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

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

Editorial.

The Editor desires most heartily to thank contributors for their willing and generous assistance. Many who had enriched the *Baptist Quarterly* in earlier years contributed valuable articles in 1936, and thirteen writers were welcomed for the first time. Contributions, archaeological or modern, are invited, and should be sent to the Editor, Baptist Quarterly, 19, Creswick Road, Acton, W.3. The service of all contributors, like that of the officers of the Baptist Historical Society, is honorary.

* * * *

Twelve months ago the President invited each member of the Society to make an effort to add *one* recruit to the membership roll. A few succeeded: others felt that, in the absence of a printed list of members, they could do nothing. It is gratifying, however, that the influx of new members has been sufficient to justify the enlargement of the present issue by sixteen pages. We thus have space to print the list of members, and the whole of Dr. Walker's well-documented article on *Dissent and Republicanism after the Restoration.* It will be a real help to the Society if members will study this membership list, and then use their persuasive powers with those whose names are missing. A considerable accession to the membership is needful before plans which are in mind can be matured. Subscriptions: ordinary membership 10s. 0d.; honorary membership £1 1s. 0d.; life membership £10 10s. 0d. The accompanying form can be used in remitting subscriptions for 1937.

* * * *

The Committee recently received a suggestion that it should be possible for a Church to become a permanent member of the Baptist Historical Society, thus ensuring that the *Baptist Quarterly* and all other publications of the Society would be supplied as issued. It was pointed out that a Church in permanent membership would, in the course of a few years, accumulate a library useful not only to the minister and officers, but also to young persons studying the development of the Free Churches as part of their history courses. The Committee gladly adopted the suggestion, and fixed the membership subscription at £15 15s. 0d. Mr. J. S. Hardman of Cloughfold, who made the suggestion, at once nominated his own historic Church as the first permanent member. Several of our members are in fellowship with churches to which they have rendered long and distinguished

service. This scheme gives them the opportunity to confer something of unending value on the churches which mean so much to them. All permanent membership subscriptions will be capitalised.

* * * *

The annual meeting of the Society will be held during the Spring Assembly on Tuesday, 27th April. Our members will be guests of the Cloughfold Church, and they can be sure that an interesting afternoon programme will be arranged. Full details will be given in April.

* * * *

Too much importance cannot be attached to the Christian training of young people, both before and after church membership, for leakages among senior scholars and junior members are far too frequent. Obviously a suitable booklet dealing with "fundamentals," which youth leaders could place in the hands of young people, should be of much service. Indeed there has been persistent demand for such a booklet, and it has now been admirably met by Dr. Townley Lord's *The Great Decision, An Outline of Christian Discipleship for Young People* (Kingsgate Press, sixpence), prepared at the request of the Baptist Union Publication Department Committee. In the course of twelve short chapters. Dr. Lord deals with Belief, the Church, Church Membership, the Sacraments, Prayer, and kindred subjects. His booklet should be placed in the hands of all senior scholars and junior church members. Any church purchasing sufficient copies for this purpose would make a gilt-edged investment.

* * * *

As the final page proofs of this issue are being passed, we have received a copy of Dr. F. Cawley's important work, *The Transcendence of Jesus Christ* (T. and T. Clark, 9s. net.) It is a study of the unique features of our Lord's Person, with special reference to the Fourth Gospel. An extended review, written by Rev. Henry Cook, M.A., will appear in our next issue, but in the meantime we suggest that any deacon looking for a New Year gift for his minister will not go wrong if he selects this volume.

The Achievement of Personality in a Material World.

ANY critically minded person observing the title of this article would fasten, I imagine, upon two ideas in it; viz., that personality has to be achieved, that the material world is, at present, the real sphere of its achievement.

For the purpose of this argument I shall assume that the material world is real. Many attempts, of course, have been made to reduce what we call matter either to ultimate unreality or at least to merely subjective reality, e.g., the religious movement popularly known as Christian Science, but better called Eddyism, proceeds on the assumption that the material world is essentially unreal, as the following quotation shows:

> "There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is all in all, Spirit is immortal truth, matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and the temporal."

But without entering into a criticism either of Bishop Berkeley and his modern interpreters, or of Mary Baker Eddy, we may surely assert that the material world, whatever may be its ultimate nature, does form the sphere in which our lives are played. In your metaphysical moments you may feel inclined to doubt the substantial reality of your body, but if the body weren't there *you* wouldn't be there either. The whole process of awareness, the expression of thought in language, the communication of one mind with another, are possible only, as far as we know, through this external bodily life of ours. The material world, in its varied manifestations, forms the arena in which we play our little part: it brings the challenges through which we begin to realise ourselves: it supplies the medium through which all art, whether of sculptor or painter or musician, declares its enduring message to mankind. The life we live, however we may define it, is made possible by this vast medley of experiences occurring in what we call the material world.

I assume further that personality has to be achieved. It is not given to us ready-made at the start. It is something to be won. The main purpose of this paper is to substantiate the view that when you speak of personality it must be in terms of body as well as mind: but there is no doubt that historically, both in religion and philosophy, it has been easier to regard

personality as mind, or spirit, or soul. Thus discussions on the origin of life have often taken the form of enquiries into the origin of the soul, and before the three main theories of that origin ecclesiastical thought has never been able quite to make up its mind. Pre-existence, so strongly asserted in Greek writers, failed to secure a permanent place in the thought of the Christian Church. The most distinguished exponent of the view among the early Church Fathers was the Alexandrian Origen, but ecclesiastical writers in the main were too anxious to do justice to the solidarity of humanity to give the theory of pre-existence more than a passing glance. It has no warrant in Biblical teaching. As far as more modern views are concerned, whether (with Spinoza or Hegel) you conceive the soul as pre-existent in the Deity, or pre-existent with its own individuality, they all tend to make the soul the real man to the exclusion of the bodily factor, and therefore do not fall into line with our present argument. Creationism, the view that the rational soul is created at the moment when it is infused into the new organism, was the favourite scholastic conception. Pringle-Pattison rather makes fun of this view, perhaps without proper respect to the very solid memory of St. Thomas Aquinas, when he pictures God standing by, so to speak, ready to squirt a new soul into the newly-made biological organism. The third view, that of traducianism, makes soul and body come into being together in the normal process of life-emergence, and has much to commend it from the standpoint of modern biology. But whatever view you prefer, I want to urge that personality is not to be thought of as implanted ready-made. We begin with potentialities, both mental and physical, and the fortunes of any person are only revealed in the sequel. Everything that goes to make up personality is subject to the laws of development. That is why I used the term "achievement" in the title. Life, properly understood, is to be regarded as something to be won, and in the winning of it we are to consider the part played by the material world.

There is no doubt that the thinking of the Christian Church in the West is under a considerable debt to Platonism, an indebtedness which, with Dr. Inge, we shall gladly recognise. But it is not everything in the Platonic trend of thought which accords with the Hebrew contribution to life, that contribution, that is to say, which is at the basis of the specifically Christian view. On one point in particular there is a real divergence between the Greek and the Hebrew views of human personality. In spite of the fact that Greek culture always appreciated the beauty of the body, expressed that beauty in art and developed it in athletics, it is incontestable that the philosophy of Plato tended

to exalt the soul at the expense of the body. You will recall the popular picture of the soul as a bird, flapping its wings against the bars of a cage, the cage being the body. It was not every Greek thinker who took this view: Aristotle stands out as the exponent of a view which has much in common with the standpoint of modern biology: but a considerable section of Christian thought took the line of Plato. It saw in the body something that was always antagonistic to the soul, an enemy to be beaten, or at least a foe to be carefully watched. Accordingly, we have in the Christian movement the important contribution of asceticism. In that movement, in its beginnings a lay protest against the worldliness of the Church, there came into being first the practices of solitary ascetics like the famous St. Simeon on his pillar, and then organised monasticism. The underlying philosophy was that the soul could only develop by its spurning of bodily things . . . family, appetites, society. This tendency found its corollary, when modern philosophy emerged, in the dualism of writers like Descartes. Descartes distinguished between soul and body as two substances: the matter of the material world is *res extensa*: the soul is *res inextensa*. The reasoning soul, he declared, is of a nature wholly independent of the body, and is immortal.

This conception of the dualism between body and soul, important and influential though it was, was not the only theory which held the field of Christian thought. Aristotle, as well as Plato, had his followers. It is in the teaching of Aristotle that we find the real roots of the modern biological position. He held that Nature's processes move without a break in an ascending scale from the inanimate world to the most intricate form of animate existence. Bodily and mental developments are parts of one continuous process. Soul and body bear a close relation to each other. You can separate them only in thought. So Aristotle called the soul the "form" of the body, the natural realisation of the organic body. "If the body were one vast eye," he said, "seeing would be its soul." This point of view kept its influence through the long years of mediæval Christendom and may be said to have come into its own in the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Scholastics who followed him.

While the Platonic idea, which separated soul and body, was influencing Christian writers, the other point of view, viz., that body is important to soul, kept its head above the ground. This we see, for example, in the persistence in the idea of resurrection as the typical Christian idea of the future life. It has never been the specifically Christian view to regard the future life as that of the immortality of the spiritual principle: always there has been, in the chief writers, some idea of the continuance of

soul plus some form of bodily organism. This was the expression of the view, not always clearly defined, that somehow bodily life is needed for the completeness of personality.

To-day, of course, modern biology, and, to an important degree, modern philosophy, proceed on the assumption that the dualism of soul and body must be resolved. Lloyd Morgan, for example, declares that in any organism we can tell two stories, a physical and a psychical. Each must be set out in terms proper to itself, but the activity which the two describe must be regarded as coming from one indivisible source, the living organism. The world plan, which is a manifestation of divine purpose, shows emergent evolution both in the physical and mental realms. Body and mind are to be regarded from the point of view of monistic interpretation within one realm of nature. Pringle-Pattison is clearly influenced by the Aristotelian view. So far from regarding soul and body as disparate entities, he prefers to start from the idea of the living body as the embodied soul. General Smuts feels that science has rendered a great service in restoring to the body its place of dignity in personality. "Body and mind," he declares, "are not independent reals, but have meaning and reality only as elements in the one real substantive whole of personality." Disembodied mind and disminded body are both impossible concepts, as either has meaning and function only in relation to the other. I am not concerned to estimate the metaphysical position that is behind such points of view: but only to notice the definite tendency in modern writers to get rid of the old-time dualism between soul and body. The position is well expressed by R. M. Freienfels in his volume called *Mysteries of the Soul.* "No longer does the body appear as a clod of earth into which the soul has been breathed from without: it is no longer the despicable prison of the soul, a mechanism which the soul somehow controls; no, for the body itself is animate, is an outward manifestation of life of the soul, a miraculous structure built up by the actual physical energy of the soul inextricably interwoven with it. But even the soul is more profoundly conceived. It is no longer an amorphous, vaporous form, no longer an empty shadow, no longer a bundle of ephemeral data of consciousness, or a conceiving mechanism, but a creative controlling force, a formative entelechy, whose internal aspect is the consciousness, and its external aspect the body. Our life is neither an external parallelism nor an incidental reciprocity between two separate substances, but a unity of body and soul; a unity which is more than matter and more than consciousness" (46).

The important thing to notice is that this view of the body in personality, which underlies modern biology and modern psy-

chology, has close affinities with that Hebrew conception of life which the Old Testament bequeathed to the Christian Church.

It is beyond dispute that the psychology of the Old Testament gave to the human body an importance not exceeded in any ancient literature, even that of Egypt. There are, e.g., many passages which indicate that the members of the body are conceived as possessing psychical power. The two factors which comprise man, body and soul, both owe their existence to God, and are to be regarded as honourable. There is no trace of the idea of the body as something unfortunately assumed by the soul. The Hebrew could not think of life at all without the body. In so far as the future life of the individual was thought of at all it was a future of resurrection. In a well-known passage in Maccabees we read of one Razis, an elder in Jerusalem, "standing upon a steep rock, when, as his blood was well-nigh spent, he drew forth his bowels through the wound, and taking them in both hands he shook them at the crowds, and calling upon Him who is Lord of life and the spirit to restore him these again, he died." A passage of vivid realism, and indicating the possible materialistic dangers in the view, but still good evidence that the future was thought of as a future of the restored body.

It has sometimes been argued that in the New Testament, e.g., in Paul, we find an essential dualism between soul and body. This, however, is to misunderstand the references. The body is not in itself evil: it is peculiarly liable to attack, the powers of evil seize upon it, but in itself it is not to be dualistically conceived as essentially evil. Speaking generally, we may say that the New Testament exalts our ideas of the physical life. The body is a temple of the Spirit. In the life to come there is to be an appropriate organism, which Paul calls the pneumatic body, to correspond to the redeemed soul. And the most significant fact of all is the Incarnation itself: God to express Himself in the noblest manner took the form of man . . . an ennoblement of the body which is not excelled anywhere in ancient literature. Undoubtedly we correctly apprehend the main teaching of the New Testament when we regard the personality of man as a unity of soul-body. The whole man is to be consecrated to the service of God.

This idea of the essential nature of man, as comprising what Fairbairn called a spiritual outfit and a material outfit, leads us to some pertinent reflections on the development of that personality and its achievement of its noble place in the economy of life.

We begin with the view that man has an important place assigned to him in the economy of nature. Measure him by his physical bulk and he is indeed insignificant, a tiny speck, as

Carlyle once remarked, standing on the outer crust of a small planet. But if you measure him by the marvellous intricacy within that small physical bulk, and, further, by the creative purpose and spiritual effort which he can demonstrate, he takes his place in the very centre of all created things. As Sir Thomas Browne remarked in *Religio Medici,* man carries within him all the marvels and wonders he beholds without him. He is not to be disregarded because in size he seems pitiable before a mountain like Everest, or before the unmeasured distances of the stellar universe. It is merely the truth to say that the mountaineer is bigger than the mountain, and the scientist bigger than the scientific facts he discovers. If the world in which we live is a world of wonder, it takes the mind of man to experience the wonder. More significant than the fact that the sun is so many millions of miles away is the fact that anyone could ever find it out. In the world of life man has a place peculiarly his own, and we do not err if we consider that place in terms of purpose.

The fundamental purpose for every man is that he shall realise his true place in a universe whose final explanation is God. How shall man realise that true place? The view we have taken of man's essential nature suggests certain definite steps in his progress.

(*a*) *Man cannot be said to be living at all unless he develops the spiritual possibilities within him.* The attempts, so common in the nineteenth century, to explain man mechanically have failed. It is true that in some branches of modern psychology materialism is again rearing its head (as, e.g., in Behaviourism): but in spite of this we may say that materialism, as a philosophy, fails to gather much support to-day. There is in man a spiritual wealth: for our purpose it does not matter much whether you express it in terms of mind or soul or spirit: it is the inner side of man's nature. By it man thinks, is conscious of himself, dreams his dreams, forms his general principles, and prays. He is heir to a world of beauty and truth and goodness: these are values which, while having their ground in God, have a definite relation to man's life, and he cannot be said to be living in the fullest sense if those values are ignored. This means that every noble pursuit, whether that of truth or beauty or duty, is a Godly pursuit: to ignore these things is to close our eyes to life in its highest meaning. The appreciation of a painting or a sonata is, from the higher level, essentially religious appreciation. Religion has to be conceived in such a manner as to make it as wide as every aspiration of the inner side of man's nature.

So far, I imagine, the main trend of Christian thought is with us. But it is not every Christian thinker who would go with us to the next point, viz.:

(*b*) *Man's achievement demands also the development of the physical life.* From the point of view adopted in this paper we may say that the culture of the body, as well as the culture of the spirit, is a religious matter. We do not deny that asceticism, in its various forms, has made a valuable contribution to life: we do not deny that there are elements in the bodily life which have to be kept in their place. But you do not keep them in their place if you despise them. The spiritual emotion of love undoubtedly has at least part of its basis in physiology. It is wrong, I believe, to despise the biological basis of love. The truer way is to harmonise it with the true spiritual purpose of man. It will be found, I suggest, that few of man's highest achievements can be separated from some physical concomitant, and if we are to seek the noblest fulfilment of the soul we had better seek also the noblest development of the body.

This has a significance for religion that is sometimes overlooked. Questions like personal cleanliness, athletics, good housing, have a spiritual reference. It is, for example, hopeless to expect spiritual qualities to develop under the terrible conditions under which so many thousands have to live to-day. That is not to say that if you put every man into a good house and give him plenty of water, air and sunshine you save his soul; but it does mean that you give his personality some of the conditions which are needed for its full achievement.

The same argument will lead us to the social implications of religion. There should not be any need to argue this point to an audience familiar with the first principles of the Christian religion. Whatever you may think about the extent to which the Church figured in the mind of Jesus there is not the slightest doubt about the important place He gave to the idea of the Kingdom of God. From the first His preaching had a social reference, and Christianity can never attain its real significance save in the setting of society.

This point, the social aspect of religion, needs strong emphasis to-day. It is admitted that Jesus and interpreters of His mind, such as the Apostle Paul, did not definitely commit themselves to specific theories. Indeed, there were many problems of the ancient world (such as slavery) which did not come within the range of their criticism. But it cannot be denied that the principles of life, both according to Jesus and Paul, carried to their logical issue, lead to the abolition of slavery in any form. We rightly regard the New Testament as laying down fundamental principles which have to be related to the special needs of any age. Those principles need to be related to the economic and political conditions of to-day, and exponents of the Christian religion fail in their duty if they do not remember

that Christ's precepts have relevance to the life of society and the life of nations. Any little group of Christians which sets itself to the redemption of individuals is engaged in a noble and necessary task: but there is another task, equally urgent, viz., the redemption of society from views on economics, war, international relationships, which are at enmity with the mind of Christ.

