, by her Will, left £200 South Sea Annuities towards erecting a Baptistry in the Meeting house " [then in Carter Lane].

In the following March it was decided that the new baptistry should be " for the use of this church only " and that candidates should " pay 2/6 towards expense of preparing, and not less than 1/- to the attendants."

OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY.

26th September 1737. " Bro. Miller & Bro. Henry Fauntleroy were appointed Messengers to Bro. James Hart, to require his attendance at ye next Church Meeting to answer for himself, he being charged with occasional conformity to ye Church of England."

24th October 1737. " Bro. Turner & Bro. Anderson were added to ye other two Messengers to Bro. Hart to acquaint him yt ye Church insists upon his personal appearance to give public satisfaction for his offence."

19th November 1737. " Bro. Anderson & Bro. Davis were appointed messengers to Bro. Hart to admonish him & urge him to appear before ye Church in order to give satisfaction for his offence."

12th December 1737. " Bro. Anderson & Bro. Davis were continued messengers to Bro. Hart to admonish him again to appear before ye Church in order to give satisfaction for his offence."

9th January 1738. " Bro. Anderson reported that Bro. Hart expressed a great concern for ye offence he has committed, ye

evil of which he is sensible, but could not tell whether he could conveniently attend this present church meeting. The Messengers were continued to put him in mind of coming to ye next church meeting & to stir him up to it."

6th February 1738. "Bro. Davenport & Bro. Millar [probably the same as Bro. Miller of the 26th September 1737] were appointed messengers to Bro. Hart to inform him that the church insists on his personal appearance in order to give satisfaction for his offence at our next church meeting or give a satisfactory reason why he cannot appear, or expect to be proceeded against."

6th March 1738. "Bro. Hart personally appeared & gave an account of his repentance, which was agreed to be genuine."

Resolutions at six successive church meetings! These men were not Nonconformists for nothing. They could give a reason for the faith that was in them. The grandparents of some may have lived in the Laudian regime; the parents of many had know the days of active persecution which preceded 1689; they themselves were living under the shadow of the Toleration and kindred Acts. In their estimation this erring and prevaricating Brother was false to a great history and to vital principles. Small wonder that they pursued him until he was "stirred up and put in mind" to face the church.

10th January 1743. "A question being sent by ye church under ye care of Mr. Flowers whether a person ought to be continued in fellowship who shall take ye sacrament in the Church of England to qualify himself for executing an office of trust & profit, when at ye same time he does not incur any penalty if he refuses to accept ye place he is elected to, agreed yt such a person ought not to be continued & yt such an answer be returned to ye question."

This question concerned one Baskerville, a member of the church at Unicorn Yard, who, at their church meeting on Sunday, 14th February 1742, was charged with "walking disorderly in taking the sacrament in the Church of England, in order to execute the Office or Trust of a Common Council Man of the City which thing Bro. Kenward [who brought the charge] apprehended to be a profanation of that Sacred Institution." Baskerville declared he "would not have taken the Sacrament had not the Laws of England required the same; and that he took it purposely to execute that trust." By twelve votes to six his action was declared an offence to the church, and four messengers were appointed to admonish him in private. To these messengers he expressed sorrow that his action had given offence, but refused to recede from his position. Desiring to continue in membership, he assured them that he would "not use money or friendship to secure re-election to the Council, that he would be

open to conviction, would reexamine the arguments and pray for further illumination; and would not commune with the established Church again without first acquainting his own Church." Unicorn Yard somewhat reluctantly accepted this reply and the matter stood over until the following January, when Baskerville reported he had been re-elected a Common Councillor, and that he proposed to qualify himself for the office. On this occasion the church unanimously "thought it unlawful to receive the sacrament in the Church of England to qualify for any place of Trust or Profit." Baskerville claimed "the right of private judgment and doing what he thought in conscience he ought to do; and that if they excluded him on this account, they offended him as much as he offended them. . . . He did not ask for dismission because he thought the Churches who were Baptists and Calvinists would not receive him, when he should, as in Conscience he must, acquaint them with the reason and design." The church then resolved to make the above enquiry of the Board of Ministers and their Churches. All replied in the negative, and an official communication dealing at considerable length with the issue was sent to the church by Samuel Wilson, the Chairman of the ministers and deputies.

