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

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

Editorial.

NEW MEMBERS.

The following have joined the Baptist Historical Society during the past quarter:

Rev. W. A. Butcher.	Rev. Selwyn Gummer, B.A.
Mr. Henry H. Collier, F.S.I.	Rev. E. F. Kevan, B.D.
Mr. William Dowler.	Mr. J. H. Osborne.

In addition, one of the members, Mr. E. A. Timson, has become a life member.

* * * *

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Baptist Union and Baptist Missionary Society have decided that future Spring Assemblies shall be held in London. The forthcoming Birmingham Assembly may therefore afford the last opportunity of a country charabanc trip in connection with our Society's annual meeting. Our member, the Rev. A. S. Langley, has arranged an attractive itinerary. We shall start from near the Town Hall, Birmingham, at 2.30 sharp on Thursday, 4th May, in charabancs generously provided by two or three Midland laymen. The route will be via Halesowen and Kidderminster to Bewdley, where we shall visit the historic Baptist church and also the church where Tombes and Baxter had their famous disputation. Passing through Stourport our destination will be the Baptist church at Bromsgrove, the mother of the Baptist churches of Birmingham. The Bromsgrove church dates from the days of persecution, and the members are justly proud of its long and honourable history. It is therefore fitting that they should entertain the Denomination's Historical Society for its annual meeting and tea which will follow at about 4.45. The return journey will be made in time for the evening meetings in Birmingham. Tickets are essential for members and their friends, and, to facilitate arrangements, members are asked to return the accompanying card as early as possible.

At the annual meeting the Secretary's report and Treasurer's statement for 1938 will be submitted, and officers and committee elected for the ensuing year. The present officers and committee whose names are printed on the back cover, have been nominated. Any additional nominations should reach the Secretary not later than Thursday, 20th April.

* * * *

LIBRARIES.

Members and students are reminded that the Society's Library is available for their use. It is housed at Bristol Baptist College, by kind permission of the Principal and College Council. Professor F. E. Robinson has charge of the volumes, and he will gladly produce them to any who are interested in research.

Another Library of value to students is the Beddington Free Grace Library, Wallington, Surrey, of which our member, Mr. Geoffrey Williams, is President. In the course of hardly ten years over 20,000 volumes have been collected, and they are now being sorted and catalogued. One section is devoted to the literature of the Reformation and of the Evangelical Revival. A booklet describing the aims and objects of the Library can be obtained from Mr. Williams, Bishop's House, 106 Bishopsgate, E.C.2.

* * * *

BAPTIST EXPANSION IN NORTH AMERICA.

Three slight corrections are needful in the article published in our January issue. They are in paragraph 2 on page 288. "Rock Island, Ill." should read "Rock Springs, Ill."; The Granville Literary and Theological Institution opened its doors to students in 1831 (December 13th), not 1832; Kalamazoo College was founded in 1833, not 1855.

The settlement known as Rock Springs is near the town of O'Fallon, Illinois, about fifteen miles east of St. Louis, Missouri. Rock Island is the home of Augustana College and Theological Seminary, a Swedish Lutheran institution. Rock Island is in the northern part of Illinois, whereas Rock Springs and Upper Alton are in the southern.

* * * *

A GLORIOUS HOWLER.

In the first proof of Mr. Beckwith's article on Alice Rawson (p. 372) a howler altogether too good to pass into oblivion was perpetrated. The opening sentence of the last paragraph reads, "Alice Rawson stands before us . . . tortured with *doubt*," but this was printed "tortured with *gout*." Possibly the good lady did have both doubt and gout!

The Process of Salvation.

IT is a commonplace to say that for a century and more the minds of men have been drawn with increasing attraction to the contemplation of the historic Jesus, and that to-day no figure in history looms more vastly before the world. He is receiving the homage of men not only within the Church but far beyond her borders, and not only in Christian lands but among the heathen. The little books we call the Gospels, which tell His brief story, are rapidly becoming the most priceless literary treasure of all humanity. It is not so commonplace to point out that the Gospels were not the earliest Christian writings, and that they were not the product of mere biographical interest, but of faith and experience. There was a Christian people before there was a Christian document, and years before the oldest of the Gospels was written there were apostolic letters addressed to Jews and Gentiles who were living a new life through the redeeming power of a Jesus who had lived and died and, so they believed, was alive for evermore. We should never have heard of the Jesus of history had it not been for their experience; and the Gospels by their very existence bear witness to a salvation of which He was the efficient cause.