(*c*) Our view of the real unity of body and soul will have an effect, finally, on our conceptions of organised worship. We have suggested that this material world is to be regarded as a revelation of God. As Gwatkin eloquently said, "The common things on which the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, the sea and the morning, the wild goats of the rock, the horse that mocketh at fear, and the eagle that beholdeth from afar . . . all these are no more than the surface of a mighty structure of seeming power and wisdom which grows more marvellous with every year's discoveries . . . there is a beauty running through Nature, from the purple clouds of evening to the iridescent colours that flash like jewels from a beetle's wing case. The petals of a lily are more gorgeous than the robes of Solomon; and even the tiger's beauty is not more terrible than a spider's eyes, gleaming out like four gigantic pearls." Such a view of Nature, which corrects the deistic view of the world, and is superior to any pantheism, presenting to us Nature as the expression of God, makes the world in a peculiar sense man's world. That world is the medium through which man finds some of his noblest artistic expressions. It is also the world which he may call to his aid as he bows down in reverence before the Creator.

This, I suggest, is the philosophy which underlies the true sacramentalism. If body is important in personality, does it not follow that physical channels may indeed be the means of spiritual benefits? Always noting carefully the importance of appropriate psychological conditions in the worshipper, it is undeniably helpful both in worship and in general experience to call in the help of external beauty, such as the aid of forms and what we call "atmosphere." A stained glass window may be a help to the soul in its aspiration. The presence of bread and wine, physical things, may be the means by which the soul is ushered into the very presence of Christ. Our friends in the Roman Church emphasise this rather to the subordination of essential psychological factors in the worshipper. Our friends the Quakers, regarding all life as sacramental, will dispense with any special physical means of grace such as the Sacraments. Is not the true position a merging of both views? With the Quakers we say: the essential requirement in religion is the inner spiritual con-

dition. With the Romanists we say: but man is body as well as soul, and this must be regarded in acts of worship. Our view of personality as soul-body unity acknowledges the power of material channels of grace while safeguarding the essential spiritual conditions of all religion. There is cogency in Paul's great words, "All things are yours, for ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

Let me conclude by quoting a passage which I have already written on this theme: "So man takes stock of himself and the environment in which he lives his life. He finds in all directions an incentive to achievement. What appears dead will take on new life. What is inert will be revealed as full of meaning for his progress. He will no longer mourn that he is incarcerated in a fleshly prison, but will accept his bodily life as a rich endowment without which he could not achieve at all. He will no longer feel hemmed in by the outer world, as if it were a tyrant pressing in upon him. He will find it full of meaning, his friendly ally, if he reacts to it in the proper way. He will learn to link together the here and the yonder, the temporal and the eternal, finding elements of both in his own nature, and knowing that God is in all. Thus he will discover a kinship between God, the world and himself. Such an attitude is not only Christian: it has the merit of supplying both purpose and power for the achievement of personality."

F. TOWNLEY LORD.

ON THE MOORLANDS in the north-east of Staffordshire, Baptists were living about 1653, Thomas Hammersley of Basford being one. He took a visitor to a meeting in the house of Taylor, at Ipstones. This visitor, Humphrey Woolrich, was one of the First Publishers of Truth, and he was so convincing that he persuaded both the host and Hammersley to join the Quakers. This is a typical instance how General Baptists were treated as a body to be exploited by the Friends. Within a year, Hammersley lent his home as a regular meeting-house for his new friends; and the General Baptist cause near Leek and Cheadle faded away, though it persisted near Stone. Details are given in the Journal of the Friends' Historical Society, xxxii. 51.

W. T. W.

Recollections of S. A. Tipple.

I.

THE Editor asks me tell you what I knew of the now-famed Samuel Augustus Tipple. He and my father were Staffordshire neighbours in the eighteen-fifties—he the Baptist minister in Wolverhampton and my father in Walsall. They were kindred spirits and great friends. My father used to express his admiration and affection through occasional gifts of choice cigars. When S. A. Tipple was called to London, he advised the Wolverhampton Baptists to invite my father to succeed him, and it ended in his settling there, and presently in his building of the Waterloo Road Chapel. In Wolverhampton my father made his first real home, and there all we, his first five children, were born. Mr. Tipple and he nurtured their friendship through all their years, and I can readily recall his letters ever and again arriving with their spidery sharp-pointed script which father would challenge us to read. Mr. Tipple became in Norwood, South London, a personality and preacher of rare distinction, though never of popular fame. My father greatly prized the first volume of sermons which his friend ventured to publish—*Echoes of Spoken Words*—and gave it to me on my going to "Regent's." In outer appearance and type, and in inner charm of style and thought, it was an unusual volume. There I found for the first time Biblical and human problems freshly and fearlessly treated, just the book for a young truth-seeker. If you are ever lucky enough to see it for sale at second-hand, seize your chance. You won't find it out of date even now. I am reminded of another book on my father's not-too-often-replenished shelves—his quiver was too full for many such purchases—which he owed to Mr. Tipple's counsel: *Catholic Thoughts on the Bible and Theology,* by Vicar Frederick Myers of St. John's, Keswick, the father of F. W. H. Myers, the poet of *St. Paul,* and the founder of the *Psychical Research Society.* It seems to me now to have anticipated the many master-problems that were destined to emerge and challenge the Church's honesty and courage, when—with the new light that was to break forth from science, history and criticism—God would be calling and compelling His own to reconsider the data and doctrine of Scripture. That was the book which, in my later 'teens, became a light to my path and a lamp to my feet, and saved me from many a stumble. I owe a deep debt to S. A. Tipple for advising my father

to its purchase. I can see that it was the very book he himself would greatly value.

When I entered "Regent's," my fond father informed Mr. Tipple, from whom I soon received an invitation to spend a Sunday in Norwood. I can never forget that Sunday morning—the little building, seating about three hundred, filled to capacity with, as I afterwards learned, faithful listeners from all parts of London. Not a child was to be seen. They could scarcely be brought there from such distances. Nor could the high-strung preacher himself bear their innocent little restlessnesses. Nobody was late. Everyone had evidently been disciplined to the due demands of the hour. A stiller and devouter fellowship could scarcely have been found. Presently, the preacher's presence hushed the assembly into awe. I was fascinated by his refined, tense, reverend face, and by his every movement. He was aged, of course, and his hair was snowy-white. His prayings were meditations and communions that expressed deep yearnings of the soul, to be classed with the devotions of McLaren and George Dawson, of Joseph Parker and Rabindranath Tagore. His reading of Scripture was a revelation of fresh significance in things familiar. And his preaching! Not a note, yet not a wasted ragged word! Pure artistry! A perfect bit of intellectual and exegetical and spiritual workmanship. Far removed from the spheres of the dogmatic and the ecclesiastical, but woven into all the warp of life. Every eye was fastened upon him. We almost held our breath. I remember how vivid was his quoted stanza from Tennyson that morning:

> "A fuller light illumined all,
> A breeze through all the garden swift,
> A sudden hubbub shook the hall,
> And sixty feet the fountain leapt."

That one hour taught me, beyond any earlier experience, what public worship and preaching might become. In his home he and Mrs. Tipple were for my father's sake the kindliest of hosts to me, a very shy young student. Though it was Sunday, he made me join him in his study, before he rested to renew his day's strength. I caught sight on his desk of the scripts of the morning's prayings and preaching. I saw, too, the tea, with sliced lemon, that he was wont to sip, too often probably, day by day. He told me how, till the last moment before entering the pulpit, he always clung to the hope that someone might arrive to relieve him of his pulpit charge. Also, that he could not much longer bear the strain of the double service, and that he feared that then the Chapel would have to be closed for the evenings, as two-fold attendance could scarcely be expected of his

far-travelling people. And this, as is well known, was eventually done.

I have often recalled what he told me that day of his spiritualistic and psychic investigations, in the course of which he had come upon many inexplicable things—especially a farm-labourer, who under his own critical testings had seemed typically torpid and dull, yet in a trance had given off a brilliant discourse on Inspiration. He told me that he himself had ceased to attend séances lest he should lose the due balance of his intellect and judgement.

A little while after I first knew him his *Sunday Mornings at Norwood* was published, and this time, to the enrichment of his readers, the prayers of the preacher were also added.

I was only able to get to Norwood very rarely, for the distance from "Regent's" was great and, for a student, expensive, and I shrank from intruding upon an Elder whom I so much revered. The last time I ventured he constrained me to conduct his evening service. With fear and trembling I strove to do my best. He himself was sitting just to my right below. From the text "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ," I reminded my hearers that we were being frequently and continually tested and judged by Christ through the experiences of life; "perhaps," I said, "by the reading of a book like *Sartor Resartus*." At this I was almost upset, for the great preacher became rather excited. He jerked up in his corner seat and fixed me with a disconcerting look. I had to pull myself together to carry on. As soon as the service was over, he came into the vestry and challenged me, "Why did you say that about Carlyle?" "Because it had been my own experience," I answered, "it was *Sartor Resartus* that became my 'baptism of fire'." "Why, that was the book," he replied, "that woke my spirit. I could scarcely believe my ears as I listened. You swept me back in that instant into my own earliest years."

The last time I saw and heard him was in Bloomsbury, in the pulpit of Stopford Brooke. I doubt whether any other preacher of ours would thus have been chosen. Nor were the grounds of the choice, I am confident, theological. It was the expression of the spiritual kinship of two sensitive poetic souls. But I couldn't feel it to be a success. The surroundings were too unusual for the Norwood preacher, and Stopford Brooke's gown, which I suppose he was asked to wear, distressed him, and in the midst of the sermon he threw it aside. I felt his discomfort. He was one who could scarcely be himself save in his own familiar fellowship. But there he was sovereign.

S. PEARCE CAREY.

II

The years of my boyhood, from eight to fourteen, were spent at my birthplace, Upper Norwood, where Charles Haddon Spurgeon had his home, and where, at Central Hill Chapel, Samuel Augustus Tipple exercised his ministry. Spurgeon I never saw; but I remember being sent by my father to read the bulletins which were posted at the gate of his house during his last illness. I also have a couple of autograph notes which he sent to my father with reference to the project of starting a Church in the neighbourhood. As Tipple's theological outlook was too advanced for my father's taste we did not attend Central Hill Chapel but had sittings instead in St. Aubyn's Congregational Church, under the Rev. George Martin, whose views were much more akin to Spurgeon's. Not until schooldays were over did I claim the privilege of occasionally absenting myself from the family pew and going to hear Tipple. That I was able to do so at all I count as one of the supreme privileges of a life rich in privileges. For no other preacher I have ever listened to made such an impression on me as he did.

With his slight, frail figure, his broad forehead, his mouth thin-lipped and sensitive, his whole face luminous with keen spiritual intelligence and fervour he conveyed an impression of finely-strung but intense vitality. His voice, although not a strong one, was very expressive. He seemed to preach with his whole being, down to his very finger-tips, and worshippers were held under a spell from the first word of the service to the last. He preached without notes, yet so choice and apt was his diction that it could not possibly have been—as it appeared from its manner of delivery to be—extempore. I was at a loss to think what could be the preacher's method of preparation until, many years later, I met the Rev. R. F. Guyton, who had once been Tipple's assistant, acting as *locum tenens* for him when he visited India. Mr. Guyton told me that Tipple's memory was of the kind that is called visual. On Sunday evening he would choose his text for the following Sunday. (In his later years he preached only once a Sunday.) He would read widely during the week and on Saturday write his sermon. While he was preaching he could with his mind's eye see what he had written, and would mentally turn over one by one the pages of the manuscript which he carried with him in his pocket. A week later he would find that manuscript indecipherable even by himself.

His sermons were characterized by remarkable range and freshness of thought, absolutely fearless candour, searching

psychological insight and delicately sensitive accuracy of expression. Four volumes of them were published, viz.: *Echoes of Spoken Words* in 1877 (originally issued for private circulation), *Sunday Mornings at Norwood,* which reached a second edition in 1895, *The Admiring Guest* in 1896, and *Days of Old* in 1911. In addition a book of selections from his prayers, under the title *Spoken Words of Prayer and Praise,* appeared in 1912, shortly before his death. But the printed page, while it preserves the lucidity and choiceness of the preacher's diction and the beauty of his phrasing, inevitably fails to convey the tense vividness of his living utterance.

When I reached home after hearing him I made fragmentary jottings of such sentences as my memory retained: and my younger brother, who heard him rather more frequently in subsequent years, followed a similar practice. My brother was killed by a sniper at Inverness Copse in 1917, but the notebook containing his jottings has been preserved, and selections from it will be given in a later issue of the *Baptist Quarterly.*

A distinctive feature of Mr. Tipple's services was the Scripture readings. Instead of reading a whole chapter he would make an anthology of verses from Old and New Testaments bearing on the subject of his sermon. And how tellingly he could read! It seemed remarkable to me at the time—and still seems so—that on one occasion I found that I could remember the complete chain of verses and jot them down along with my recollections of the sermon. These readings are given with the first of the sermon notes hereafter to be printed.

ERIC J. ROBERTS.

The October issue of the *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society* maintains the high standard associated with that Society's productions. Of interest to Baptists is the first part of an article on The Old Meeting House, Bessels Green.

The Arab and the Jew in Palestine.

I RETURNED to England last July from Palestine, where I had been living for a year, but my first introduction to the racial problem there was in the spring of 1933, when I visited it for a fortnight from Egypt. Then I was amazed at the prosperity of the Jewish colonies we passed along the Maritime Plain; wherever there were well-cultivated citrus groves or farms with a modern house and farm buildings, there were prosperous Jewish communities with unlimited energy and considerable wealth. We stayed one night at Haifa and thence were driven to Nazareth by an Arab taxi-driver, who was only too willing to talk about the condition of his country. He told us how boat after boat was coming, crowded with fresh Jewish immigrants, legal and illegal, at the rate of 5,000 a month; how successive commissions had found that either there was no more room or that the maximum number the country could absorb was 10,000 a year and that 20,000 a year would give a Jewish majority in the country in twenty years. As we climbed the hills north of Esdraelon he pointed out the wire fences of the Jewish colonies, which were crowding the black Bedouin tents into an ever decreasing space at the foot of the Carmel Range, and told me how, with their boundless wealth, the Jews were buying all the best land from the absentee farmer and turning out the Arab peasant tenant who had lived there for generations. He finished with a venomous snarl: "They are buying it with their money, but they will sell it with their blood." In the autumn of that year riots broke out in Palestine.

We came away after that visit with two equally strong impressions; first, of the obvious and growing prosperity of the Jew, and secondly, the equally patent fear of the Arab lest he should be dispossessed from the land his fathers had held for 1,300 years.

THE HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM.

There is no need to remind you of the history of the race problem in Palestine in Biblical times; nor in the succeeding centuries dealt with by Professor Margoliouth in his Schweich lectures. The Arab conquest took place in 636 A.D. Since the Mongol invasion in 1518 under Sultan Selim, no Arab prince has borne rule in the Holy Land, nor have the Arabs had political freedom, but it must be remembered that during those 400 years *their* religion was also the religion of the overlord,

and Arabic was the official language and remained supreme. Apart from the short Crusader Period it has been their land for 1,300 years. The Dome of the Rock, built in the old Temple area in 691 by the Ommayad Caliph Abdul Malek, was adorned by the conquering Mongols under Suliman the Magnificent; Jerusalem had become the Holy Spot—*El Kuds*—for them, and second only to Mecca, and some of the most fanatical Moslems in the world are those who guard the Cave of Machpelah at Hebron.

Though the modern invasion of the Hebrews by force of wealth and at the instigation of the Government is a new thing in the history of aggressive warfare, yet I need hardly remind you that they also are not newcomers to the land. From the first tribal invasions of the Habiru in the fifteenth century and Joshua's invasion in about 1200 B.C.—if we may trust the Bethel evidence—Hebrews have remained. Driven out of Jerusalem by Hadrian in the second century A.D., they moved to Tiberias; they returned again with the Arab in the seventh century, and were allowed to resettle and found schools, and also again after the defeat of the Crusaders, although Benjamin of Tudela (1160-1173) tells us that there were "only few men left." In 1492 Jews expelled from Spain returned to Galilee and obtained from Sultan Selim II. permission to rebuild Tiberias and repeople it with Jews. They were joined in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by refugees from Central Europe, and, by the middle of the eighteenth century, with the help of the Haluka fund, Jewish schools had been founded in the four Holy Cities of Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias and Safed. In 1770 there were about 5,000 Jews in Palestine, but by 1840 the number had grown to 12,000. It is of interest that when Britain stopped the advance of Ibraham Pasha at Acre in 1832, Lord Shaftesbury proposed that the land be used for Jewish settlement. It was, however, handed back to the Turks, but the first British Consul, appointed in 1838, had as part of his work the protection of the Jews who began to flow back. Officially they were not allowed to purchase land nor to remain more than three months. In 1855 Sir Moses Montefiore obtained from the Sultan permission for Jewish purchase of land, and from then the Jewish colonisation increased and the Jewish population doubled itself in the forty years to 1880. The Russian persecution of 1881 brought more recruits—among them Ben Yehuda in 1882, who was mainly responsible for the revival of Hebrew as the spoken language of Palestine—and stimulated the Nationalism which had begun to spread to the Jews. This Nationalism took the form of a "Back to the Land" movement, with the desire that the rejuvenated Judaism should be firmly planted on the soil,

and that Jews should be no longer traders in "new money and old clothes," but creative and productive. More land was purchased in Sharon and Galilee, worked by 3,000 young pioneers from Russia and Roumania. The Zionist movement proper began a few years later when Theodor Herzl, roused by an anti-Jewish outburst in Paris, started a fund for the purchase of land for Jews, and in 1897 convened the First Zionist Congress at Basle, which had as its aim the establishment of a Palestine home for the Jewish People. By 1914, mainly through the inspiration of Sir Laurence Oliphant and the wealth of Baron Edmund Rothschild, forty-three Jewish colonies had been established, each with an average population of 3,000 and an average area of 100,000 acres.