MUSICAL.

22nd February 1726. "It was agreed to allow Bro. Anderson one Guinea pr annum for setting ye Psalm & to commence from Christmass last past."

In 1730 this remuneration was altered to "a private collection among members about Christmas, which he is to have, be it more or less," and in 1732 it was agreed "yt Brother Fall have forty shillings per annum for setting ye psalm."

23rd March 1731. "It was agreed yt David's Psalms according to the best version, instead of hymns, be sung in the church."

6th July 1767. "Agreed the whole Psalm or Hymn or such verses as are app'd to be sung be first read & afterward every line separately."

ELECTION OF DEACONS.

21st April 1724. "Agreed that Tuesday next being the 28th of this instant be kept in fasting and prayer for the nomination & choice of two Deacons."

28th April 1724. "Being the day appointed for the nomination and choice of two Deacons the Church accordingly met & after some time spent in prayer and a word of direction given respecting the nature of that office & the qualifications of persons for it the church proceeded to the nomination of four persons, viz.,

Bro. Turner, Bro. Deale, Bro. Kelly and Bro. Whorley out of which the two former were chosen by a majority."
16th June 1724. "Bro. Deale and Bro. Turner having been chosen Apl. 28th Deacons of this Church were desired to accept of this office & serve the Church therein. The former of which assented to the Churchs request, the latter desired a months time to consider of it & then to give in his answer, which was agreed to."
14th July 1724. "Bro. Turner being called upon by the Church to give in his answer to their request viz. to take upon him the office of a Deacon, desired another month to consider of it, which was accordingly granted."
11th August 1724. "It was agreed yt Bro. Turner and Bro. Deale do officiate as Deacons next Lords day in attendance at ye Lords table."
16th May 1727. "It was agreed yt ye 30th of this instant be appointed a day of prayer for ye ordination and setting apart of Bro. Deale and Bro. Turner for ye Office of Deacons in this Church which was done accordingly."

Other entries indicate the serious concern with which the church always approached an election of deacons. Reference need only be made to two. In 1743 "both Brethren and Sisters were desired to signify their assent" to the choice of William Leppard [he remained in office until his death in 1799, aged 98], and, in 1751, two who were elected were given six weeks in which to consider their decision. They were then "solemnly ordained with prayer and a sermon."

MEMBERSHIP.

6th April 1720. "The church being informed that Hannah Cooper desired to be baptised and admitted a member of the Congregation, Bro. Smith, Bro. Jones & Bro. Crosby with some others were appointed to hear the account she could give of her Faith and Repentance, she being not able through Bashfullness to speak before the whole Church."
7th March 1721. "Mary Clark, a member of the congregation under the pastoral care of Mr. Foxwell [General Baptist, Fair Street, Horsleydown] desired to be admitted to full communion with the church. Bro. Smith and Bro. Crosby were appointed Messengers to the said Mr. Foxwell to acquaint him thereof & to know if he had anything with respect to her life and conversation to object against her being received."
17th July 1722. "Elizabeth Wilkinson desired to be admitted to Baptism and Communion with the Church, she gave a satisfactory account of her Faith and Conversion and having Testimonies of ye Regularity of Her life and Conversation It

was agreed that she should be Baptised and received and on the Lords Day following she was received accordingly."
31st March 1730. "Messengers from ye Church under ye Pastoral care of Mr. John Wilson attending this Church for ye dismission of Bro. James Hawley, ye same was accordingly granted."
26th March 1739. "Agreed ye persons who desire communion with ye church for the future shall propose to the church one month before they give an account of the work of God upon their souls, during which time enquiry is to be made into their moral character."

The church would neither apply for transfers from a church whose pastorate was vacant nor grant transfers during its own pastoral vacancy, unless on grounds of removal to a distance, In January 1784, when three sisters who were "members at Rotherhithe, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Mr. Rowles, desired messengers to ask for their dismission," the church resolved "That it is not customary for this church to receive members from a sister church during their widowhood state."

DISCIPLINE.