In dealing with the Process of Salvation there is a certain advantage in starting with this fact. For one thing, it makes it clear that in Christianity we have to do with a religion of redemption and not simply with a higher morality. It is inconceivable that after the shattering disillusionment of the crucifixion, and if that had been the end, the followers of Jesus of Nazareth would have rallied again in order to proclaim to the world a few beautiful precepts their ill-fated Master had taught them. The Sermon on the Mount is an essential part, but not the whole, of Christianity; and there would have been no Christianity if it had been. And for another thing, it makes it clear that the vital centre of Christianity is not Jesus, considered simply as an historical figure, but Jesus as Redeemer and Lord. The earliest preaching was of a Jesus who by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God had been crucified by lawless men, but whom God raised up, "and being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear." Pentecost was the sequel to Calvary, and out of Pentecostal experience Church and Gospels have come.

1. THE NEW TESTAMENT EXPERIENCE IS THE EXPERIENCE OF THE SPIRIT.

There is much that is of interest in the Pentecostal and similar experiences of the Apostolic Age that is not strictly

relevant to our subject. "Tongues," ecstasies, visions, and the like, are abnormal phenomena which have frequently appeared in religious movements, and have not been confined to the line of revelation. Considered in themselves they are of more importance to the psychologist than to the Christian interpreter. That profound emotion may under some circumstances have psychic effects, and that some persons are peculiarly liable to experiences of this nature, are facts too well known to labour. Prophecy in its earlier stages was closely associated with them, and they reappeared in the early Church. Their supernatural character was never questioned, and it was natural in that age that they should be regarded as signal signs of Divine favour. To acknowledge that primitive conceptions of the Spirit were defective is not to deny that the power which carried men beyond themselves in a rapture that had strange effects was truly the Spirit of God. It is only to distinguish between the essential and the accidental, the permanent reality and the transient form. It is the more necessary to do this in that there is evidence that many were disposed, as some are still, to value these phenomena for their own sake, and that they were occasionally associated with sub- or even anti-Christian features. The controversies outside, for example, found an echo within the Corinthian Church when a believing brother, speaking in ecstasy, cried "Jesus is accursed." It was to a bewildered community which had submitted the incredible fact to him that St. Paul laid down the principle that no one speaking in the Spirit of God could say that. It was plain that not all "supernatural" phenomena were of God. It was probably such experiences as these, as well as his own profound instinct for ethical reality, which led him to discount the value of such abnormal endowments, and to find the true fruits of the Spirit in faith and character. And it is not without significance for the history of religion that in this he was anticipated by the greatest of all the prophets. In dealing with the "false prophets," Jeremiah was confronted with the problem of phenomena universally believed to be the products of the Spirit of God. He no more questioned the reality of their visions than he questioned his own, but his experience compelled him at length to submit all visions to a moral test, and to recognise that it was the substance rather than the form that proved prophecy to be of God. Because of its associations the word "Spirit" is never used by him. In the same way, while we may be sure he was not the only Christian to know where the true values lay, St. Paul—so far as we know—was the first to relegate what were called "spiritual gifts" to their right place among those secondary and transitory things that change and pass.