As far as I can find out, while the increase was a natural growth not officially supported by a Government declaration, there was no Arab opposition or discontent. In 1918, before the Balfour Declaration had been published in Palestine, the Moslem Mufti of Jerusalem was present at the laying of the foundation of the new Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. The difficulties experienced by the Jews were those common to any non-Moslem in a Turkish land—the inability to acquire political rights—but backsheesh would then, as now, purchase anything in the near East!

The war changed everything. Britain had long realised the importance of Palestine as an additional defence for Suez and as a bridgehead for the land route to the Persian Gulf, and had carefully cultivated the friendship of Sheriff Hussein of Mecca. In 1915-16 the negotiations between Great Britain and Hussein offered him, in exchange for Arab support against the Turk, a great Arab Empire to include all Arabia, except Aden, Transjordan and Palestine, except a coastal strip west of Damascus and Aleppo. Later, Britain claimed that the agreement excluded all Palestine, but her persistent refusal to publish the documents tends to suggest that the claim cannot be substantiated. In 1916 the Sykes-Picot agreement reserved for France and Britain spheres of influence within this Arab Federation. France wanted Syria, and Britain wanted Haifa and Acre and the right to build a railway—a corridor—through to Mesopotamia. The "Holy" part of the land, between a line from Acre to Tiberias on the north and Gaza, Hebron and Jericho in the south, was to be in International hands. On November 2nd, 1917, after the British capture of Gaza, Britain published a letter from Lord Balfour to Lord Rothschild containing the now famous "Balfour Declaration," which, with characteristic British diplomacy, said nothing but was sufficient to bring into the Allied cause Jewish and American support and

finance. This letter was not published in Palestine, so far as I can ascertain, until 1920. The Declaration said: "H.M. Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of *a* National Home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine."

In 1918 an order issued by the British Headquarters in Palestine said that the Allied aim was "Complete and definite emancipation of the Peoples so long oppressed by the Turks, and the establishment of National Governments and Administrations deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of the indigenous populations."

In 1919 a commission was sent by the Council of Ten to ascertain the wishes of the peoples of Palestine and Syria, and the plebiscite was overwhelmingly against the idea of a Jewish National Home and in favour of a United Arab State under the protection of America or Great Britain. Feisal—the son of Hussein—was allowed to found an Arab State with Damascus as its capital, and it is to this period that Feisal's agreement, quoted so often by Jewish writers, to the project of Jewish immigration belongs; the agreement was made on the definite and written understanding that the British pledges to the Arabs were fulfilled.

But in 1920 the Conference of San Remo gave to France the mandate of Syria, and in three months Feisal's Arab troops had been defeated, and Damascus captured. Britain obtained the mandate of Iraq, Transjordan and Palestine. This arrangement was confirmed by the League of Nations in 1922 and all powers of legislation and administration were vested in the mandatory power. From the British share Iraq has become independent and a member of the League of Nations, Transjordan has obtained a relative independence ruled by the Emir Abdullah under British protection, and the British Government has made various attempts to make Palestine more self-governing. In 1920 Sir Herbert Samuel nominated an Advisory Council of ten British Officials, seven Arabs and three Jews, but the Arabs refused to serve. In 1923 another Council was suggested of ten Officials, eight Moslems, two Christians and two Jews. An attempt in 1930 was defeated by the Jews, who now saw the possibility of a Jewish majority in Palestine and wanted to postpone any scheme of self-government until this majority had been achieved. A final attempt was made by Sir Arthur Wauchope—the High Commissioner—in 1935; this provided for a council of twenty-eight members, of which fourteen

would be Arab—nine elected and five nominated—eight Jews—3 elected and five nominated—five British Officials, an independent commercial representative and a specially appointed British chairman. Reserved subjects with which the Council would not deal would include all international affairs and obligations, the terms of the Mandate, the Budget and the immigration quota, though the last two subjects would be open to discussion by the Council. Extensive powers were reserved for the High Commissioner, including a veto on any measure that might be passed. The Arab leaders gave their consent, but the Jews have rejected it, carried on an extensive campaign against it and their more militant section, the Revisionists, have organised demonstrations in Palestine against it. To the Arab it is significant that the Jewish opposition has prevented the project from being proceeded with; he regards it as proving the enormous Jewish influence on British politics.

THE JEWISH ACHIEVEMENT IN PALESTINE.

No one who knows Palestine can doubt the amazing achievement of the Jewish people in Palestine during the last fifteen years. There are now about 450,000 Jews in the land, and the number is increasing at the enormous rate of 70,000 a year—the official report to the League stated that in 1935 a total of 64,147 legal immigrants entered Palestine as compared with 44,143 in 1934, and it should be noted that this figure does not include the thousands of illegal immigrants who have entered during this period. Jewish wealth appears to be flowing in at the same rate. From 1923-33 £10,000,000 of Jewish public money was spent in setting up 2,700 farmers and as much private capital on the cultivation of orange groves. It is estimated that £1,000,000 sterling is coming into the country every month, and of this about £6,000,000 was spent on building in 1934.

It is almost impossible to give any one acquainted with Palestine an adequate impression of the economic prosperity which has been brought to the country by this Jewish invasion. The report issued by the Jewish National Fund in 1935 shows that the primary effort has been put into citrus groves—oranges, grapefruit and lemons—and about 140,000 dunams (a dunam is about a quarter of an acre) have been planted by Jews, and of the 5½ million cases of fruit exported in 1934, sixty per cent. were from the Jewish groves. The difficulty of finding markets for a further increase in this trade is causing the new stream of settlers to turn to more general farming and the raising of dairy, poultry and vegetable products, which up till now have been largely supplied by the Arabs. Whether this agricultural prosperity is still a subsidised one is a question on

which Jewish opinions differ; one suspects that the majority of these colonies are not self-supporting, but their growth can be judged from an example like Rishon-le-Zion, which was founded in 1882 on land bought for £9,000 and paying taxes of £25 a year, and now supports 2,000 Jewish families, is worth £2,000,000 and pays £25,000 annually in taxes. There are three types of these agricultural settlements:

(1) That of the individual farmer who owns his land and employs Jewish and Arab labour, and because Arab labour is cheaper these settlements are responsible for the large seasonal inflow of the Haurani Arabs from Transjordan;

(2) Colonies of smallholders (Moshav Ovdim) who employ no outside labour, but work on a kind of guild system and form a unity for marketing purposes;

(3) Those run by workers' co-operative groups (Kvuzoth). These groups consist of about 200 people, who work the farm as a unit, have everything in common, receive no wages, have creches for the young children and all the adults have meals together.

Industrial undertakings are also increasing, as can be seen from the increase in the consumption of electricity from the Jordan plant from eight million kilowatts in 1931 to thirty-four million in 1934. The exports of potash and bromide from the Dead Sea works are growing; the Iraq pipe line from Mosul to Haifa—1,150 miles long—has been completed, and, though only forty miles of the line is in Palestine, the oil will be shipped from Haifa, and the tonnage of boats entering there, which trebled itself in the past five years, will be rapidly increased.

Among the Jewish achievements in Palestine, mention must be made of the rapid growth of Jewish culture there. Large sums of money are being spent on education; elementary schools, secondary schools and technical institutes form, with the Hebrew University, a complete and satisfactory system of education. The literary output in good modern Hebrew is enormous, not only of original work, but of translations. Most works of real interest in other languages—whether it be Shakespeare or Kipling—can be obtained in Hebrew.

There has been one slump period. In 1925 the opening of the Hebrew University caused a great enthusiasm in world Jewry and many immigrants of the £500 class came to swell the ranks of small shopkeepers. The amount of immigration far exceeded the amount of land purchase; at the end of 1925 immigration began to decrease and in 1927 more Jews left the country than entered; but by 1929 the slump was over, and bankers tell us that the same is not likely to occur again.

There are certain disquieting features in the situation. The

first is caused by the Aim of Zionism, which, from the beginning, has been two-headed. On the one side are the followers of the Jew who called himself Ahad Ha'am, who asked for a legally assured home where the Jew was of right and not on sufferance and where, in freedom, he could build up a cultural and spiritual centre for all world Jewry and develop the genius of the Jewish peoples. Dr. Weizmann—the great Zionist leader—has spoken sometimes in a way that supports this aim: "Jewish people desire to live with the Arab people on terms of amity and mutual respect and together with them to make a common home into a flourishing community, the upholding of which may assure to each of its peoples undisturbed national development." Professor Bentwich has written: "A National Home, as distinguished from a State, is a country where a people are acknowledged as having a recognised legal position and the opportunity of developing their cultural, social and intellectual ideals without receiving sovereignty." Dr. Magnus, President of the Hebrew University, in a booklet, *Wie alle Völker,* emphasises the fact that a Jewish State cannot offer the solution to the problems of the whole diaspora, and has repeatedly recognised that a National Home cannot be permanently built if founded on British bayonets, but only on understanding, co-operation and the recognition of others' rights. But on the other side are the great mass of political Zionists, whose spearhead is the Revisionist section, who last year broke away from the general Zionists, whose aim is definitely a Jewish State with a Jewish majority. In 1919 at Versailles Dr. Weizmann said that a Jewish National Home meant settling from 50 to 60,000 annually on the land, developing Jewish institutions and language so that Palestine would become as Jewish as America is American. The refusal of the whole Zionist Congress at Lucerne last August to accept the proposed Legislative Council points in the same direction. Official Zionism has become cautious and no longer speaks openly about majorities or Jewish States; its slogan is now, "The largest possible number settled on the smallest possible space in the least possible time at the lowest possible cost." But it is essential for the permanency of the only Home that can offer a haven to Jewish victims of persecution, that the Jew should deal as firmly as possible with those aggressive Nationalists from central Europe who are insisting on political domination and raising Arab fears, and that he should take every opportunity of co-operating with the mandatory power and with the Arab population.

Another disquieting feature is that this growth of population has been far too rapid owing to the persecution in Germany;

at least 30,000 German Jews entered Palestine last year, and some of them are not the most desirable citizens; Europeans at Tel Aviv are indulging in crimes almost unknown in Palestine a few years ago—counterfeiting, scientific safe-breaking, passport and visa forgeries and bank frauds. There are also some of the other bad features of Western civilisation present—slums and homeless children, and the pathway to the Wailing Wall is lined on both sides with Jewish beggars.

THE ARABS' POSITION.

I have written at length of the Jewish side of the question, now may I turn to the Arab. The War and the Allied promises gave to the Arab a new feeling of nationalism and kindled a vision of a revival of that independant Arab State which they had lost 400 years before, and that vision fades but slowly. Until 1925 their policy was one of non-co-operation with the British, their leader was Emin el Husseini, now the Mufti and President of the Supreme Moslem Council, but his leadership lacked drive because his aim was not simply an Arab Palestine but a great pan-Islamic movement which would force the hands of the British Government.

Then the Arab National Party was formed under Nashashibi, who until last year was Mayor of Jerusalem. It was ready to co-operate with the Government but demanded: (*a*) Full recognition of Palestine as an Arab land; (*b*) revocation of the Balfour Declaration; (*c*) formation of a democratic National Government; (*d*) recognition of Arabic as the sole official language; (*e*) improvement of the conditions of the fellahin and of Arab industry.

It lost its power because as soon as it was formed in 1925 the great slump came, and with characteristic Eastern optimism —born of indolence—the Arabs believed Zionism would never recover and that they need do nothing. The hope was not realised and in 1929 riots broke out. The agitation spread to the masses, and the outcome was the formation of a vigorous Arab Nationalist Movement under Husseini. Even religious differences were sunk in the common Nationalist sentiment, and a quarter of the 600 delegates to the following Arab Congress were Christian. Gradually the cohesion weakened, trouble arose between the Nashashibi and the Husseini parties, and the Arab Youth party gradually drifted away from the main body. Last year a determined effort was made to form a united Arab front and the Arab Reform Party came into being, leaning for advice, not as was expected on Ibn Saud, but on the Emir Abdullah of Trans-jordan. This party has been strengthened by the events in Egypt, and particularly in Abyssinia.

The Arab lacks cohesion, organising power and energy. The Effendi is growing rich by his contact with the Jew; he sells part of his land and retains some, watches the Jewish methods, and copies them, and, since 1919, nearly as many orange groves have been planted by Arabs as by Jews. But this Effendi has little in common with the peasantry, whom no invasion really moves and whose blood, probably predominantly Canaanite, has mingled with that of every people—including the Israelite—which has entered the land. These peasants also are far removed from the poverty-stricken Bedouin, whom the Government are attempting gradually to settle on the land. The peasant is friendly, humorous and very childlike; there is far more rapprochment between him and the Jewish colonists than anywhere else between the two peoples; he borrows their implements, watches their methods and does likewise. The Effendi are the leaders, but they have not yet bridged the feuds between the leading families. Until his death there was a great hope among many of the Arabs that Lawrence of Arabia would one day return to lead them. But though they have no real leadership and their political aspirations can be drugged by prosperity, the inflammable material is always there and needs but a spark to fire it. At the end of last year there was some trouble when they discovered a large consignment of arms and ammunition being smuggled into the country by Jews, but it did not spread because the hope was strong in them that the Abyssinian affair would create a European conflict which would remove the British control. That hope has been disappointed and as in 1929 they were more ready for trouble when Jews fired the powder train last May. The immediate occasion of the present trouble was a hold-up on the Haifa Road; two Jews, among those held up, were foolish enough to show fight with the revolvers they were carrying, and they were immediately shot, as they would have been whether they were British, Arab or Jew. That night two lonely Arab shepherds were shot by Jews as a reprisal, and the Jews in Tel Aviv began to attack the Arabs in Jaffa. At once the wildest rumours spread that the Arabs were being murdered by the Jews and the peasantry rose. It is not surprising that Britain's magnanimous offer of another royal commission does nothing to appease them—they have convinced every commission that has been appointed but it has not affected British policy—nor that the threat of capital punishment and the presence of six more battalions of British infantry has done little to allay their fears.

The large increases in numbers are making the Jews aggressive, many of them are armed and they believe that the time is within sight when they will be the most powerful section

in the country. But 2,000 years of persecution seem to have taught them nothing. Bentwich wrote: "The establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine lays a special obligation and a special task on the Jewish people with relation to its international and pacific ideals. They may order their conduct in relation to the other nationality in Palestine in such a way that the cause of peace may be served by their example"; and Herzl wrote: "Build your home in such a manner that the stranger may feel happy in your midst." Under the Moorish Caliphs of the middle ages the Arab and the Jew together built up one of the highest civilisations of the time. The same might have been possible in a happy, prosperous Palestine to-day if the Jews had been willing to handle aright their relationships with the Arab; they have everything to gain if their national home is founded on sure foundations, everything to lose if it is not. Palestine is not "An unpeopled land ready for a landless people"; 1,300 years of occupation have given the Arabs at least some rights there, and they form a single unity with the surrounding peoples. These peoples are rapidly growing in strength and in national feeling, and Moslem India is already showing in unmistakable ways its sympathy with its fellow Moslems in Palestine.

The present trouble in the country has subsided, as everyone knew it would, now that the slack season in agriculture is over. But the ending of the strike and the presence of a whole division of British troops has not solved the problem of the relationship between these two peoples. A home must be found for thousands more Jews in a world in which anti-Semitic feeling is growing rapidly, but that home can be built in Palestine only if the rights of the Arabs are fully recognised. Perhaps there is yet hope that wiser counsels may prevail in Zionism, for the key to the situation still lies in Jewish hands.

J. N. SCHOFIELD.

A Baptist Governor of Liberia.

WHEN the spirit, endeavours and achievements of Lott Carey are generally known and appreciated, he will take his place with the world's foremost Christian missionaries. The bases of this claim rest in his obscure and humble birth, the unusual obstacles he surmounted, and the actual contributions he made to the programme of Christian missions in foreign fields.

This interesting man was born a slave in 1780 in Charles City County, near Richmond, Virginia. His slave parents were of the devout kind, and so influenced their children. In 1804 Lott Carey was sent to the city to work in the Schockoe tobacco warehouse. It is stated that here he grew wicked, profane and intemperate. But on a certain occasion he heard a powerful sermon on "the New Birth," which awoke in him a deep conviction of his sin and was followed by a genuine conversion to Christ. In 1807 he was baptised by the Rev. John Courtney, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Richmond. Afterwards he was licensed as an "exhorter" by this Church, and soon gave evidence of his piety and his native ministerial gifts.

It is said that he was like most of his fellow-slaves in his longing to learn to read and write. This they often craved so they might write and issue permits or "passes" which slaves had to carry when making Sunday or night visits from one farm to another. But Carey desired knowledge to increase his religious usefulness. He therefore made a beginning by procuring a New Testament, and trying to learn his alphabet. Later he profited greatly by attendance at a night school. During this time he heard of Africa, its ethereal sunshine, amazing resources, and the dire needs of his forbears; and, Nehemiah-like, he determined that he would dedicate his life to the improvement of their condition. The revelation of the needs of his homeland was so striking and impressive, and so fired him, that he at one time exclaimed: "Some day I shall go to Africa and see for myself." This was not the declaration of a curious explorer or mercenary trader, but the courageous, unconditional surrender of a soul, and its commitment to a heaven-given and most difficult missionary task. It seems that the spirit which stirred Abraham Lincoln when first he viewed the horrors of American slavery and made him declare his future attitude thereto, now captured Carey. He was possessed of such a missionary passion as dominated the prophet Isaiah.