This occupied an important place in the life of the church. In those leisurely days members had the "time to stand and stare" for which a modern poet sighs. They knew of the places frequented by Brother Brown and of the gossip of Sister Smith. Discipline therefore tended to be severe, but it must be remembered that, in an age when the outlook on social life and practices was different from that of the present day, our forefathers were striving for a pure church life. These records reveal that in the good old days of "loyalty to God's house and walking in the narrow way," the standard of conduct among a fair percentage of church-members was not on the high level that has sometimes been suggested. Non-attendance at the Sunday services was a constant cause of complaint, and various minutes record the appointment of a messenger to a member "to know the reason of his absence and to admonish him to his duty." One brother was admonished five times, and, he proving adamant, on the 14th July 1724, the church "observing yt all her admonitions to him were of no use to reclaim him, came to a resolution to withdraw from him as a disorderly person being guilty of immoralities viz: drunkenness, Sabbath breaking & non-attendance upon the publick worship of God, & he was accordingly withdrawn from."

At the church meeting on the 17th October 1785 it was reported that John Browning "did not by any means consider the consequence of Adam's transgression to extend any further than

corporal death." This was serious declension and merited stern discipline with the result that " The Church being of opinion that Bro. Browning had fallen into dangerous errors did agree to withdraw from him till such time as the Lord should convince him thereof and give him true repentance and he was accordingly declared to be cutt off from communion by our pastor of which Brethren Lepard and Misnard were appointed to inform him." Other reasons for discipline were: " Disorderly Practises in her house "; " Evil of Drunkenness "; " Slighting ye ordinances & indulging enthusiasm "; " Obstinate and incorrigible "; " Abusing of Church in general and several members in particular "; " Abusing his wife to ye great & open scandal of Religion " ; " Imbibed Antinomian principles " ; " Church cannot agree to her attendance on the Methodists "; " Remiss in attendance and also guilty of idleness." These quotations afford opportunity for the reader to exercise his imagination and visualise the sustained interest of a disciplinary church meeting.

The replies of the admonished members are revealing. One member stated the cause of her absence was " darkness of soul and she promises to attend for ye future." Another " lamented his misconduct and hoped for future he should attend better." A third " expressed great brokenness of spirit & concern for non-attendance by reason of a bad husband but declared she had privately attended & hoped to do so more and more " which satisfied the church. Not infrequently the reply was far from respectful.

COMMUNION.

6th April 1720. " Saml Gill, a member of the church at Kettering, was admitted to transient communion with the church."

25th March 1729. " A motion being made, it was assented to yt ye hearers be desired to give us ye liberty of singing by our selves at ye Lord's table."

18th August 1783. " Three persons Members of the Church at Northampton under the Pastoral care of the Rev. Mr. Jno. Ryland haveing apply'd for transient communion with this Church, The Deacons were unanimously of opinion that it was inconsistent with the faith and practice of this Church to grant them that priviledge as that Church held with mixt communion, allowing unbaptised persons to sit down at the Lord's table with them, our Pastor being of a different opinion thought it proper to lay it before the Church declaring that as in the multitude of counsel there was safety he had applyed to various Ministers of the particular Baptist Churches in town for their opinion on the subject that he had received their several answers in writing

(which was read) that it was not improper or unscriptural, and that his own conscience would be much hurt if they were not admitted to transient communion. After much debate it was mov'd by our Pastor and seconded That those Baptised Persons belonging to perticular Churches holding mixt communion upon their application to this Church for transient communion be indulged with that previledge. The motion was carried by seventeen for it against thirteen."

LAYING ON OF HANDS.

12th March 1721. "Jane Wiltshire and Sarah Pullen [elected earlier that meeting] having not at their first entrance into the Christian Church come under the Ordinance of Laying on of hands, it being not the practice of those Churches to which they gave up themselves Did now submit thereunto and had Hands laid on them according to the practice and example of the Holy Apostles."

3rd February 1729. "Bro. Gill declaring his dissatisfaction in using ye custom of laying on of hands at ye admission of members, it was agreed yt he be left at his liberty in ye point for ye future."

ETERNAL SONSHIP.