But these abnormal experiences are of evidential value in so far as they bear witness to the immense enthusiasm that characterised the first believers, and the profound changes the Gospel wrought in them. Discount the phenomena as we may and must, the fact remains that it was an excess of joy that broke the bounds of reason and sometimes of order. The men who spoke in ecstasy and trance were possessed men, but what possessed them was an overflowing consciousness of redemption from bondage into freedom, from bleak disappointment with life into immortal hope. When St. Paul spoke of the Gospel as "the POWER of God unto Salvation" he was using language which most, if not all, of his converts could understand and repeat. It may be doubted whether they could follow him in the subtleties of his dialectic, but there is no doubt that when he wrote to some of his earliest converts "God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying 'Abba Father'" they knew what he meant. We are told that the news that there is but one God and not a million can be a Gospel to a Japanese to-day;[1] and this must have counted for something in the early days.[2] But the dynamic of the Gospel, then as now, was the certainty that the one God had demonstrated His Fatherhood to sinful men by sending His Son Jesus Christ to save the lost. St. Paul "placarded" Christ crucified before the Galatians as the Son of God Who loved them and gave Himself for them; and it was in the amazing love of Christ that they found God, or rather, as the apostle would have said, were found of Him. It was the discovery of a grace in God, of which Jesus Christ was the Embodiment and His Risen Life the security, that was the soul of the joy that broke into inarticulate praise. A redemptive power was in and accompanied the Gospel which reproduced the most gracious incidents of the Gospels. Indeed, St. Luke was speaking the language of soberness and truth when he opened his second book with the words, "The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus BEGAN both to do and to teach"; because the written and unwritten Acts of the Apostles were but continuations of the Gospel story. If, during His earthly life, Jesus brought salvation to publicans and sinners, to harlots and extortioners, St. Paul could, years afterwards, say to the Corinthians, "Such were some of you." If Jesus could tell the parable of the Prodigal Son in defence of His ministry, its beauty has preserved the private letter to Philemon which tells the story of the Prodigal Slave, "no longer a slave, but

[1] Warneck, *Living Forces of the Gospel*, 211.

[2] cf. Tatian, "This ends our slavery in the world and rescues us from rulers manifold and ten thousand tyrants" (quoted by Glover: *Christian Tradition*, 150).

more than a slave, a brother beloved." A power entered the world with Jesus which continued to work moral miracles. Redemption was a reality wherever the gospel came, because there was an energy in it which was not of man but of God. And this power was associated permanently with Jesus Christ. It was the Holy Spirit which He "sent forth," or it was His Spirit, or it was Christ Himself. "The Lord is the Spirit" says St. Paul in a brief and flashing word; and St. John is essentially right when he antedates Pentecost, and represents the disciples as "receiving" the Holy Spirit in the Upper Room with their first Vision of the Risen Lord.

2. The Primary Work of the Spirit is to Reveal Christ.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit lies outside this study, and yet it is necessary to attach a definite meaning to the phrase. Denney, as is well known, practically identified the Spirit with the moral influences of the Gospel, or with faith. If this is unsatisfactory it is because it seems to ignore, if not deny, any personal and immediate relation of God with the soul in conversion. God is more than a moral influence. He is the living God in Whom every soul lives and moves and has its being. We are not only dependent on Him moment by moment of our life; He is within us, nor is it possible to say where the human and the Divine meet and mingle. So wondrously and with such lowliness does He hide Himself behind our consciousness that we are unaware of His presence; and yet He is the Source of whatever goodness we possess, the Secret of the shame we feel when we would fain cover our sins from our own eyes, and it is He who works creatively within us towards unrealised visions of beauty and truth. It is because He, by an unutterable kenosis, and by grace and not necessity, is bound up with us, that He can be afflicted in all our afflictions, and burdened with our sins. On the other hand, and this is the mystery of our life, for man is a greater mystery than God, we are spiritual beings in a universe of spiritual values which we may or may not make our own; each of us, as Tennyson says:

> The main miracle that thou art thou,
> With power on thine own act and on the world.

And therefore any revelation made to us must be one that appeals to our mind and moral consciousness. God can only make Himself known to us in rational and ethical ways. There is a mystic element in all true religion, inasmuch as a personal relation always passes speech and the senses; and all mysticism is in the words of the fourth Gospel "A man can receive nothing except it have been given him from above." But, with all its glorious immediacy, mysticism, as such, adds nothing but