Carey was a man of deep faith and resolute determination. This is clear from the outset. Great hindrances had to be

overcome. He who longed for the freedom of Africa was himself the subject of a galling slavery. As the superintendent of the labourers on the tobacco plantation in which he worked, he was so industrious and faithful that, though he was a slave, his master rewarded him with a substantial sum of money. With this encouragement, and by constant thrift, he was able to amass $850.00, and succeeded in purchasing his own freedom and that of two of his little children, some time in the year 1813.

Although Lott Carey had in 1815 fully decided to devote his life to the furtherance of African missions, it was not until 1821 that the way was opened up for him. About this time a group of American philanthropists founded the Republic of Liberia as a home for free negroes who desired to return to the continent of their origin. The American Colonisation Society aided or sent out the first group of freed men to make their home in Africa. How strikingly providential it was that Carey, who paid a portion of his own fare, was a member of this group!

We know but little of what happened immediately before Carey's departure for Liberia, but we should imagine that those were for him intense days. He preached his final farewell sermon in the First Baptist Church, Richmond, Virginia, where he had been baptised and licensed to preach. It is reported that the following words were a portion of his valedictory sermon:—

"I am about to leave you, and expect to see your faces no more. I long to preach to the poor Africans the way of life and salvation. I don't know what may befall me, whether I may find a grave in the Ocean, or among the savage men, or more savage wild beasts on the coast of Africa; nor am I anxious what may become of me. I feel it is my duty to go; and I very much fear that many of those who preach the Gospel in this country will blush when the Saviour calls them to give an account of their labours in His cause, and tells them, 'I commanded you to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature'." With the utmost possible emphasis he added: "The Saviour may ask, 'Where have you been? What have you been doing? Have you endeavoured to the utmost of your ability to fulfil the commands I gave you; or have you sought your own gratification and your own ease, regardless of my commands?'"

On January 23rd, 1821, at half-past six in the morning, Carey and his family with others embarked for Africa, and after forty days' sailing amid contrary winds, tempests, sea-sickness and other inconveniences and perils, landed in Africa about five o'clock in the afternoon of March 7th, 1821. During

the entire voyage Carey and his little band gave themselves over to much prayer, preaching and fasting. Concerning this he said: "We met you on Monday at the throne of grace in a concert prayer meeting, and we had a comfortable time; for we met together, agents and colonists, and united in prayer." (Extract from *Lott Carey's Journal*, 1821.) "We have come to a resolution to keep the nineteenth as a day of fasting and prayer, to ask forgiveness of our sins, and for direction and protection of the Lord, who ever waiteth to hear the prayers of His people." He also said, when reporting the landing: "To us it was a pleasant sight." (*American Baptist Magazine*, 1829.) His deep insight into his task is further exhibited in the first report he sent back to America after his arrival in Africa.

Lott Carey, as pioneer missionary, was by nature and training eminently fitted for his task. He possessed a strong physique, a well-ordered mind, and a keen sense of right. The hard school of American slavery had prepared him for the difficult duties of an evangelist in Africa. The things he had endured and conquered through faith in God gave him the background and reserves necessary for effective missionary work amid such conditions as confronted him. He first met and conquered the hostility of the natives, the people whom he wished to help. At the outset these made fierce attacks upon him and his fellow-colonists, and he had to serve as a warrior and a captain to preserve the lives of his companions. Climatic conditions were difficult. The rainy season initiated a period of sickness in which the fevers peculiar to the region prevailed. On March 12th, 1824, he wrote concerning these conditions: "The fever began about the 24th ult., and on the 28th we had thirty-seven cases; and by the 2nd inst. we had sixty-six under the operation of medicine; and at present I have about one hundred cases of fever to contend with, but we have been very much favoured, for they appear all to be on the recovery, and we have lost none saving three children. I have very little time to write you, myself being the only man that will venture to act in the capacity of a physician." (Extract from Lott Carey's *Journal*.)

During this time the little Baptist Church of Monrovia, of which Carey was pastor, witnessed a constant growth. It had a membership of about eighty, and was maintaining a healthy Sunday School for native children. Carey discovered that the children of the natives would prove the best means of overcoming their hostility; hence he established a school for their instruction, which grew rapidly and met with great success. Carey also perceived immediately the industrial possibilities of Africa and attempted to establish their proper connection with

successful missionary endeavours. As a pastor he was diligent and sympathetic and a tireless worker. It is said that he preached with fiery zeal and led many to Christ. He was a pioneer missionary to Africa, not only in time but in the programme he sought to execute. He led not merely in matters of education, industry, health and religion, but also in civic affairs. The people so strongly believed in his prudence, fidelity and courage, that he was cordially accepted when appointed Governor of Liberia. He believed in the power of conciliation, and thus won the co-operation of many of the hostile natives. Lott Carey was a patriot. His was a very trying position, for he loved both America, the land of his birth, and Africa, the land of his fathers, with a pure, simple devotion. He endured much in Africa, but without complaint. Touching this point his Board said of him:

"The interest of the colony and the cause of his countrymen, both in Africa and this country, are near his heart. For them he is willing to toil, and to make almost any sacrifice; and he has frequently declared that no possessions or honours in this country could induce him to return."

He chose to suffer with and elevate his own people at any cost.

In 1825 a letter from Carey to Mr. William Crane, Richmond, Virginia, led the General Baptist Convention to make the following comments concerning his labours in Africa:

"It cannot fail to excite gratitude to the great Head of the Church to learn that the Lord is smiling upon Africa. Lott Carey, a descendant of this bewildered race, embarked with the first colonists sent out by the American Colonisation Society, under the patronage of the General Convention of the Baptist denomination. The mystery of Divine Providence in permitting his unhappy ancestors to be torn from their native land and brought into a country where they and their offspring were doomed to slavery, began to unfold itself. It was that he might receive existence in a country blessed with Gospel light, whence he should return, in the fullness of time, to bear the tidings of salvation to that of his progenitors; and the prospect of preaching Christ to his kinsmen according to the flesh, and in the land of his fathers, induced him to leave America."

"That your Committee contemplate the labours and pious deportment of Lott Carey with entire satisfaction, and are happy to find that his virtuous deportment has secured to him the high approbation of the American Colonisation Society."

"That Lott Carey has not only endeavoured to render himself useful as a minister of the Gospel of Christ, but has opened a small school for the instruction of the children of the natives

and has received ample demonstrations of their respect and attachment."

His was an unexpected death. "He perished by an accident, November 8th, 1828." (*Baptist Encyclopedia.*) The *American Baptist Magazine* says of him:

"It is a source of consolation to the friends of Mr. Carey that though his life was terminated at an unexpected moment, and in a most distressing manner, the unwearied diligence and fidelity with which he discharged the important trust confided to his care, his zeal for the honour of religion, and the purity and piety of his general conduct, have gained him a reputation which must live in grateful remembrance as long as the interesting Colony exists, in whose service he lived and died. . . ."

He passed away in the midst of unfinished plans, but his memory is yet a sweet benediction to his successors. The succeeding years have revealed the true worth of his tireless endeavours, for nothing human has united Negro Baptists and preserved their organised efforts like the life, labours and usefulness of Lott Carey.

J. H. BRANHAM.

DR. WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY has an acute head in Mr. Stephen Jones. He has found a duodecimo volume which has long been overlooked. It contains two little books by Philotheos, both printed in 1708. The one has 103 pages, and is a Catechism intended as a Guide for pious young men. Its existence was known, but no copy had been located. The other has 144 pages, and is "A Threefold Dialogue, concerning the three chief points in controversy amongst Protestants in our days, viz. 1. Whether the Holy Scriptures do prove the doctrine of Free Grace, or of Free Will? 2. Whether Believers, or Infants-Baptism, be the ordinance of Christ? 3. Whether the Seventh or First Day of the Week, be the Sabbath of the Lord? Deliver'd in a familiar Stile, easy for each Capacity to understand."

Mr. Jones thus identifies the books entered in the Baptist Bibliography as 11.708 and 7.728. And thus he proves that Philotheos is John Maulden, of whom Stinton wrote, and Crosby printed in iii. 140.

W. T. W.

Some Baptist Hymnists.

Part I.

THE realm of Hymnody is a realm of harmony. Here, when the worship of the Most High God is the theme inspiring the strains of song, discord is unknown; and, when the spirit of man expresses itself in adoration and praise, there is unity of desire and aspiration.

To achieve this glorious concord, many voices in many lands have combined in strong and beautiful notes of sacred minstrelsy. My aim in these articles is to show in what way Baptists have established their right to be counted as members of Christ's choir.

Familiar Hymns.

The late Dr. Henry S. Burrage, of Portland, Maine, U.S.A., in 1888 published a volume entitled *Baptist Hymn-Writers and their Hymns.* Canon Julian, in the Appendix to his *Dictionary of Hymnology,* describes it as "a most exhaustive work," adding, "All nations where Baptists have been located are included. The work is very complete in its range, and is well done." Naturally, the present writer is indebted to this book, and to the works of other authorities, for several facts and incidents herein related.

Dr. Burrage, in his Preface, asserts that "to those who have not given attention to this department of Christian literature, it will be a surprise to learn how many of the hymns oftenest on the lips of believers of every name were written by Baptists." In the body of the volume, nearly 700 pages are devoted to authors who have helped to promote "*the Service of Song in the house of the Lord.*" Most of these writers bear names unfamiliar to British people, yet my citing the first lines of twenty well-known hymns of Baptist origin will suffice to support the claim that "Baptists have an honourable place among writers of '*psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.*'" Here are the first lines:

Awake my soul in joyful lays.	*S. Medley.*
Blest be the tie that binds.	*J. Fawcett.*
Come, Thou Fount of every blessing.	*R. Robinson.*
Father of mercies, in Thy word.	*Anne Steele.*
Head of the Church, and Lord of all.	*J. Tritton.*
Holy Bible, Book divine.	*J. Burton, Senr.*
Ho! my comrades, see the signal.	*P. P. Bliss.*[1]
How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord.	*R. Keene.*

[1] Major A. W. Whittle, in his Biography of Mr. Bliss, states that he was immersed, and joined a Baptist Church. Afterwards he attended other Churches.

I need Thee every hour.	*Mrs. A. S. Hawks.*
Just as I am, Thine own to be.	*Marianne Hearn.*
Mighty God, while angels bless Thee.	*R. Robinson.*
My country, 'tis of thee (American National Hymn).	*S. F. Smith.*
My hope is built on nothing less.	*E. Mote.*
O Lord, I would delight in Thee.	*J. Ryland.*
Praise to Thee, Thou great Creator.	*J. Fawcett.*
Saviour, Thy dying love.	*S. D. Phelps.*
Shall we gather at the river.	*R. Lowry.*
Sound the battle-cry.	*W. F. Sherwin.*
Tell me the stories of Jesus.	*W. H. Parker.*
Whosoever heareth, shout, shout the sound.	*P. P. Bliss.*

Anabaptist Pioneers.

Dr. Whitley, in his *History of Congregational Singing in England,* writes: "It is seldom recognised how the Anabaptists pioneered in hymn-singing. . . . We hear of hymns composed in prison, of hymns sung on the way to the stake, and of men having to be gagged to prevent them singing." He gives instances of one prisoner being cheered by a fellow-prisoner's hymn-singing; of an Anabaptist woman singing to the monks who came to debate with her; of a Leyden disciple who, on the way to prison, sang,

O truth, how art thou now despised;

and of a martyr bound to a stake and singing right through a hymn of triumphant faith. His testimony is enforced by Dr. Burrage, who wrote a history of sixteenth-century Swiss Anabaptists and those of South Germany. Translations from some of their German verses are supplied. Most of these brave witnesses suffered constant persecution, and many were martyred. Yet, we are told that in the hymns "little that is polemical can be found. Faith and love are exalted, and steadfastness in persecution even unto death is exhibited as the mark of true discipleship."

The truth of this statement may be judged by quoting two or three stanzas from the compositions of Anabaptist hymnists.

Peter Riedemann, described by a contemporary as "rich in divine knowledge, who refreshed all who listened to him," endured long terms of imprisonment for preaching the Word, and died in 1556. From the dungeon he sang,

In anguish and distress,
Give us the bread of heaven,
And in the pain of death,
Let peace to us be given.
Thou Father, full of love,
Who makest rich the poor,
Oh, strengthen from above.

A stalwart soldier of the Cross was John Leopold, a citizen of Augsburg. When condemned to die for his faith, "Ye shall, by the sword, pass from life to death!" was the doom pronounced by his foes. "Nay, gentlemen of Augsburg," was his valiant response, "but, if God wills, from death to life!"

The opening and closing verses of his best-known hymn were,

My God, Thee will I praise
When my last hour shall come,
And then my voice I'll raise
Within the heavenly home.
O Lord, most merciful and kind,
Now strengthen my weak faith,
And give me peace of mind.

* * * *

To Thee, in every deed,
My spirit I commend,
Help me in all my need,
And let me ne'er offend.
Give to my flesh Thy strength,
That I with Thee may stand,
A conqueror at length.

Baptist Hymnody—Seventeenth Century.

In Britain, Baptist hymnody had its rise in the following century. Among General Baptists of that generation, promiscuous singing of metrical hymns or psalms was strongly condemned. But Particular Baptists did not all share that view.[2] Indeed, the records of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, show some of them to have been persistent vocalists.

(*a*) Broadmead Psalm Singers.

There, so Edward Terrill the writer of the early records relates, when the Mayor, accompanied by informers, came to arrest the preacher, the members "were all singing, so that the Mayor knew not who to take away more than another." In similar fashion other Bristolians thwarted their persecutors. The foes were untiring, and once again visited Broadmead. "On ye 14 day of March, 1674 [75], ye informers and officers were very rude, and used much violence." But "we were singing when they came in, Brother Terrill singing with the rest." A constable and an officer laid hands on Brother Terrill, but, failing to move him, "stood for a while, and ye people kept singing." A third attempt to seize Terrill followed, and failed. Then, a sergeant entreated the good man to come with him. To compel obedience, Terrill's hat was taken from the table and put on his head. Unmoved by the trick, the owner of the

[2] See Article by Rev. W. R. Stevenson in Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*.

hat calmly "pluckt it off againe, because he and they (the people) were still singing."

A delightful picture this! showing how Christian song was used as a weapon of victory over evil-doers. The leader, having in mind our Lord's injunction, "Be ye wise as serpents," announced beforehand the numbers of the selected Psalms, so that the congregation would be ready to sing when the officials and informers arrived. Moreover, as preaching was an indictable offence, the preacher, with certain members, was hidden behind a curtain. At a given signal the curtain was drawn back; the preacher, sitting down, would be intent on his Psalm Book like the other singers, for, according to the record, "ye people kept on singing looking on their bookes."

The folk at Broadmead doubtless used Sternhold and Hopkins' versified Psalms, issued one hundred years before the date of their persecution. As some of these versions contained from twenty to forty-nine four-lined stanzas, and one—Psalm cxix—had 176 verses, a single Psalm would enable the singers to keep going. At other times they would repeat again and again the eleven verses of Psalm xlvi., beginning,

> The Lord is our defence and aid,
> The strength whereby we stand:
> When we with woe are much dismayed,
> He is our help at hand,

and ending with the Gloria Patri—

> To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
> All glory be therefore:
> As in beginning was, is now,
> And shall be evermore.

(*b*) Benjamin Keach and the Advent of Hymns.

But the day was at hand when, for Baptists and for members of other denominations, hymns as well as psalm paraphrases were to be used as an integral part of worship-song in the house of the Lord. Many holders of the Baptist faith were, however, bitterly opposed to their introduction, and before their general adoption a long and tedious battle-royal raged. The details of this wretched wrangle, of the scores of pamphlets containing arguments for and against the practice, of solemn debates and resolutions in Association gatherings and in denominational assemblies, of churches split asunder on the question, need not be given here. Suffice it to record that final victory was won by the advocates of hymn-singing.

In the early stages the honours of war were gained by the redoubtable Benjamin Keach, pastor of Horsleydown Chapel,

Southwark. To him belongs the credit of issuing the first Baptist Hymn Book in Britain. With wise caution, he gradually trained his people to use hymns, gaining the consent of his Church members to each step taken. From the Epistle Dedicatory in one of his books, it appears that the training was spread over a period of many years. At first, he persuaded them to sing one hymn after each Communion Service. At the end of six years they agreed to sing also on days of Public Thanksgiving. Later, they adopted the plan of one hymn after the sermon on each Lord's Day.

In 1691 Keach published *Spiritual Melody*, containing nearly 300 original hymns. An examination of this work shows that, whilst the author was a "bonny fighter," he possessed no poetical gifts; and one does not wonder that the so-called "hymns" fell into disuse. In the Preface he claims that "these hymns being short, children will soon get them by heart." But even seventeenth-century children were not likely to be enamoured by verses that were merely sermon-points expressed in feeble rhymes, such as this on the text "*The Lord God is a sun and shield*"—

> Like as a shield the blow keeps off,
> The enemy lays on,
> So Thou keeps off all hurt from us,
> And saves us everyone;

or by compositions of which the following verse is typical—

> The antiquity of Scripture show
> That they are most divine;
> For no writings did the world know
> So soon as they did shine.

(*c*) Other Early Hymnists—Seventeenth Century.