24th July 1768. "At a full meeting of the Church on Lords Day July 24th 1768. The Pastor reported that he had recd a letter from Ic. Harman, Member of this Chh, in wch he declared he had been long at enmity wth the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Christ by the Generation of the Father. Upon wch a Motion being made, seconded & Thirded the Vote was put That Isac. Harman who now Stands a Member of this Church be rejected, removed & excluded from the Common of it for his declared enmity wth the Doctrine of Christs Eternal Sonship by the Generation of the Father untill he manifests a repentance satisfactory to ye Church. Which vote was Carried unanimously & wth out one dissenting voice or hand lift up when the Negative was put up. And accordingly he was rejected, removed & excluded from the Communion of the Church in the name & by the authority of the Church for the reason & for so long as expressed in the Vote And Bro. Collier & Bro. Hoffman were appointed Messengers to acquaint him therewith."

MORAL LAW.

3rd October 1791. The Messengers to Bro. Sadd reported . . . "that he did not look on the moral law as a rule of life to a believer. The same Messengers were continued to admonish him."

31st October 1791. "The Messengers to Bro. Sadd reported that they found him in the same way of thinking that the moral law was never design'd for the rule and walk of a believer but only made for the ungodly. Agreed that our Bro. Sadd on holding the above error be excluded from communion with this church & he was excluded by our Pastor in the name of the church. In consequence of the aforesaid prevaling error in this day, we as a Church of Christ do agree that the Moral Law as summarily comprehended in the Ten commandments is a rule for the conduct of men in general and for God's people in particular. Resolved: That no one after a first & second admonition by Messengers from this Church denying the moral law to be a rule for the conduct of Men in general, & for God's people in particular should be continued a member of this church which was unanimously agreed to."

PEWS AND COLLECTIONS.

26th January 1725. "A dispute arising about ye green pew in ye middle, it was agreed yt it belongs to Bro. Clarke he having bought two places therein & resigned two more in ye pew before it on ye account of ye same."

2nd November 1741. "Agreed for ye future yt no pews should be sold but that all such persons, members & hearers who are able & willing to assist in defraying the charges of publick worship, be accommodated with proper places if desired, & that they hold their right unto such places whilst they continue their usefullness & afterwards to be at ye discretion of ye persons appointed to take care of 'em.

Agreed yt ye Deacons be appointed to take upon 'em ye care of Regulating ye seats of persons in pews & keep a list of 'em."

7th March 1774. Two additional pew openers were appointed at a wage of £4 per year each "and it is expected of them that they do assist the women once a quarter in brushing the curtains & cleaning down such parts of the meeting ho. as the woman cannot reach."

4th August 1776. "Agreed that a Publick Collection be made at a convenient time for the church at Northampton under the Pastoral care of the Revd. Mr. Ryland towards the expense they have been at in inlargeing their meeting house." There are occasional references to collections for other country churches.

18th August 1777. "Agreed that only twelve monthly public Collections be made at the Doors for the use of the Church in the course of the year, & that the four usual Quarterly Collections made for Ground Rent & other expenses be added to & included in the said twelve monthly ones."

Other interesting minutes record letting the meeting house

to a Society in October 1783 "they finding their own coals and candles and satisfying the pew openers for their trouble in attending on them" and collections in January 1806 "to relieve distress of poor Protestants in Germany, occasioned by war," £128 14s. 0d. and in May 1806 for the Baptist Missionary Society, £252 5s. 0d.

DR. JOHN GILL.

His Portrait.

19th February 1770. "Bror. Robinson acq'd the Church that at a Meetg of a Number of the Members of the Church at the Kings Head Tavern [in the Borough] being the Day the Deacons was Ordained that it was the Unanimous request of the Brethren then prest & Application was then made Agreable thereunto to our worthy & hond. Pastor that he would indulge them by Setting to have a Painting Drawn of his Person to be hung up in the Vestry from the great Love & regard they had for the Original. And the Doctor was then pleased to Intimate his readiness to Indulge them therein.

"And Accordingly the same has been Executed & that it had been thought Expedient likewise to have a Mezzotinto Print taken therefrom & the wch was now in hand. But as the same would be attended wth a Considerable Expence it was thought proper to lay the same before them, & to know their Minds: And at the same time it was Intimated their would be a Necessity of Borrowing some Mony on a Morgage on the place in order to pay the Workmens Bills for the repairing & Beautifying the same. And therefore it was proposed to their Consideration whether they would Approve of the Expences Attendg the Drawing & framing the Picture as also the Copper Plate Engraving, paper & Printg of the same be added thereunto, & so in Consequence thereof the said Picture & Copper plate become the Property of the Church & the produce Arising from the Sale of the Print be Also placed to the Churches Credit by the Officers of the Church. The wch motion being Seconded it was desired that Every one prest. would speak their Minds freely before it was put up to the Vote, & Every Member then prest having Seperately Signifyed their Approbation it was put up to the Vote & it was Unanimously Agreed that the said Expence of paintg Engraving &c be defrayed by the Church & to be Included in the Amount of the Sum to be Borrowed for the repairs &c of the Meetg. &c & that they both become the property of the Church."