irradiation to our knowledge of God. The *material* of mystic vision, where it is not formless, however it may be illumined by the Spirit, is already given in experience. It is the transcendent, not the immanent divine, that is the object of knowledge, but without the immanent the transcendent would speak in vain. It is the Spirit of God within us that bears witness to the God above us, interpreting all objectve revelations, whether given in nature or history, in great events or in private life; and as at Pentecost we hear "Every man in our own language, wherein we were born." And supremely the Spirit within bears witness to Jesus Christ when He is presented to us, and in testifying to Him reveals its own nature as the Spirit of holiness and the Spirit of Christ. Deep calls unto deep when Jesus and the soul are face to face; and though, owing to the limitations of language, we use words drawn from spatial and temporal existence, and speak of the "coming," the "descent," or the "baptism" of the Spirit, these but describe the release of power and heightening of personality that attend the opening of the will itself to the witnessing and now invasive Spirit. The divine fact is that the Spirit is present in every man and witnesses to the revelation without; energising within us according to the greatness of the revelation and our response to it. Jesus Christ is not only the greatest, He is the final revelation of God, for there can be nothing deeper in God than the Holy Love manifested in Him. And Jesus Christ, and Him crucified and glorified, is the material of the Spirit where He is made known to men. The work of the Spirit is to glorify Him, to illumine Him in His life and death and eternal significance; and according to our response is the inward power.

All recognition of and response to Jesus Christ is due to the Spirit of God. At its simplest and lowest, if it were not for the Spirit bearing witness to moral worth and beauty, we should see nothing in Jesus that we should desire Him; still less should we know such constraint in Him as to compel us to His feet. The child's response to what it sees in Him is as valid a work of the Spirit of God as is the surrender of the sin-stained soul of an Augustine. The youth and maiden, captured by His radiant courage and dedicating themselves to His service, are yielding to the same Spirit as the saint who knows there are riches in Christ of which as yet they have no suspicion. It is always true that no one can call Jesus "Lord" save in the Holy Spirit. But in all true response to Jesus Christ there is an implicit as well as a conscious faith, and it is the continuous work of the Spirit to unfold the meaning of Christ to the believing soul. The Christian life, in one of its aspects, is the exploration of Christ and the discovery of needs that only He

can meet; and though like the original disciples we may begin with the Master, beloved and admired, like them we must follow on to know our Lord in the whole range of His truth and saving power, and to realise that the religion of Christ is not for good men but for men. "We may begin with the Master," but we may begin anywhere with Him. There is and can be no uniformity of initial experience. Peter, who left his nets at the call of Jesus, did not start from the same point as Matthew the publican, to whom the call itself was a wonder of grace. The young John who flung himself joyously after the Master did not start like the woman who was a sinner and who washed His feet with her tears. Yet the time came when Peter wept bitterly, and he and John and Matthew joined hands in a common confession of failure when their defiant virtues had proved windy boasts. Men may *begin* with the sense of sin and the conscious need of forgiveness, and like Bunyan's Christian, must be eased of a burden before they can go far on the pilgrim path. But there are many who do not and, without violence to their natures and upbringing, cannot begin with this experience. Yet without it the grace and power of Christ cannot be fully known, nor the Father who gave Him, and was in Him, loved as He is to be loved. Sooner or later the Holy Spirit unfolding the things of Christ to the Christian soul reveals Him as the Saviour.

Increasing knowledge of Christ inevitably involves a deepening knowledge of ourselves, and a dissatisfaction with our own achievements which is not assuaged by greater efforts. The goodness we attain by our own striving turns to ashes, and our self-begotten virtues lose their lustre. And even if at the beginning it was the sense of sin that brought us to Him, that sense is transformed into sorrow and cleansing tears when He shows us His hands and side. Christian penitence is the fruit of His love and not of our fears. And the Cross which compels moral sincerity creates the conditions of its own reconciling power, and becomes through the Spirit a subduing and redeeming energy as it lifts the veil from our sinful hearts in the same action as it rends the last veil from the face of the Father. Our sin is revealed and judged by the divine love that suffers and forgives. And in responding to Christ crucified the soul, of necessity, for this is the only response, associates itself with Him in His Passion. As McLeod Campbell puts it in the greatest of all books on the Atonement: "To be washed in the blood of Christ must be to have the moral and spiritual elements of that offering revealed in our spirits, as bringing us into spiritual harmony with them, making us to partake in them."[3] That is, in brief, the forgiven soul makes its own the judgment of Holy Love upon