Far removed from the strife of words, another seventeenth-century Baptist preacher, immured in Bedford Gaol, was writing an immortal allegory. With no thought of producing hymns to be sung in general worship, John Bunyan penned verses possessing lyrical qualities, assigning them to some of his characters. The two best known are (1) The Shepherd Boy's Song in the Valley of Humiliation—

> He that is down need fear no fall;

and (2) The brave war-song of Valiant-for-the-truth—

> Who would true valour see.

These are found in several modern collections of hymns, including *The Baptist Church Hymnal* (*Revised*).

Mercy's song,

> Let the Most Blessed be my guide;

and Bunyan's versification of The Lord's Prayer—taken from his *Book for Boys and Girls, or Country Rhimes for Children*—have a place in other hymnbooks. Thus, the Dreamer of Bedford may rightly be counted among early Baptist hymnists.

A niche must also be provided for one of his contemporaries —Joseph Stennett (1663-1713), whose rare little volumes of Hymns on the Lord's Supper (1697) and Baptism (1702) are open before me while writing. Isaac Watts acknowledged borrowing lines from one of the Sacramental Hymns, "Because," he explained, "they expressed my thought and design in proper and beautiful language"; and he embodied them in one of his Odes.[3]

Joseph Stennett, the son of one minister and brother of another, received a sound education at the hands of his father, and after acting as a school teacher, became minister of the Seventh Day Baptist Church, which met in a Hall in Devonshire Square, London. He was held in high esteem because of his character and attainments. The Poet Laureate of that day described him as "a good poet"; and another writer spoke of

Stennett, the patron and the rule of wit [i.e. in the sense of wisdom],
The pulpit's honour, and the saint's delight.

Stennett's works fill three volumes. Though author of many poems, he will be best remembered by his hymn commencing,

Another six days' work is done.

Eighteenth Century Writers.

1. Beddome. 2. Steele.

The seed sown by Keach and Stennett brought forth an abundant harvest among Baptists in the following century, most of the hymnists in this period being preachers of the gospel.

Benjamin Beddome, of Bourton-on-the-Water, Gloucestershire, born in 1717, leads the way. At the age of twenty-six he was ordained as minister of the Church at Bourton. There he laboured till his death in 1793. As a faithful preacher and pastor, he lived in the hearts of his people. Many tempting calls to larger Churches were declined. The spirit of this good man was revealed by his declaration: "I would rather honour God in a station even much inferior to that in which He has placed me, than intrude myself into a higher without His direction." Hymn-writing was a passion with Mr. Beddome. Every Lord's Day he composed a new one to follow his sermon. After his death a volume of 822 hymns was published, with a commendatory Foreword by the celebrated Robert Hall. Among the compositions generally used were:

[3] See Dr. Hatfield's *Poets of the Church.*

My times of sorrow and of joy,
Let party names no more,
Did Christ o'er sinners weep?
Prayer is the breath of God in man,
Buried beneath the yielding wave,
(BAPTISMAL HYMN).

and the hymn for Ministers, No. 504 in the *Baptist Church Hymnal (Revised)*,

Father of mercies, bow Thine ear.

In an age when Paul's stern saying, "*I suffer not a woman to teach . . . but to be in silence,*" was literally and rigidly enforced, two women dared to hymn the praises of their Redeemer, both using pen-names. Anne Dutton (1698-1765), wife of a Baptist minister in Great Gransden, Hunts., issued a selection of "sixty-one hymns on several subjects," but these are now forgotten.[4] Not so are those of Anne Steele (1716-1778), daughter of the Baptist pastor in Broughton, Hants., who wrote under the *nom de plume* of Theodosia. A great invalid, she "learned in suffering what she taught in song." Dr. Hatfield styles her "the female poet of the sanctuary."

Her hymns gained wide popularity both in the home-country and America. A volume made up of 144 Hymns, 34 Psalms, and various Poems, is accompanied by a Biographical Sketch from the pen of John Sheppard of Frome. From this Sketch we learn that hers was a gentle and affectionate nature. Although constantly suffering, she was always patient, and found opportunities for many unrecorded deeds of benevolence. In her last hour her thoughts centred on her Saviour. "*I know that my Redeemer liveth!*" she exclaimed, then gently fell asleep. She still lives in hymns such as,

Father of mercies, in Thy word,
My God, my Father, blissful name,
Father, whate'er of earthly bliss,
The Saviour calls, let every ear,
Dear Refuge of my weary soul,

and

To our Redeemer's glorious name.

The inscription on her tombstone in Broughton runs—

"Silent the lyre, and dumb the tuneful tongue
That sung on earth her great Redeemer's praise;
But now in heaven she joins the angelic song,
In more harmonious, more exalted lays."[5]

CAREY BONNER.

(*To be continued.*)

[4] See Transactions Baptist Historical Society, VII., 129.

[5] Varied wordings of the inscription appear in different books. The above has been supplied by Mr. Wardle, the present minister of Broughton.

Dissent and Republicanism after the Restoration.

DURING the first half of the seventeenth century political parties were described by ecclesiastical rather than by political terms. The men who opposed Charles I in 1640 were known as Puritans and Presbyterians. Those who executed him were more often described as Independents than as Republicans. The same confusion persisted after 1660. Anglicans could not subscribe to the doctrine of Roger Williams, that every man should be free to save his soul according to his liking, because they thought that those who differed from them in religious matters had political ideals incompatible with loyalty to the Crown. To clergy who had been driven from their rectories and to squires who had tasted the bitterness of exile, dissent and republicanism were synonymous terms. As from the sects had proceeded the sufferings of the Anglicans, they inevitably became the victims of a blind, fierce, fanatic intolerance. It was only to be expected that the sectaries would be regarded as waiting a fitting opportunity to recover their lost lands and church preferments.

Burnet divides the nonconformists into four groups and naively assigns political opinions to each. The Presbyterians, he says, "liked civil government and limited monarchy." The Independents he describes as republicans because they put all power in the hands of the congregation. According to his unsupported testimony they were the republicans of 1688.[1] James II repeated with wearisome reiteration that the dissenters were commonwealthsmen.[2] Jenkins, in 1680, thought that the dissenters were working for a republic,[3] while after the Rye House plot Ormonde[4] and Sprat[5] noted that "most if not all the meaner sort that are engaged are observed to be Anabaptists or Independents." Foreigners judged the relations between dissent and republicanism to be intimate and close. Cominges[6] and the *Rotterdam Gazette*[7] described the sectaries as averse to kingly government. Preachers from their pulpits commented on the same phenomenon. Dr. South thought that the Presbyterians

[1] Burnet, iii. 161.
[2] Clarke, "James II" i. 46; Macpherson, S. P. i. 21, 38; Savile—Foljambe MSS. H.M.C. Rep. xv. App. v. 130, 131.
[3] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1680-/1. 36.
[4] H.M.C. Ormonde MSS. (N.S.) vii. 65.
[5] True Account of the Horrid Conspiracy (1686).
[6] Jusserand. "An Ambassador at the Court of Charles II" 115-116.
[7] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1667. 294.

were still bound by their Covenant to repeat their attack on monarchy.[8] Samuel Parker, not content with sermonising in the pulpit, told the world in print "that princes may with less hazard give liberty to men's vices . . . than their consciences," and attributed political doctrines to the dissenters which he thought justified a denunciation of their "turbulent temper of mind."[9]

A majority of the gentry were no more willing than the incumbents to follow Marvell's advice to Parker, and "let all those things of former times alone."[10] Daniel Fleming hoped "His Majesty will ever remember King James's adage, no bishop, no king."[11] In Devon the justices at the Quarter Sessions, following the discovery of the Rye House plot, solemnly recorded that the nonconformist preachers were "the authors and fomenters of this pestilent faction."[12] The men who executed the penal laws listened with approval when Clarendon attacked the dissenting clergy as "trumpets of war and incendiaries towards rebellion."[13] That the dissenters were ostensibly persecuted from political motives may be proved from the Statute book. The authors of the Conventicle Acts speak of "disloyal persons who under pretence of tender consciences have or may at their meetings contrive insurrections (as late experience has shown)." The "Five Mile" Act struck at ministers who "distil the poisonous principles of schism and rebellion into the hearts of His Majesty's subjects." In short, as Halifax recorded in 1687, "It is not long since . . . the maxim was, it is impossible for a dissenter not to be a rebel."[14]

As long as nonconformity was regarded as an explosive political force, the dissenters could not hope to obtain legal recognition of their moral right to worship in their own way. The memories of the Interregnum were the ghosts which headed the ruling classes along the road they followed and could always be used as an unanswerable argument against those who would respect "tender consciences." The blame for the persecutions must be attributed not to the King, but to the bishops and Parliament.[15] Much of the intolerance of Sheldon and his subor-

[8] Sermons, i. 436.
[9] A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity. Preface p. lxv. 145-50, etc.
[10] Works, iii. 178.
[11] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1668/9. 321.
[12] Hamilton, "Quarter Sessions" 188-96.
[13] Parl. Hist. iv. 184, 207.
[14] Letter to a Dissenter. Foxcroft, "Life of Halifax," ii. 376.
[15] Lyon Turner, "Orig. Records of Nonconformity," iii. 36-42. John Nicholas to Sir Edw. Nicholas, March 14th, 1667/8. "The King if he pleases may take a right measure of our temper by this and leave off crediting the undertakers who persuade him that the generality of the kingdom and of our house too, is inclined to toleration." Eg. MS. 2539, f. 170. See also f. 215.

dinates no doubt sprang from the same cause as that of Laud had done, a passion for unity and seemliness in ecclesiastical affairs. But the political motive, if weak at Lambeth, was strong at Westminster, and axiomatic in the minds of the men who ruled rural England.

The term, nonconformist, was used to describe all who did not subscribe to the doctrinal practices and standards of the Anglicans. It is not to be understood, in the sense often given to it by contemporaries, as denoting a body of men inseparably united. The Anglican clergy from the Olympian heights of comfortable livings affected to discern no difference between the Presbyterians and the millenary enthusiasts whom Cromwell had been forced to silence. The number of sects was less during the reign of Charles II than in the days when Ephraim Paget [16] and "Gangraena" Edwards had compiled frenzied catalogues of heterodox opinions.[17] The Bishops in their replies to Sheldon's circulars [18] enumerate four main groups—Presbyterians, Independents or Congregationalists, Anabaptists or Baptists, and Quakers. The few references to Fifth Monarchy Men, Sabbatarians, Freewillers and Muggletonians proves their rarity. We can best determine to what extent the nonconformists were attached to republican ideals by considering each group separately.

One of the difficulties that the student of seventeenth-century history meets is that of assigning to party labels the exact shade of meaning they ought to bear. The degrading of Presbyterianism to the precarious position of a proscribed sect was accompanied by an extension of meaning to the term. It was used to denote all that the word Puritanism had meant earlier. When Father Orleans tells us that Shaftesbury filled Parliament with Presbyterians, he only means, as Calamy points out, that the members were not High Churchmen or "for favouring the papists." [19] Rapin complains that although the Presbyterians and the Sects did not make one body, because their enemies were pleased to give them one name, the former had to suffer the consequences of the actions of men with whom they had no connection.[20] Even if a distinction were drawn between the Presbyterians and other nonconformist bodies, their opponents could argue that the late troubles "bubbled up" in Presbyterian pulpits and that, therefore, they were responsible for all that had happened since "forty-one." Baxter even found it necessary

[16] Heresiography. May, 1645.
[17] Gangraena, pts. 1, 2, 3, Feb., May, Dec., 1646.
[18] Lyon Turner, i. *passim.*
[19] Revolution d'Angleterre (1695) iii. 351: Rutt, "Life of Calamy," i. 85.
[20] History, ii. 627.

were still bound by their Covenant to repeat their attack on monarchy.[8] Samuel Parker, not content with sermonising in the pulpit, told the world in print "that princes may with less hazard give liberty to men's vices . . . than their consciences," and attributed political doctrines to the dissenters which he thought justified a denunciation of their "turbulent temper of mind."[9]

A majority of the gentry were no more willing than the incumbents to follow Marvell's advice to Parker, and "let all those things of former times alone."[10] Daniel Fleming hoped "His Majesty will ever remember King James's adage, no bishop, no king."[11] In Devon the justices at the Quarter Sessions, following the discovery of the Rye House plot, solemnly recorded that the nonconformist preachers were "the authors and fomenters of this pestilent faction."[12] The men who executed the penal laws listened with approval when Clarendon attacked the dissenting clergy as "trumpets of war and incendiaries towards rebellion."[13] That the dissenters were ostensibly persecuted from political motives may be proved from the Statute book. The authors of the Conventicle Acts speak of "disloyal persons who under pretence of tender consciences have or may at their meetings contrive insurrections (as late experience has shown)." The "Five Mile" Act struck at ministers who "distil the poisonous principles of schism and rebellion into the hearts of His Majesty's subjects." In short, as Halifax recorded in 1687, "It is not long since . . . the maxim was, it is impossible for a dissenter not to be a rebel."[14]

As long as nonconformity was regarded as an explosive political force, the dissenters could not hope to obtain legal recognition of their moral right to worship in their own way. The memories of the Interregnum were the ghosts which headed the ruling classes along the road they followed and could always be used as an unanswerable argument against those who would respect "tender consciences." The blame for the persecutions must be attributed not to the King, but to the bishops and Parliament.[15] Much of the intolerance of Sheldon and his subor-

[8] Sermons, i. 436.
[9] A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity. Preface p. lxv. 145-50, etc.
[10] Works, iii. 178.
[11] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1668/9. 321.
[12] Hamilton, "Quarter Sessions" 188-96.
[13] Parl. Hist. iv. 184, 207.
[14] Letter to a Dissenter. Foxcroft, "Life of Halifax," ii. 376.
[15] Lyon Turner, "Orig. Records of Nonconformity," iii. 36-42. John Nicholas to Sir Edw. Nicholas, March 14th, 1667/8. "The King if he pleases may take a right measure of our temper by this and leave off crediting the undertakers who persuade him that the generality of the kingdom and of our house too, is inclined to toleration." Eg. MS. 2539, f. 170. See also f. 215.

dinates no doubt sprang from the same cause as that of Laud had done, a passion for unity and seemliness in ecclesiastical affairs. But the political motive, if weak at Lambeth, was strong at Westminster, and axiomatic in the minds of the men who ruled rural England.

The term, nonconformist, was used to describe all who did not subscribe to the doctrinal practices and standards of the Anglicans. It is not to be understood, in the sense often given to it by contemporaries, as denoting a body of men inseparably united. The Anglican clergy from the Olympian heights of comfortable livings affected to discern no difference between the Presbyterians and the millenary enthusiasts whom Cromwell had been forced to silence. The number of sects was less during the reign of Charles II than in the days when Ephraim Paget [16] and "Gangraena" Edwards had compiled frenzied catalogues of heterodox opinions.[17] The Bishops in their replies to Sheldon's circulars [18] enumerate four main groups—Presbyterians, Independents or Congregationalists, Anabaptists or Baptists, and Quakers. The few references to Fifth Monarchy Men, Sabbatarians, Freewillers and Muggletonians proves their rarity. We can best determine to what extent the nonconformists were attached to republican ideals by considering each group separately.

One of the difficulties that the student of seventeenth-century history meets is that of assigning to party labels the exact shade of meaning they ought to bear. The degrading of Presbyterianism to the precarious position of a proscribed sect was accompanied by an extension of meaning to the term. It was used to denote all that the word Puritanism had meant earlier. When Father Orleans tells us that Shaftesbury filled Parliament with Presbyterians, he only means, as Calamy points out, that the members were not High Churchmen or "for favouring the papists." [19] Rapin complains that although the Presbyterians and the Sects did not make one body, because their enemies were pleased to give them one name, the former had to suffer the consequences of the actions of men with whom they had no connection.[20] Even if a distinction were drawn between the Presbyterians and other nonconformist bodies, their opponents could argue that the late troubles "bubbled up" in Presbyterian pulpits and that, therefore, they were responsible for all that had happened since "forty-one." Baxter even found it necessary

[16] Heresiography. May, 1645.
[17] Gangraena, pts. 1, 2, 3, Feb., May, Dec., 1646.
[18] Lyon Turner, i. *passim*.
[19] Revolution d'Angleterre (1695) iii. 351: Rutt, "Life of Calamy," i. 85.
[20] History, ii. 627.

to defend them from the charge that all dissenters had a hand in the King's death.[21]

Royalist attacks on the Presbyterians appeared on the bookstalls before the return of the King. *The Grand Rebels Detected,* or the *Presbyter Unmasked,*[22] contained extensive quotations from their political guide, Buchanan. In July, 1660, Thomas Tomkins reviewed Baxter's *Holy Commonwealth* and called his book *The Rebels' Plea.*[23] The most virulent criticisms came fittingly enough from the pen of L'Estrange. From the Restoration to the Revolution he harped on one theme, the Presbyterians were enemies of monarchy, and never tired of repeating that "the independents murdered Charles Stuart but the presbyterians kill'd the king."[24] His ill-timed censures on the men who had made possible the King's return were disliked at Court, however acceptable they may have been to Cavaliers whose petitions for employment remained unanswered. In the *Relapsed Apostate* he speaks of having been asked "to hold my hand," but to justify publication wrote, "my crime is not the raking into pardon'd actions" but "exposing relapses and discovering new combinations."[25] As a supplement to the *Relapsed Apostate* he published about the same time[26] *State Divinity in Notes upon some late Presbyterian Pamphlets.* Despite the protest that he had discovered "new combinations," the tract was in the main "a scandalous recital of their old forgeries." In the next year appeared the *Memento directed to all those that truly reverence the memory of King Charles the Martyr.*[27] He once more repeats the history of Presbyterianism, and refers to the damning fact that in 1660 they had hoped to limit the powers of the King.