It is interesting to learn that the cost of the engraving of the learned Doctor which has been reproduced on so many occasions was originally included in a sum borrowed on mortgage

of the chapel buildings. Nowadays trustees would have something to say about the legality of such a transaction.

His Burial.

The deacons and several of the brethren met at the King's Head in the Borough on the 19th October, 1771, when they drew up the following for submission to the church: "Memorandum that we being Members of this Church Meetg. in Carter Lane in Southwk do Agree to joyn an intended Procession on Wednesday next for the purpose of interring our late Worthy Pastor Dr. Gill in the Burying Place at Bunhill fields.

"In order thereto, We design to Assemble at the said Meeting House in Mourning, at twelve o'clock on that day & thence proceed in Coaches & pairs, to the Turnpike at Newington, & there wait for the Procession that will Come from Camberwell. And that our Bror. Button provide as many Coaches as may be wanting, & also Cloaks for the Men, & Scarves & Hoods for the Women & Hatbands & Gloves for such as are not provided therewith. AND that the Pulpit & Clerks Desk in the said Meeting-place be hung wth black Cloth, & the fronts of the Gallery wth black-baize. It is also desired that the Members of the Church come in the Afternoon of Lords day the 27th of this Inst. Octo'r. very Early, when a sermon will be preached by Dr. Stennett & that they come in at the Vestry Door & take their Seats, the Men at the Table Pew & the Women in the Middle of the Meeting as Near it as Possible. As to the Expences incurred by the Church making Part of the said Procession. It is agreed that Each person going in the Coaches, do pay his proportion of the same, & for his Cloak &c. & in regard to those Members who are unable so to do, but yet desirous to go It was agreed that their proportion be born by the Church. It is farther recommended that the Brethren & Sisters, do put themselves into decent Mourning for the space of two Months & into Second Mourng for one Month in all three Months."

I have felt it unnecessary to make more than slight comments on these Sidelights, preferring that they should tell their own story.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

Four Centuries of Pacifism.

THE Mennonites are a body of evangelical Germans and Dutch, numbering nearly 400,000, who five years ago celebrated the 400th anniversary of one of their great leaders on the Rhine. To-day they are found in Canada, the United States, Mexico, Paraguay; Russia, Germany, Holland, France and Switzerland.

Until 1888 there was very little information about them available in English, but one or two of their American groups then began to explain themselves. A fine study of their origins was published in 1897 by professor A. H. Newman, the Baptist historian of America. With 1915 one of their leaders in Holland contributed a capital account to Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.* Three years ago they began a *Quarterly Review* at Goshen, Indiana; and their Historical Society is now issuing most valuable work in both German and English. Our own Society is exchanging publications; and from the Mennonite sources we offer this introductory sketch.

First, we recognize the governing principle of the whole body, which has been emphatic ever since Menno organized in 1537. It is conformity to the New Testament ideal of life, positively in simplicity and love, negatively in non-resistance to force. A Mennonite can be recognized by plainness of attire and customs, by industry, by mutual help to an unusual degree; and in these days as ever by an uncompromising Pacifism. As the Quaker has been the typical Conscientious Objector in English-speaking lands, so the Mennonite has upheld the same ideal on three continents. A firm grasp of this principle is the clue to the extraordinary migrations of this persecuted people.

One of their earliest leaders was Balthasar Hubmaier, who in 1523 persuaded Zwingli for a short time "that children should not be baptized before they are instructed in the faith." It was a cardinal principle of all these men that "as the congregation of the Lord consists only of believing and regenerate children of the Lord, only those who are sufficiently advanced in years and experience, and, therefore, able to believe, can be admitted into the congregation." To that simple rule they have always adhered everywhere.

From Switzerland, where they were bitterly persecuted,

three streams flowed; one to Alsace and France, one to lower Germany and Holland, one to Tirol and Moravia. The westward branch was the least important; Alsace and Montbeliard were the chief districts; yet it has a special interest for Baptists. Many of the Mennonites in France have dropped the use of German, and speak French. This has cut them off from their co-religionists, and as they are too poor to educate their own ministers, young men are being sent, with much misgiving, to a Baptist Bible School in Paris. "There is the danger that they will slip away from us into the Baptist ranks, if they are really gifted."

The eastern branch is the least known till of late. It owed much to a mining engineer, Pilgram Marbeck, who after working at Strassburg, settled at Augsburg where he died about 1546. With him is to be coupled Jacob Hutter, who laboured throughout Tirol, and promoted an emigration to Moravia, which became a great refuge. In the course of the Thirty Years' War, the Hutterians were persecuted away to Hungary, where they had peace nearly 150 years. In another persecution, many gave way, but the faithful were reinforced by a strong contingent of new converts from western Austria, and all crossed the mountains to Rumania in 1767. Thence they were invited to south Russia, where they found peace for a century.

The main body has an even more migratory career. As early as 1530 the people were found all the way down the Rhine. To Strassburg there came a man, Melchior Hofmann, who for a short time exercised a most disastrous influence. Hofmann held two remarkable doctrines; that Jesus Christ did not take flesh from Mary; that Jesus Christ was due to return in 1533 A.D., and set up a visible kingdom. The former doctrine sank deeply into many hearts, and by a remarkable inversion, gave much ground for saying that Hofmannites tended to Unitarianism. The Second Adventism induced a few thousands to fix upon, first Strassburg, then Münster, as the place where the King would reign; and they flocked to the latter city, where by constitutional election the Hofmannites had obtained a majority on the town council. They were besieged, and massacred out of existence. But the fact that when attacked they defended themselves scandalized all Europe—Lutherans and Calvinists had not yet taken up arms—and for more than a century afterwards the cry of Münster! or Anabaptist! caused paroxysms of hatred.

After that crisis, emerged Menno Simons, a Frisian priest, whose brother had been in a party hunted down and slain near to him. In 1537 he accepted an invitation to lead the people, who had in a great congress utterly renounced the use of force. From that day they have been unreserved Pacifists; and before

his death in 1559, his influence was so great that the whole body has ever since been named Mennonites.

It may well be imagined how uneasy was their lot, when they refused under any circumstances to fight; and how in place after place they were plundered and massacred. No other church has such a record of martyrdoms. They have some 700 hymns, mostly describing their sorrows and deaths: a collection of these was published in 1564, of which a unique copy has just come to light.

Twice they came into contact with Englishmen. At Amsterdam one of their number hired out his great Bakehouse to John Smyth and a party of refugees from the Trent valley. The English and they compared carefully their opinions, as it was suggested they might unite. Half the English refused, partly on the ground that they could not accept Pacifism; these returned to England in 1612, the first Baptist church in the world. The other half stayed, and became gradually Dutchmen; in the next generation they were accepted as a sister church, and in the third generation they amalgamated entirely; thus on the walls of the great Mennonite meeting-house in Amsterdam may be seen the names of ministers and deacons from Lincolnshire.

In 1654 some English Quakers crossed, and visited many communities up the Rhine. When William Penn secured a refuge overseas, he invited all persecuted sects to come to America. A Mennonite emigration began in 1690, which continued until the outbreak of the revolutionary war in 1774 made Germantown and Pennsylvania generally a most undesirable home for conscientious objectors.

When the revolutionary French began to overrun Holland and Germany, the home-lands were equally uncomfortable. But the Tsarina Catharine had conquered south Russia from the Turks, and was anxious to populate the new territory. She offered to colonists a large measure of home-rule, including the use of their own language, their own schools, their own religion; and what the Mennonites prized most of all, freedom from military service. And so from 1790 there flowed into the Ukraine and south Russia, both Mennonites from the Rhine and Hutterites from Rumania; cousins long parted came at length together. The tide flowed for about fifty years, till Russia had the largest section—all speaking German.

But when America in 1812 settled down to peace, and the Holy Alliance in Europe began renewed persecution, a third current of emigration started from the Rhine, this time to Indiana, Ohio, Illinois and Iowa. This continued till 1861, when the Civil War, which soon led to conscription, stopped the current from Europe.