More scholarly than these diatribes of L'Estrange was a posthumous tract which appeared in 1663 called *"Philanax Anglicus, or a Christian Caveat for all kings . . . showing plainly . . . that it is impossible to be at the same time presbyterians and not rebells."*[28]

[21] Reliq. Baxter, iii. 148-9.
[22] April, 1660.
[23] The Rebels Plea or Mr. Baxter's Judgement concerning the late Wars (July 25) 1660.
[24] State Divinity (1661), 15. Cf. Needham, "Though they (the presbyterians) laid him not down upon the block, yet they brought him to the scaffold." (Case of the Commonwealth Stated (1650) 64-65). See e.g. 1, The Interest Mistaken or the Holy Cheat (1661). A 4th ed. appeared in 1682 (Kitchen. L'Estrange. 413). ii. Relapsed Apostate (1661). 2nd ed. 1681.
[25] Relapsed Apostate, advertisement.
[26] Nov. 1661.
[27] April 1662. 2nd ed. 1682 with a different title. (Kitchen 413).
[28] Published by T. B., a brother-in-law of the author.

The author succeeds in making out a case for his conclusion, by tracing the effects of the teaching of Calvin, "*Junius Brutus*," Knox, Goodman and Buchanan in Holland, England and Scotland. In the same year was published Sir John Birkenhead's *Cabala*, describing an imaginary conference of dissenters at which two ministers were appointed to "observe all the failings of State and report them to a committee appointed to improve and aggravate them." [29]

That the Presbyterians were the monsters of L'Estrange's imagination is untrue. As a body they were responsible for the Restoration and loyally accepted the non-limitation of the prerogative when this had proved impossible. A paper among the Leeds MSS. [30], to select one of many, contains a list of worshippers at Presbyterian conventicles whom even the perjured informers employed by the bishops could not plausibly accuse of assembling for political reasons. Many of the clergy were famous scholars, honoured in their own days as great preachers and efficient pastors. Their interests were primarily theological, not political. The loyalty to the Crown of many of those ejected in 1660 and 1662 had been punished with imprisonment during the Interregnum.[31] The case of Andrew Parsons illustrates the readiness of the episcopal authorities to discover treason where none was intended. Parsons had joined Sir George Booth in the Royalist rising of 1659, and at the end of 1660 preached a sermon in which he compared the Devil to a King courting the soul. This was held to mean that the King was a devil, and the unfortunate preacher suffered three months' imprisonment before a royal pardon released him.[32]

The accusation that the Presbyterians met to plot against the Government cannot be substantiated. Calamy's evidence is nearer the truth. Speaking of the days of his boyhood, he says, "Often I was at their most private meetings for worship, and never did I hear them inveigh against those in power, though they were commonly run down as enemies of royalty. Such men prayed heartily for king and government." [33] Calamy's testimony becomes more significant when it is remembered that he was writing of men who had endured persecution for a quarter of a century.

The description of the opponents of the second Stuart despotism as Presbyterians, however, is to some extent intelligible.

[29] Cabala, or an Impartial Account of the Nonconformist's private designs. 29.

[30] H.M.C. Rep. xi. App. vii. 15.

[31] See e.g. the account of Joshua Kirby in Bryan Dale, "Yorkshire Puritans," 93-95.

[32] Lyon Turner, iii. 303-4, 372-3.

[33] Life, i. 88-9.

The "Five Mile" Act imposed a political test, the famous "Oxford Oath." Dr. Bates and Dr. Jacomb subscribed, but the vast majority refused, not because they were republicans, but because they would not tie their hands in unforeseen contingencies.[34] They could only bind themselves to obey the lawful commands of the King. A few, for example, Philip Henry,[35] were prepared to swear not to alter the civil government, but refused to say the same about the ecclesiastical settlement.[36] Because large numbers of nonconformist ministers could not bind themselves to maintain the established order in Church and State, we are not justified in ascribing to them a dislike of monarchy. On the contrary, Colonel Blood, in 1663, thought it advisable to assure the Presbyterian clergy in Ulster that his party had no intention of setting up a republic.[37] The best-known Presbyterian writer of the day, Baxter, criticised Harrington and Vane and lived to regret it,[38] not because he had handled them too gently, but because his political opinions did not square with those of the Church party. Baxter taught that the people do not possess sovereign power, but he also refused to acknowledge the despotism of one man. He thought that democracy was "usually the worse" form of government, but also was of the opinion that Neros were more numerous than Solomons.[39] He wanted a limited, not an elective, monarchy. Sovereignty, he said, was vested in King, Lords and Commons, and when the King acts "*ultra vires*" Parliament can resist him. The abuse which was lavished on Baxter is easily explained. He never recanted, but always maintained that the Long Parliament had justice on its side when it took up arms against Charles I.[40]

Baxter expressed the views of a majority of his co-religionists. The fact that in England and elsewhere they were a considerable minority opposed to the ecclesiastical order favoured by the monarch made them the opponents of regal despotism. Their rejection of the doctrine of passive obedience marked them out as supporters of Parliament against the Crown. When Shaftesbury was building up the Whig party he found his recruits, as Parker had prophesied,[41] among the men whose fathers had followed Hampden to battle and Pym into the

[34] Reliq. Baxter, ii. 422-5; iii. 4-9.
[35] Wm. Bates, "Life of Philip Henry," 76.
[36] R. Wild, "The Loyal Nonconformist," quoted Bate, "Declaration of Indulgence," 51.
[37] Adair, "True Narrative," 271.
[38] A Holy Commonwealth (1659). Reliq. Baxter, iii. 71-72.
[39] Holy Commonwealth, 63-8, 85, 202.
[40] *Ibid.* preface and pp. 86, 203-6, 230, 346, et seq. Reliq. Baxter, iii. 72.
[41] Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity, 149-50.

division lobby. In so far as they can be described as a political party, the Presbyterians were the forerunners of the Whigs. As York wrote in 1667, they did not wish to abolish kingship but "to bring low the regal power."[42] Their desire to limit Charles II's power in 1660 was never forgotten, and was one of the arguments used against their toleration by Danby in 1673.[43]

One effect of the attempt to enforce strict uniformity was the bridging of the gulf which divided the Presbyterians and the Independents. In 1660 they were on the worst possible terms, because the policy of the former was not toleration for all but comprehension for themselves.[44] The royal declaration of October 25th, 1660,[45] foreshadowed a union between the Anglicans and Presbyterians, but was ominously silent as to the fate of the sects. Of the latter the most important numerically and socially were the Independents, the men who carried on the traditions of the five dissenting brethren of the Westminster Assembly. Strict Calvinists in theology, they differed from the Presbyterians on questions of Church discipline and organisation. This dissimilarity tends to disappear after 1660, as the persecutions forced the Presbyterians to organise themselves in congregations, and not in classes governed by synods.[46]

In 1660 the term "Independent" did not possess a purely religious significance. The growth of Independency was connected in the popular mind with the execution of the King and the establishment of the Republic. The Independents had even discarded the Brownist principle and accepted preferment in the Cromwellian State Church. The political importance of the Independents during the Interregnum was the direct result of their strength in the army. Hence it is not surprising that their religious assemblies were regarded as strongholds of republican faith. But to describe all their members as republicans is an untenable position. Most, if not all, the Independent clergy in 1660 were born episcopalians.[47] In 1649 their political support was given to that party which opposed the employment of gaolers, magistrates and judges in the enforcement of ecclesiastical uniformity.

Only two Independent ministers, John Goodwin and Hugh Peters, openly supported the regicides. John Owen, who preached before the Rump the day after the execution, refrained

[42] Clarke, i. 431.
[43] Grey, "Debates," ii. 47.
[44] Reliq. Baxter, ii. 379-80. Ralph, i. 52-3.
[45] Wilkins, "Concilia," iv. 560-4.
[46] There still remained minor differences. The authority of the Presbyterian clergy, for example, was greater than that of the Independent ministers (Burnet, iv. 161, Stoughton, "Hist. of Religion," iv. 166-7).
[47] Hanbury, "Historical Memorials," iii. 379.

from commenting on it.[48] Goodwin, the former Arminian Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street.[49] was anathema to his Calvinist brethren. In January, 1649, he published a vindication of the policy of the army in purging the House of Commons [50] and after the execution of Charles I. came forward with *The Obstructors of Justice: or a Defence of the sentence passed on the late King.*[51] But even Goodwin was a republican only because circumstances made him one. He defended the regicides, not because he had a predilection for commonwealth institutions, but because the restoration of the King would mean a return to religious tyranny.[52]

Too much stress has been laid on the political aspects of Independency. Before the Restoration many congregations were purely religious bodies. In 1659 the Church at Yarmouth recorded "concerning civil business the Church, as a Church, desire not to meddle with." [53] After the return of the King the Independents were anxious to make clear the non-political character of their organisation. They recognised Charles II's claims,[54] and began to describe themselves as congregationalists, a term which possessed no political associations.[55]

The most celebrated of their ministers taught the necessity of submission to the civil authority. John Howe opposed the officers who dissolved Richard Cromwell's Parliament.[56] In his best-known sermon, *"The Living Temple."* Howe uses language which sounds odd on the lips of a pastor whose people were noted for their democratic principles and the low estimate they placed on the hereditary rank. He thought it ridiculous that peasants and labourers "should take it upon them to judge to the rights of their prince and make an estimate of the measures of offences committed against the majesty and dignity of government." [57] The reputed head of the Independents, John Owen, maintained that his followers were loyal to Charles II, and disavowed every one of the political principles Parker had attributed to them in the "Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity." [58] He was almost a Tory in his views. The compact theory has no place in his philosophy. On the contrary, men are born

[48] A Discourse about Toleration. Jan. 31, 1648/9.
[49] Wilson, "Dissenting Churches," ii. 406.
[50] Right and Might Well Met. Jan. 2, 1648/9.
[51] (May 30) 1649.
[52] Jackson, "Life of Goodwin," 201-2.
[53] Stoughton, "Hist. of Religion," iii. 28.
[54] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1660/1. 4. 442.
[55] In the applications for licences in 1672 the older word is rarely used (Lyon Turner, i. *passim*).
[56] Rogers, "Life of Howe," 120-24.
[57] Works, iii. 356-7.
[58] Works, xii. 455-6.

citizens and are not at liberty to dissent from the community. Subject have no right to rebel, even against a tyrant, save when he commands them to be guilty of the sins of idolatry and superstition.[59]

When such as Owen and Howe dared not at times appear in the streets,[60] the lives of the less cautious must have been well nigh unbearable. Persecution naturally led to a loss of social influence. Although members of the Common Council of London sat in George Cockayne's congregation,[61] the Independents never regained the influence they had possessed when men in high places had worshipped in their churches. It must not be supposed that the views of Howe and Owen were universally accepted among them. That many of the clergy were unjustly persecuted does not admit of doubt, but in the pews the democratic spirit was strong. The organisation of the Independent Churches was founded upon principles which made clergy and laity, peer and peasant, equal in the sight of God. Each Church was self-governing and democratic in character. It was the successful working of the democratic principle in religious matters that inspired the movement towards political democracy during the Civil War. The influence of their religious associations had made itself felt in the political conduct of many Independents in the past and possibly would do so again. It is significant that when Algernon Sidney was seeking allies, at the time of the Popish Plot, to assist in establishing a republic, he looked for them, not among the more aristocratic Presbyterians, but in the Independent Churches.[62]

Leaving the Independents for the moment suffering under the imputation of being actual or potential rebels, we come to a third group of dissenters, whose real character has been obscured by the abuse heaped on them by both Anglicans and Nonconformists. The Anabaptists have been described as "the pariahs of history."[63] The movement in the sixteenth century was condemned both at Rome and Wittenberg. Catholic priest and Protestant ruler alike regarded it as a menace to social order and religious truth, and communicated their prejudices to posterity. After the collapse of the Munster experiment the Anabaptists were hunted throughout Christendom like wild beasts.[64] The real character of the movement is difficult to

[59] *Ibid,* 490-6, 531-2.
[60] Life of Howe, 225.
[61] Wilson, "Dissenting Churches," iii. 280-81.
[62] Dalrymple, i. 357.
[63] R. Heath, "The Anabaptists and their English Descendants." Contemporary Review, Lix. 389.
[64] Underhill, "A Martyrology of the Churches of Christ commonly called Baptist."

determine. It was neither wholly religious nor wholly social and political. The poor who revolted against economic disabilities, religious enthusiasts living on the borders of an unseen world awaiting the kingdom of Christ, passive resisters and militant firebrands were all denominated Anabaptists. The attempt at Munster to apply the teaching of the New Testament, viewed through the eyes of the ruling classes, meant communism —a euphemism for the spoiling of the rich—the polygamy of Jan of Leyden and the horrors of class war.[65]

The first appearance of the Anabaptists in the State Papers is in 1533,[66] but the movement had died out by the reign of Elizabeth. They reappeared just before the outbreak of the Civil War, not as part of a continental upheaval but as an offshoot of Independency. Puritans engaged in settling a "godly ministry" saw in these English Baptists the successors of Jan of Leyden. Histories of the Munster tragedy began to circulate in London.[67] After reading their Confession, published in 1646, Baillie wrote that thousands of them would not own it, as their beliefs agreed with those of the German Anabaptists.[68] Dr. Featley concluded that of all heretics the Anabaptists ought to be the most carefully watched.[69] Evidence that some of the Baptists of Stuart times were influenced by the earlier movement is found in the writings of Bunyan. The Anabaptist tradition must have lingered in the eastern countries which had provided a refuge for many fugitives from the continent. This tradition was the treasury on which Bunyan drew in writing *Pilgrim's Progress* and the account of the fall of "Mansoul."[70]

In the seventeenth century the word Anabaptist was loosely used as a term of reproach and applied to all suspected of holding extreme opinions. The bogey of communism and the belief that the attack on the prelates was a preliminary to the ruin of the wealthy, explains the savage severity with which they were treated. In March 1660 the General Baptist Assembly issued "*A Brief Confession of Faith,*" article 19 of which lays down that the Church ought to provide for the poor by voluntary gifts. This was their answer to those who accused them of

[65] Bax, "Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists"; Lindsay, "Hist. of the Reformation," ii. Hastings, "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics." Article on Anabaptists.

[66] Gardiner, "Letters and Papers of Henry viii." Vol. vi. 184.

[67] A Short Hist. of the Anabaptists of High and Low Germany (1642). A Warning for England (1642). Harl, Misc. vii. 382-90.

[68] Anabaptisme, the true Fountaine of Independency (1647).

[69] The Dippers Dipt (1645).

[70] Heath, "The Archetype of the *Pilgrim's Progress*," and "The Archetype of the *Holy War*." Contemporary Review Lxxx. 541-58. Lxxxii. 105-18.

being communists.[71] As a matter of fact, the only people to practise communism of property were the "Diggers." Even they only claimed the right to take unimproved lands.[72]

Those who with Dr. Nalson dismissed the Anabaptists with the phrase, "let Munster eternally complain of them,"[73] found confirmation of their dislike in the excesses of the Fifth Monarchy Men. A few Baptist and other Nonconformist preachers such as Vavasour Powell, John Canne, Feake, Simpson and Rogers were actively associated with this sect. "Old Dagon" and "Man of Sin" were a type of the epithets they used to describe Cromwell, the great "Anti-Christ."[74] But the Fifth Monarchy Men are not as black as they have been painted. The doctrine of the millennium is older than the prophet Daniel. It was held by the Fathers of the Church and still persists. Calamy describes his old schoolmaster as a strict dissenter and "a sort of Fifth Monarchy Man" who could never be prevailed upon to take the oath of allegiance. Yet a more harmless and inoffensive person Calamy had not met with.[75] The sentiments of these men only became dangerous when the "saints" took upon themselves to hasten the coming of the divine kingdom. But such outbreaks as that of Venner were the work of a few madmen. The majority were content to wait patiently the fulfilment of God's promises. A pamphlet published by William Erbery in 1653 reminded the militants that they ought to be subject to the powers that be. The Fifth Monarchy Men and the Republicans had little in common. The first was a religious movement deriving its inspiration wholly from the Bible; the second a secular one, whose origin can be traced to a study of the classics rather than to a literal interpretation of Biblical prophecies. "Is Monarchy in a king any more against the reign of Christ than aristocracy in a parliament?" Erbery asks. "Is not the State of Holland and the Commonwealth of Venice as much for anti-Christ as the King of France or of Spain?"[76]

The Baptists dissociated themselves from the political heresies of the Levellers, Republicans and Fifth Monarchy Men as completely as they denied connection with the economic fallacies of the "Diggers." After the publication of the second

[71] Underhill, "Confessions of Faith," 118-19. Cf. that of 1647 where they say "the diligent and the slothful ought not to have equal positions" (*ibid.* 280-84).

[72] Behrens, "The Digger Movement."

[73] Common Interest of King and People (1677) 234.

[74] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1653/4 304-8.

[75] Life, i. 76.

[76] An Olive Leaf: or some peaceable considerations, etc. from Mr. Rogers, Mr. Powel and the rest of the good people of Christ Church. Jan. 9, 1653. Ivimey, "Hist. of the Baptists," i. 257.

part of *England's New Chains Discovered*,[77] Kiffin presented an address from the London Baptists complaining that it was read in their churches without their consent.[78] In a series of Confessions of Faith published between 1644 and 1689 they declared their aversion to interfering in secular affairs. They were the first who clearly understood the modern doctrine of toleration. The magistrate, they said, ought not to interfere in the government of that kingdom which is not of this world, and subjects ought not to rebel against the prince. Only when liberty of conscience is denied ought the "saints" to refuse obedience, and then only in that particular.[79]

The same conclusions were reached by Thomas Grantham in 1678.[80] The State in Grantham's eyes was an organization existing for a temporal purpose, which had no mandate to coerce the consciences of its members. He complains that Baptist Churches had been unjustly treated by those who dissolved them as seminaries of rebellion and quoted from *Saints No Smiters*,'[81] in which the Baptist pastor, John Tombes, argues from the New Testament that both Christ and St. Paul commanded their followers to submit to the civil authorities. "Even if some foolish men in the same form of profession with us should break due bounds," Grantham writes, "yet this ought not to prejudice our Churches in general, who oppose such exhorbitances as much as any." These "foolish men" were the militant Fifth Monarchy Men. Grantham held millenary views as did most members of his Church, but he advised the impatient "to study to be quiet and do their own business."[82]

Political designs were attributed to the Baptists as a result of the activities of the Fifth Monarchy Men and the Republicans.[83] Cromwell dismissed many from the army,[84] but he protected Baptist congregations and allowed their ministers to hold Church livings. It was not until after the Restoration that peaceable citizens like Kiffin and Knollys were molested, than who no men could be less like conspirators. The Baptists

[77] By John Lillburne. March 24, 1648/9.

[78] Underhill, "Confessions of Faith," 288-92.

[79] *Ibid, passim.* The 1689 Confession of Faith is only a reprint of that of 1677. The Baptist Historical Society has just reprinted the "Mistery of Iniquity" of the Baptist leader, Thomas Helwys (1612), the first plea in English not merely for toleration but for absolute religious liberty.

[80] Christianismus Primitivus.

[81] Published in 1664.

[82] Christianismus Primitivus iii. 1-5, 12-13, 48-50, etc.

[83] L. F. Brown, "The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men." Champlin Burrage, "The Fifth Monarchy Insurrections." E. H. R. xxv. 722.

[84] Crosby, "Hist. of the Baptists," iii. 231-42.

sent addresses of loyalty to Charles II, but the persecutions began as soon as the Anglican clergy were in the saddle.[85]

Venner's rising increased the suspicions with which they were regarded, and although with other Nonconformist Churches[86] they publicly disowned it, they were handled as though they had appeared in arms. Their meetings were restricted and their leaders imprisoned.[87] One writer drew a parallel between the Baptists, the Lollards and the sixteenth-century Anabaptists, concluding that unless the movement was suppressed the nation would be ruined.[88]

Plots and rumours of plots always had unhappy consequences for the Baptists. When news of the Yorkshire plot reached London several clergymen petitioned in favour of severer laws against Anabaptists "who desire to throw off the yoke of all government."[89] Nothing was too extravagant to be believed of them. Samuel Parker, the chaplain of the Primate, even licensed a book, *Mr. Baxter Baptised in Blood*, which described how the skin of the unfortunate Baxter was "most cruelly flea'd off from his body" by New England Baptists. We do not need Marvell's assurance that "there never was a compleater falsehood invented."[90] But there was some foundation for the fears which the Baptists inspired. Although allowance must be made for the use of the word, Anabaptist, to denote all classes of extremists, many of those who intrigued against Charles II's government belonged to the sect. Colonel Henry Danvers and Francis Smith, the "fanatic" bookseller, were both Baptist preachers.

As a rule, the Baptists were men of lower social status than the Presbyterians and Independents. In the episcopal returns of 1665, 1669 and 1676 they are generally described as "mean, inconsiderable fellows." Hence it is not surprising that popular fancy should attribute to them dangerous social doctrines. Some of their ministers, notably Tombes and Knollys, were men of ripe

[85] *Ibid.* 19-26.

[86] *Ibid.* 42-9, 66-83. Neal, "Hist of the Puritans" (1833) iii. 73-4. Underhill, 343-60. The Humble Petition of Several Societies called Anabaptists (Jan. 30) 1660/1. The Humble Apology of some . . . called Anabaptists (Jan. 28) 1660/1. Second Humble Address of . . . Anabaptists in Lincoln (Feb. 6) 1660/1. A Renunciation and Declaration of the Ministers of the Congregational Churches, Jan. 1660/1. A Judgement and Condemnation of Fifth Monarchy Men. Jan. 17, 1660/1.

[87] Wilkins, "Concilia," iv. 564-5. Crosby, ii. 91-2. Life and Death of Hanserd Knollys, 35-6.

[88] Semper Iidem (1661). Harl, Misc. vii. 398-407.

[89] Wilkins, "Concilia," iv. 580. For the Yorkshire Plot (1663) see my article in the Yorkshire Archaeological Society's *Journal*, xxxi., 348-59 1934.

[90] Marvell, "Works," iii. 309-10.

scholarship and occasionally we meet with a wealthy merchant like Kiffin among them.[91] A large number of Cromwell's soldiers and junior officers were Baptists, but only a few of the higher officers, for example, Harrison and Overton, Robert Lilburne and Packer. The red-coats returned to civil life and attended conventicles, thereby supplying some justification for the idea that conventicles were military units. The episcopal returns of 1669 specially noted the presence of ex-soldiers at Nonconformist meeting-places. In Berkshire Colonel Rich held a conventicle at his house at Cookham. In Normanton Major Prinne assembled forty of his former command for religious purposes.[92]

The fear that "the number of those that were to be suppressed did very much exceed . . . those that were to suppress,"[93] occasioned a census which proved the Nonconformists to be a small minority. Evidence on this point can be gleaned from the returns to Sheldon's circular in 1669, from the Indulgence documents of 1672 and to a lesser extent from the returns of 1665 and 1676.[94] The episcopal returns indicate that the dissenters did not exceed a quarter of a million, or about one twenty-fifth of the population,[95] a number which Dr. Sherlock admitted to be "too small to hurt the constitution."[96]

The Baptists were considerably weaker than either the Presbyterians or the Independents. In Wiltshire they obtained one-third and in Somerset one-fourth of the licenses granted in 1672. In Devon they secured three out of a total of 105. Although in Kent one-half of the licensed conventicles were Baptist, the numerical superiority of the congregational groups elsewhere was overwhelming.[97] If disaffection is to be wholly attributed to the Dissenters, the more wealthy and numerous Presbyterians must bear the greater part of the blame. A fourth group of Dissenters, the Quakers, need not detain us longer than

[91] In Liverpool the Bishop describes an Anabaptist conventicle as composed mainly of rich people (Bate, App. iv.)

[92] Lyon Turner, i. 50-1, 112 and *passim.*

[93] Leeds, MSS. 14.

[94] Lyon Turner, *passim.*

[95] Barlow, "Genuine Remains," 312-5. Some Remarks upon Government 1689 (S. Tracts (1705) i. 150). Both of these estimates are based upon the returns of 1676, which only dealt with the Province of Canterbury. Cf. Lyon Turner, iii. 114, 142, and Parker, "Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity," pp. xxxix.-xl., who obtain a similar result from those of 1669. But the Bishops' returns must be used cautiously. They are only reliable for districts in which the penal laws were not enforced. Dartmouth is said to have no dissenters in 1669, but in 1672, 164 members of a licensed congregation sent an address of thanks to the King. The same is said of Oxford City. Lyon Turner, i. 42-6, 207-8, iii. 827.

[96] A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts (1718) 53.

[97] Lyon Turner, i. and iii. *passim.* Bate, App. vii.

to note that though much misunderstood and persecuted by Anglicans and Dissenters, they had no share in the plots which troubled the last two Stuart kings.

An examination of the geographical distribution of the Dissenters yields interesting results. Those districts which supported the Long Parliament and consistently returned Whig members, were strongholds of the Nonconformist faith. Somerset, according to the returns of 1669, contained more Nonconformists, more dissenting ministers and more conventicles than any other county not excluding London.[98] After 1681 Shaftesbury looked to Somerset for armed support. Its peasantry rallied round Monmouth, who, like William III, preferred to land near the western woollen towns rather than on the east coast. Next to the western counties the Nonconformists were most strongly entrenched in London and the south-east, the district into which Protestant refugees from the Continent had immigrated during the reign of Elizabeth.[99] In East Anglia, the home of Cromwell's "Ironsides," Independency had flourished since the days of the Brownists. The Independent Church at Yarmouth boasted one regicide, Miles Corbet.[100] Richard Bower's letters to Williamson show how strong Independency was in Yarmouth after 1660, and here again we find the same phenomenon, a disposition to favour Puritan and Whig governments.[101]

The Dissenters were most numerous in the towns. In the counties where Nonconformity had taken deep root, the big towns were remarkable for their consistent opposition to the Court. London elected four Presbyterians to the Long Parliament of Charles II. Taunton and Tiverton were Whig strongholds. Under the command of Blake, Taunton successfully defied Charles I. In 1662 the walls were razed,[102] but, nothing daunted, for years after the Restoration the inhabitants celebrated as a public holiday the anniversary of the relief of their city.[103] "Were this town brought to obedience," wrote an informer in 1682, "all the West would be then very regular, for it is the nursery of rebellion in these parts."[104]

It would be erroneous to attribute the hostility of the

[98] Lyon Turner, iii. 78, 114-8.
[99] Smiles, "The Huguenots in England," 88-115. Barlow, Genuine Remains, 312.
[100] Stoughton, "Congregationalism in Norfolk."
[101] Cal. S. P. Dom. 1667/8, *passim*: 1671, 48: S. P. Dom. Car. II 418. No. 67.
[102] Toulmin, "Hist of Taunton," 429-30.
[103] Letters and Hist. Documents of Alfred Morrison. Bulstrode Papers (1897) i. 40, 43, S. P. Dom. Car. II 419. No. 21.
[104] S. P. Dom. Car. II 418, No. 118.

Dissenters solely to a desire to restore the Commonwealth. Inhuman treatment at the hands of enraged Cavaliers must have destroyed the genuine constitutional loyalty of many of them. Oppression, according to Solomon, "makes a wise man mad." As Sir Charles Wolseley wrote, it is "not the having several parties in religion . . . that is in itself dangerous, 'tis the persecuting of them that makes them so."[105] The son of William Jenkins, a Presbyterian minister who died in Newgate, fought for Monmouth to avenge his father's death.[106] The persecutions which followed the Rye House plot explain the enthusiasm with which Monmouth was greeted. The Independents at Axminster took up arms primarily to defend liberty of conscience.[107] Many of them were so far from being Republicans as to believe that the Duke was the lawful king.[108] Joined to the legacy of hatred which intolerance left behind it was the suspicion that the royal family desired to restore Roman Catholicism and regal despotism. These latter considerations had more weight with the Nonconformists than the sufferings they experienced at the hands of the Anglicans. Hence they refused a toleration which was extended to Catholics and rested on a doubtful legal foundation.[109]

The belief that the Dissenters had been unjustly condemned, alarm at the ruinous effects of the penal laws on trade[110] and humanitarian sentiment[111] assisted the growth of a party in favour of religious toleration. Those who supported this idea divided the Dissenters into two groups, the tolerable and the intolerable. In the first class Baxter includes the Presbyterians and most of the Independents, that is those who accepted the Scriptures as the standard of faith. Those who looked for revelation "from within" he labelled "proper fanatics."[112] Most people agreed that "fanatics" ought not to be tolerated but differed in defining them. Shaftesbury would have tolerated all but the Fifth Monarchy Men.[113] The anonymous author of *The Present State of the Nonconformists*[114] advised the King

[105] Liberty of Conscience the Magistrates Interest (1668), 3.
[106] Turner, "Hist. of Remarkable Providences" (1697), i. Ch. 143, pp. 117-8.
[107] Stoughton, "Hist. of Religion," iv. 91-2.
[108] Pierce, "Vindication of the Dissenters" (1717), i. 261. Turner, "Hist. of Remarkable Providences," i. Ch. 143, p. 137.
[109] Reliq. Baxter, ii. 429-30, 433. Reresby 396.
[110] Petyt, "Britannia Languens" (1680), 104-10. Wolseley, "Liberty of Conscience," 9-10. Grey, "Debates," i. 114. Christie, "Shaftesbury," ii. App. i.
[111] Pepys, Aug. 4, 1664. Cal. S. P. Dom, 1670, 240.
[112] Reliq. Baxter, ii. 387.
[113] Christie, ii. App. i. pp. vii.-viii.
[114] Transcripts of State Papers, Stowe, MS. f. 16 (1672). Another copy is wrongly dated 1660 in the catalogue. *Ibid.* 185, f. 171.

in 1672 to adhere to the Declaration of Indulgence, but added that it would be "great providence to provide against the worst." He described the Presbyterians as friendly to monarchy, recommended that "a careful eye" be kept on the Independents, but doubted the possibility of gaining the goodwill of those "zealous commonwealthsmen," the Anabaptists. Unfortunately for the Dissenters, their toleration was never debated on its merits. The issue in 1672 was not, is it safe to permit Nonconformity, but has the King exceeded his powers? The Whigs preferred later to stake their all upon the exclusion of York, and lost the opportunity to obtain relief for their Nonconformist allies.

The Commonwealth party was not recruited solely from the conventicles. The names of a few dissenting ministers appear in lists of conspirators, but the Fergusons, Hobsons and Richardsons found little support among their ejected brethren. On the contrary, there is evidence that the republicans were opposed by the leaders of Nonconformity. The Presbyterians "thought it a deliverance to be rescued out of their hands." [115] The attitude of the Republicans to the clergy was ill calculated to win their support. Baxter was moved to write the *Holy Commonwealth* by the anti-clericalism of the author of *Oceana*. Such a government, he thought, "Would not secure us the Christian religion." [116] Many of the regicides were not Puritans. Marten and Scot were notorious libertines. John Howe, speaking of the Republican officers, wrote, "I know some leading men are not 'Christians.'" [117] This rift between Puritanism and Republicanism was as noticeable after the Restoration. Many Republicans were free-thinkers and began to "profess deism." [118] The Commonwealth leaders in the reign of Charles II, Essex, Wildman, Sidney and Neville, the City agitators, West, Wade, Ayloffe, Rumsey and the two Goodenoughs, to name only six, were not members of any religious organisation. Some of those who plotted armed resistance after 1681 were censured by the Dissenters for their moral frailties. The vices of Howard and Grey were the theme of popular gossip. Monmouth was an adulterer, and Armstrong, his intimate friend, a murderer and a well-known figure in London's haunts of vice.

The primary interests of the Dissenters were not political but religious. They had supported the Interregnum governments and would have been equally loyal to that of Charles II if liberty of conscience had been allowed. That the Bible was the revealed Word of God was the fundamental article of their faith. The

[115] Burnet (ed. Airy), i. 120.
[116] Holy Commonwealth, 225. Reliq. Baxter, iii. 71.
[117] Rogers, "Life of Howe," 94-5.
[118] Burnet (ed. Airy), ii. 352.

intellectual ancestors of the Republicans must be sought in Greece and Rome. They quoted the Bible to demonstrate the futility of building political systems upon any other foundation but that of natural reason. To them it was a history of the Jews, and for political purposes, only of equal value with that of any other nation. Their faith in the superior value of Republican institutions was defended by arguments of a political rather than a theological nature. A strong monarchy was believed to threaten the safety of private property and personal liberty. It is these economic and political considerations that lie at the root of Whig and Republican opposition to the second Stuart despotism.

The "mean, inconsiderable fellows" who attended conventicles were not the men to whom such arguments were likely to appeal. They did not submit to a thousand and one annoyances because they were convinced that landed property was sacred. It was the gentry who saw in the political philosophy of Locke and Sidney a faith worth fighting for. The leading county families were the most formidable foes the Stuarts had to face. They aimed at and ultimately succeeded in reducing the authority of the Crown and increasing that of the aristocracy. The politics of the squires who filled the benches at Quarter Sessions were those of the neighbouring great landowners. Sir Edward Seymour's influence in Devon was so great that it was mockingly called his "western empire," and its members were styled by himself his "West Saxons."[119] In a thoroughly agricultural county like Cheshire the politics of the people were settled by their landlord. Here Delamere was the leader of the gentry who entertained Monmouth in 1682 and whose son disappointed the Duke's expectations in 1685. Three years later Delamere in Cheshire and Danby in Yorkshire won a bloodless victory over the Stuarts. Buckingham, the county of Hampden and his less worthy grandson, found a constituency, Amersham, for Algernon Sidney, produced regicides from among its landed gentry and Presbyterians as eminent as Lord Wharton.

Just as the religion of the towns coloured the political sympathies of the inhabitants, so the influence of great nobles decided those of rural England. The importance of the Dissenters in the struggle against the Stuarts lay in the fact that the suspicion that Charles and his brother were plotting the overthrow of Protestantism and the destruction of the national liberties, alienated the Dissenters from the Crown. Hence their discontent was always at hand to assist the political innovator.

J. WALKER.

[119] Marvell, "Works," iv. 337. Ailesbury Memoirs, i. 360. Portland MSS. H.M.C. Rep. xv. pt. iv. 177.

List of Members.

CHURCH (Permanent Membership):

Cloughfold.

LIBRARIES AND UNIVERSITIES:

Angus Library.
Baptist Union Library.
Birmingham Public Libraries.
Bristol Baptist College Library.
Colgate Historical Collection, U.S.A.
Congregational Library, Boston, U.S.A.
Friends' Reference Library.
Gloucester Public Library.
Gould Library.
Leeds Central Free Library.
Manchester Public Libraries.
National Library of Wales.
New York Public Library, U.S.A.
Newberry Library, Chicago, U.S.A.
North Wales Baptist College.
John Rylands Library.
Scottish Baptist Union Library.
Southern Baptist Seminary, U.S.A.
Stockport Public Library.
Union Theological Seminary, New York, U.S.A.
Dr. Williams' Library.