About 1873, when the fear of Prussian militarism was great, the Tsar decided to try to Russianize the German Mennonites in his dominions. They feared that this would involve their liability to conscription, so they sent to explore conditions in Canada and the Dakotas. As a result, a fourth migration began, from Russia this time; and it was only checked when they were reassured in 1880 as to the maintenance of their privileges where they had dwelt for ninety years.

The World War, with its special effects in Russia, caused this removal from Russia to begin again on a large scale. Britons going through the Kiel canal in 1923 to the Stockholm Congress met a vessel laden with Mennonites on their way to Canada. And the newspapers recently have been telling how 20,000 at one time were first given leave to go—leaving all property behind —and then were being forcibly detained. Ten years ago, Russia had a hundred thousand; now they are all trying to leave, experimenting even in Mexico and Paraguay, against a background of Latin-Americans, with a predominantly Catholic religion.

Here is an experience that seems quite typical of this gentle people:—"Great-grandfather migrated with his family from Prussia to South Russia via the wheelbarrow method; great-grandfather lies buried in Russia. Grandfather with married sons and daughters came to Canada in 1873; grandfather lies buried in Manitoba. Now father, an old man, has brought his family to Mexico, where we are starting over again. 'Where next?' you ask. Mexico only as long as we can here live out the principles we deem vital and essential."

Menno issued about 1539 a Fondamentboek, also a treatise on baptism. We can thoroughly agree with his view on the meaning of baptism:—"For however diligently we may search day and night, we find but one baptism in the water which is acceptable to God, and expressed and contained in his word, namely the baptism on the confession of faith, commanded by Jesus Christ, taught and administered by the apostles." The Dutch original was not understood by Morgan Edwards, the Welsh-American Baptist minister, who unfortunately rendered the word "doopsel" as "dipping" instead of "baptism." Baptists in America naturally accepted his version, and have been mistaken from 1770 onwards as to the act, though they might surely have looked for themselves and have seen what their Mennonite neighbours actually did. Unfortunately it is easier to copy a book than to go and see for yourself. Thus the Mennonites have always practised Believers' Baptism, though until within living memory the act was always pouring water on the head. The custom has a little interest for Baptists, since

after careful enquiry the Mennonites in Amsterdam agreed that in this matter there was no difference between them and John Smyth.

And Menno when discussing the commands to love one's enemies, to crucify the flesh and its lusts, had written:—"I certainly think that these and similar commands are more painful and burdensome to perverted flesh, which is everywhere so prone to walk in its own way, than it is to receive a handful of water."

As the Mennonites in America are dropping their ancestral German and Dutch, so they may presently give up their quaint old dress. They will then perhaps bear even more effective witness to what is their fundamental principle—the literal obedience to Jesus Christ in all things, including what in another dialect is called the Outlawry of War.

CHARTERHOUSE. The buildings once used by the Carthusian monks were utilized in 1613 by Sutton for a Hospital, wherein aged gentlemen and poor children were sheltered. The Rev. A. G. Matthews, of the Congregational Historical Society, has identified three boys educated there, who are of interest to Baptists. Roger Williams was admitted in 1621, sent to Cambridge with an exhibition 1624; but he forsook the university and discontinued his studies, so was suspended in 1629. John Gosnold was admitted 1635, sent to Cambridge at Pembroke College 1646: he afterwards founded the church in Paul's Alley, Barbican, and a careless description of him led to the hasty inference that he had been an officer of the Charterhouse. Hanserd Knollys induced Bulstrode Whitelock to give his son John a presentation; but in 1653 it was found he was blind, so three shillings weekly was allowed till he was cured.

MARY DELAUNE on 9 May 1634 gave a receipt for cash due from her late uncle, Peter Chamberlen, of Blackfriars, surgeon; the receipt may be seen at the Guildhall Library, MS. 1849. Her uncle was the father of the Peter Chamberlen whose career was sketched by Dr. Thirtle in our pages twenty years ago, the Seventh-Day Baptist. How Mary was related to Thomas Delaune the schoolmaster, author, and martyr, is not clear. But evidently these Baptists of Huguenot descent were in touch.