PERSONAL MEMBERS:

Acworth, Mr. J. H.
Amos, Rev. J., M.A.
Ashworth, Miss F.
Askew, Rev. E. C., B.A.
Attenborough, Mr. J. A.
Bailey, Mr. W. J., M.I.E.E.
Beaumont, Mr. J. W.
Beckwith, Mr. F., M.A.,
Bonner, Rev. Carey
Bonser, Rev. H.
Bowie, Rev. W. Taylor, M.A.
Bowser, Miss M. E.
Bryan, Rev. F. C., M.A.
Butt, Rev. A. W. Gummer
Calder, Mr. A. H.
Carey, Rev. S. Pearce, M.A.
Carlile, Dr. J. C., C.H., C.B.E.
Cawley, Dr. F., B.A.
Child, Rev. R. L., B.D., B.Litt.
Chown, Rev. J. Leslie
Christopherson, Mrs.
Clark, Mr. Arnold S.
Clark, Mr. Percy S., J.P.
Clark, Mr. Theo., J.P.
Coats, The Misses
Cocks, Mr. A. E., O.B.E.
Codd, Mr. E. J.
Cole, Mr. C. T.
Coles, Mr. A. R.
Compton, Rev. J. E.
Cook, Mr. G. H.
Corby, Mr. F.
Courtier, Mr. C. L.
Crane, Mr. A. C.
Crispin, Mrs.
Crowe, Mr. W. H.
Dakin, Dr. A., B.D.
Daniel, Rev. J.
Davis, Rev. Walter G.
Dow, Mrs. Alex.
Dunning, Dr. T. G., M.A.
Dyer, Rev. Charles
Evans, Rev. George, B.A., B.D.
Evans, Dr. P. W., B.A.
Ewing, Dr. J. W., M.A.
Fairbairn, Mr. Gordon G.
Farrer, Rev. A. J. D., B.A.
Farrer, Miss M. Agnes
Foulds, Mr. L. H.
Fry, Mr. Clarence
Gale, Mr. Frederick
Gale, Mr. Horace F.
Glover, Mr. G. W.
Glover, Miss M. L.
Gould, Dr. Eric Pearce
Granger, Mr. B. B.
Gray, Mr. W. Parker
Haley, Mr. G. H.
Hall, Mr. S. Taylor
Hardman, Mr. J. S.
Hastings, Rev. F. G., B.A.,
Hayward, Rev. E. E., M.A.
Hole, Mrs.
Holmes, Mr. J. Stanley
Hooper, Mr. T. R., A.R.I.B.A.
Horlick, Rev. B. E., M.A.
Hough, Rev. W. E., B.A., B.D.
Hutchins, Mr. Arthur S.

Jewson, Mr. C. B.
*Johnson, Mr. Austin H.
Kershaw, Rev. W. T.
Killip, Mr. J. T.
Kirby, Mr. F. J.
Klaiber, Rev. A. J., M.C., B.D.
Langley, Rev. A. S., F.R.Hist.S.
Larcombe, Rev. H. V., B.A., B.D.
Laslett, Rev. G. H. Ruffell
Laws, Rev. Gilbert
Lewis, Rev. Frank G.
Lewis, Dr. W. O.
Linzey, Mr. A. Robert
Lonnon, Mr. A. C.
Lord, Dr. F. Townley, B.A.
Loveridge, Rev. S. Moss
Luckett, Mr. E. J.
MacBeath, Rev. J., M.A.
Mann, Mr. S.
Mare, Mr. R. A. de la
Marsden, Mr. J. W.
Martin, Rev. Hugh, M.A.
Matthews, Rev. W. H., B.A., B.D.
Middlebrook, Rev. J. B., M.A.
Millard, Mrs.
Miller, Rev. W. R., B.A., B.D.
Mills, Rev. E. W.
Moody, Miss
Morris, Miss Irene
Morris, Rev. S. G.
Morris, Rev. W. D.
Moore, Mr. L. H.
Newton, Mr. Arthur
Owen, Rev. W. G.
Page, Mr. G. E.
Payne, Rev. E. A., B.A., B.D., B.Litt.
Penny, Mr. T. S., J.P.
Peppiatt, Mr. C.
Philcox, Mr. H. N.
Pollard, Rev. F. W.
Pratt, Mr. Richard M.
Price, Mr. G. Vernon
Price, Mr. Seymour J.
Ramsbottom, Mr. R.
Reid, Mr. A.
Ritchie, Rev. Allan M., M.A.
*Roberts, Sir James, Bart.
Robinson, Rev. F. E., B.A., B.D.
Robinson, Dr. H. Wheeler, M.A.
Rooke, Mr. Cecil B., B.A., LL.B.
Rushbrooke, Dr. J. H., M.A.
Seymour, Mr. C. C.
Smith, Mr. F. Sutton
Smith, Miss S. L.
Smithson, Rev. R. J., B.Th., Ph.D.
Southwell, Miss C. R.
Springall, Mr. Amos
Stephens, Rev. J. R. M.
Stock, Mr. Percy
Sutton, Rev. H. H., B.A.
Taylor, Mr. H. L.
Tebbit, Rev. W. H.
Thomas, Mr. W. P., J.P.
Thorne, Rev. W. G. E.
Townsend, Dr. H., M.A.
Underwood, Dr. A. C., M.A., B.Litt.
Vokes, Rev. E. F. M.
Walkey, Rev. F. J., O.B.E., M.C.
Waller, Mr. Arthur G., F.C.A.
*Warburton, Mr. B. A.
Webb, Mr. A. E.
Welsh, Mrs. H. T.
Whitley, Dr. W. T., M.A.
Whitman, Rev. T. J.
Wiborg, F. M. S.
Wilkins, Mr. Cecil V.
Williams, Mr. T. F.
Wood, Miss C. D.
Wood, Mr. H. Ernest, J.P., C.C.
Woodfield, Mr. S.

**Life Members.*

Reviews.

God and Man, Four essays on the Nature of Personality, by Emil Brunner. (Student Christian Movement Press, 5s. net.)

In these four essays on the nature of personality, Dr. Brunner brings his well-known emphasis on the sovereignty of God to bear on the problems of personality. He writes vigorously and with a strong sense of conviction, and his conclusions are bound to arouse considerable discussion. The first essay is devoted to a criticism of the philosophers' idea of God. Greek philosophy, Brunner holds, has for a long time had a stranglehold on the Biblical conception of God. Idealism, realism and the system of identity are in turn brought under his acute scrutiny, and are rejected because they all share in the conception of man as, in his inner nature, one with God. This, Brunner argues, is not according to the conclusions of faith: for faith tells us that man is a sinner whom God reconciles with Himself by forgiving his sins. He is very severe on the metaphysicians. "It is impossible to build up the Christian proclamation of the Gospel and its theology on the basis of a philosophical doctrine of God." "A philosophically reasoned faith in a personal God is a contradiction in terms." "Not by philosophical speculation do we come to know God: He is only to be known in His revelation of Himself." We shall agree that the path of metaphysics does not carry us all the way we wish to go, but in estimating Brunner's position it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he makes too clean a division between thought and revelation. Is he not making too abstract and formal a distinction when he declares "The Lord, the Creator, cannot be fitted into any system of thought, but can only be comprehended in obedience."?

The second chapter on the Problem of Ethics is marked by Brunner's desire to free our notions of conduct from the domination of rationalistic ethics. Both idealistic legalism and realist eudaemonism share a common weakness. They trust man himself to achieve the good, and in their motive they are self-centred. In accordance with his general scheme in this book Dr. Brunner stresses the power of Christian faith in producing true freedom. It is the activity of God which creates a new relation between Himself and man, releasing man from bondage. "All ideological ethics, all ethics of principle, are unmerciful and inhuman. They are not only loveless, but also they prove themselves time and again ineffective. They unfold programmes of social reform . . . but it is faith that frees us from all slavery to programmes."

This emphasis on the final and complete determination of God in all human well-being is directed, in the fourth chapter, against systems of naturalistic psychology. Naturalism, Brunner argues, fails to do justice to man's spirituality and freedom. Idealism, on the other hand, refuses to see man's real dependence on the body, and errs in tracing back evil to man's bodily nature. The Biblical view, on the other hand, sees the contradiction in the nature of man: for on the one hand man is created by God, and on the other he is a fallen sinner. We are thus to interpret man as a "broken unity."

From this rapid reference to three chapters it will be gathered that Brunner's treatment of the problems is distinctly "heavy going." Dr. Cairns, who has translated this book, says that Brunner's style of lecturing is clear and emphatic, but, it must be admitted, Brunner has a love for the startling sentence that is not always self-explanatory. Dr. Cairns tells us that many country congregations in Switzerland and Germany have been puzzled by the sermons of young pastors who are adherents of the new view. One of them is reported to have begun a sermon, "I have never loved God, and I shall never love Him." It is not only village congregations that will find a certain bewilderment in the arresting declaration of the Barth-Brunner school. Dr. Cairns feels (and we share the feeling) that the new movement gives the impression that it is more concerned with discussing systems of thought than human realities, though, we must admit, Brunner has his little jest against the scientific psychologist who really knows less of the life of the soul than the man in the street!

Chapter three, in which Brunner deals with the Church and Revelation, deserves special comment. It is a fine argument, sustained throughout on the loftiest level, that the Word of God, which is the ground of personality, is also the ground of the Church. In masterly fashion Brunner sweeps aside all humanistic conceptions of the Church, and lifts us to the idea of the historical fellowship of the Church through which man realizes his true fellowship, and through which God ensures that His message of salvation shall be taken to all places and to all times. We recommend the study of this chapter as a fine antidote to the modern tendency which sees nothing more in the Church than a human society.

A word of special appreciation must be added regarding Dr. Cairn's excellent introduction to this book, and his illuminating discussion of the main points now at issue between Barth and Brunner.

F. TOWNLEY LORD.

The Veil of God, by H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D. (Nisbet and Co., 2s. 6d. net.)

The Principal of Regent's Park College is widely known and respected, in our own ranks and far beyond, for his writings on the Old Testament and on Biblical Theology, and for his expositions of Baptist principles. This attractive looking volume in the "New Library of Devotion," edited by the Dean of St. Paul's, is of the more precious and intimate things of personal faith, and it will be very eagerly welcomed by all those who know the author. It is written for that great company "who from time to time may find it hard to hold the faith without wavering, because for one reason or another God seems to hide Himself." Nature, history, even the great drama of redemption and its record in the Scriptures, the inner life of man and the supreme mystery of death, alike seem to conceal as well as reveal God. In six brief but closely knit chapters, each of which closes with a prayer, Dr. Robinson deals with these "veils." The series of books to which this belongs is intended so to handle the central themes of Christian experience that they may strike with fresh vigour upon the hearts of readers. It is difficult to imagine that anyone will read these pages thoughtfully and not be lastingly grateful for them, for they are themselves an unveiling of the author's own deepest beliefs.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England, by W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 21s. net.)

Dr. Jordan is giving the student of history what will long remain the standard authority on Toleration. The first volume, covering the period from the beginning of the English Reformation to the death of Queen Elizabeth, appeared in 1932 (*Baptist Quarterly,* vi., 187); the present volume deals with the important period from the accession of James I to the convention of the Long Parliament (1603-1640); and a concluding volume, which will include a complete bibliography for the whole study, is promised.

The plan of this volume is admirably clear. There are five long chapters: The Dominant Groups, 1603-1625; The Dominant Groups, 1625-1640; The Minority Groups, 1603-1640; The Laymen and the Moderates; Roman Catholic Thought and its relation to the development of Religious Toleration, 1603-1640. The development of the policy which led to the Civil War and to the cleavage within Anglicanism is clearly traced. Baptist and Congregationalists come prominently on the scene, and Dr. Jordan devotes fifty-six pages to a careful examination of Baptist Thought and its Relation to the Development of Religious

Toleration. It is with them, he says, "that the tolerant implications of Protestant sectarianism becomes most fully apparent . . . It is to their great credit that, though persistently persecuted, they maintained steadily the doctrine of religious liberty, and denied that any human power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, exercised any legitimate authority over the human conscience." The author shows full acquaintance with our denominational literature of the period, and he summarises the teaching and writings of Helwys, Smyth, Busher and Murton with fine judgment. One discovery will excite Baptist historians, both in this country and in the United States. Leonard Busher's *Religious Peace; or, a plea for liberty of conscience* is perhaps of equal significance with Helwys's *Mistery of Iniquity* in the development of the theory of religious toleration. Very little is known of him, but on the title page of *Religious Peace* he described himself as a citizen of London. He was exiled well before 1614 and sought refuge in Holland. In his book he puts forth the simple axiom that no temporal or spiritual power may coerce faith. For "as kings and bishops cannot command the wind, so they cannot command faith." Of the first edition of this book no copy was thought to be extant, and the edition of 1646, which, two centuries later, was reprinted by the Hanserd Knollys Society, has generally been relied on. But Dr. Jordan understands that a copy of the first edition is in the Huntington Library collection, and, if this is so, the 1646 edition should be closely compared with it.

Dr. Jordan's study can be commended whole-heartedly to all students of the Elizabethan and Stuart periods, and it should find its place on the shelves of all libraries worthy of the name.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

Christ in the Modern Scene, by F. Townley Lord, D.D. (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d. net.)

This is a bracing book, with the positive note dominant throughout. Christ is real and active, at work in the world of to-day. The chapter headings are arresting: "He gives us a song and puts colour into life; takes us inside religion and shows us life creative; makes us rich and gives us romance; breaks the conventions and disturbs our complacency; shows us reverence for life and gives us power for to-morrow; makes us adventurers and shows us the Father; refutes the critics and saves and abides." The author's scholarship does not obtrude—yet it is there—and many apt illustrations, the fruit of wide reading, enrich the pages. A book to stimulate faith and deepen devotion.

The Christian Epic. A study of New Testament Literature. By Mary Ely Lyman (Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 8s. 6d. net.)

It was inevitable that the early Christian Church should produce great literature; in its life were the conditions requisite —heroic abandon to a cause, passionate feeling about that cause, an uncalculating devotion to its interests, and a transcendent joy in its possession. How that literature—gospel, chronicle, epistle, homily and apocalypse—came into being is discussed in this book. The New Testament met "definite needs in special localities at given times. Special problems had to be dealt with. The needs of given churches had to be met. It belonged to its own time, and answered the needs of its own age. But at the same time it stands above its own age."

The authoress is connected with Barnard College of Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary, and her treatment is both historical and appreciative. She takes the writings in the order in which they arose, thus seeing them as they are, a vivid expression of life. Naturally she begins with the earliest records, "Q," of the exact nature and content of which she admits there is no certainty. It is not known whether "Q" was a single document or many, whether it was originally written in Aramic or in Greek, whether Matthew and Luke used the same or differing versions, nor what exactly it contained. She passes to Paul's letters, which "directed to meet certain definite situations in the Graeco-Roman world in the first century, have proved to have power both to express and to inspire Christian experience all over the world and all through Christian history." Acts is divided, part being treated in the chapter, "A Diary and some stories of the Early Church," and part in the chapter on Luke. James is described as a Christian sermon, and assigned to the closing years of the first century; Hebrews shows the church meeting persecution; Revelation evinces the hostility to Rome; the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles interpret Christianity for the Graeco-Roman world.

The book is ably and interestingly written, although perhaps many of the lengthier Biblical quotations could have been omitted (surely if references were given readers would consult their Bibles), and anyone who reads it with care will have a new appreciation and understanding of the New Testament.

The Baptists of Towcester, by Ernest A. Payne, B.A., B.D., B.Litt. (Billingham and Son, Northampton, 1s.)

Mr. Payne's ability as a historian needs no emphasis, particularly when he is dealing with Northamptonshire, a County that he has made peculiarly his own. This booklet of twenty

full pages, which covers a period of two hundred and fifty years, reveals the careful research and marshalling of facts which we expect from him. He takes us into the company of early General Baptists; later he introduces John Wesley, William Carey, and other notabilities; and then he shows how a church of the "General" persuasion became "Particular." Would that all local histories were as competently written.

Are We Uniting? The Prospects of Reunion in England, by Hugh Martin, M.A. (Student Christian Movement Press, twopence.)

No one has a more intimate knowledge of the Reunion movement than Mr. Martin, and in this booklet he carefully summarises its present position and prospects. He recognises that beyond question there has been a set-back in the progress towards Christian unity in England, and speaking of the Baptists suggests that no one claims that a majority of them are in favour of uniting with anybody. He faces the reality of the situation, and draws the conclusion that if there is ever a United Church of England it will be: (1) a unity based upon a common Faith; (2) a unity of comprehension and not of compromise; (3) a Church in which will be preserved the elements of value in the episcopal, presbyteral and congregational forms of church government; and (4) a Free Church.

Casting out Fear, by Frank Buffard, B.A., B.D. (Student Christian Movement Press, 1s. net.)

Any book with something to say about the way to handle life in the face of its fears is sure to have readers in these days. Mr. Buffard, in this short but most interestingly written book, has given us an account of the place of fear in life, its causes, and the way it can be met with confident faith born of a living relationship with God. The chapters dealing with courage as the fruit of forgiveness, and the crowding out of fear by eager obedience to the will of Christ, are full of wise practical counsel. This is a book to put into the hands of such of our friends as are "troubled by many things."

The Lord's Prayer in Modern Life, by R. Guy Ramsay, M.A. (Kingsgate Press, 2s. net.)

This is a very brief but helpful exposition of the Lord's Prayer. It gathers up the many shafts of light that have come from the study of this prayer and focuses them on the thoughts men are thinking and the problems they are dealing with to-day.