[3] *Nature of the Atonement*, 251.

its sin, and inwardly disowning its sin, identifies itself with Christ in His obedience to the Father even unto death. Where there is true penitence there is union with Him in all the meanings of the Cross. The Cross, as it is the ultimate manifestation of forgiving and redeeming love, is the absolute assurance of forgiveness; but it does its saving work as it effects this substitution of Christ for self as centre; and we, being liberated from the burden both of sins and virtues which are the products of self, rise with Him into a newness of life which will reach heights of ethical sonship beyond the vision of any striving moralist, and our personal selfhood is consummated in God. The forgiveness of the Cross is not a general amnesty but a constraining power, which, in reconciling us to the Father, fashions us into the likeness of the Son. There is no "mystic Union" with Christ which does not involve this moral union with Him, a union which for us as for the New Testament is symbolised by baptism. It is not suggested that in the experience of any individual, even of an apostle, this identification is complete[4]—our strong temptations and our many falls are proof to the contrary. But it is implicit in all response to the holy and forgiving love of God in Christ crucified, and it is part of the work of the Holy Spirit to bring us, through triumph and failure, joy and suffering, chastening, temptation and victory over temptation, into more perfect union with Christ in the ethical realities of the reconciling Cross.

3. The Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Sonship.

It was as a Son that Jesus Christ lived and died. And He revealed the Fatherhood in a Sonship which in its every motion reflected its quality and purpose. The word "Father" conveys little, or rather it conveys anything according to our ideas and experience of earthly fatherhood. But the best fatherhood is bettered by the "how much more" of Jesus, and by the life and death which give their value to the words "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." Faith in Christ is not a passport into the presence of the Father; it is faith in the Father as the Son has revealed Him. Christ is indispensable to that faith, for it is upon the work of Christ as Redeemer that it rests. Our faith in Christ brings us into conscious relationship with God, and the Spirit within us bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God.

It belongs to our sonship that we should have free access to our Father at all times and in all needs, and when we have no need except to see His face. There are no guarded chambers in the Father's House into which His forgiven children are

[4] cf. Phil. iii. 12.

forbidden to come. There is no throne-room or holy place into which none but dignitaries and priests may enter. The child is free of the home, and the holiest place is where he tells his secrets into the ear of his Father. Prayer is awed and trustful intercourse with God. It is the seal of sonship. Our prayers rise as we rise, and as our knowledge of the Father grows. And the Spirit, ever revealing the things of Christ, leads us into a wider and deeper knowledge of the Father's will for us as Christ is deeplier understood. To ask for earthly things is within the rights of children, but to pray for the gifts that are at God's *right* hand and which He desires us to possess is a privilege we come to value more. "For my part," says St. Theresa, "and I have been long at it, I desire no other gift of prayer but that which ends in every day making me a better and better woman." Yet for the highest things, the grace and perfection of sonship, unbroken and blessed fellowship with God, who is Light, and in Whom is no darkness at all, we know not how to pray as we ought, for our aspirations fail on flagging wings and droop to earth; but the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of Christ within us, never ceases to intercede for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and deeper than our broken prayers is the sighing of Him who worketh in us both to will and to do the Father's holy will.

In the doing of the Father's will there is no element of legalism. The motive is not fear of punishment or hope of reward; nor can the will of the Father be done in any labour of obedience which is not filial. It is not the quantity and outward perfection of the work done which satisfies Him, but the spirit of sonship expressed in it. The essential weakness of Law, from this standpoint, is not merely that it is mainly negative and that it cannot cover the infinite variety of circumstances and life, but that it tends to concentrate our attention on ourselves and our own achievements; and therefore it creates self-righteousness or pronounces condemnation. As the children of God we are not under law but under grace; none the less under grace that He has revealed His mind in the teaching and obedience of Christ. In the Father's House there are no tables of commandments, but there is the love which is the fulfilling of all noble law. As von Hügel says, "Holiness consists primarily not in the absence of faults, but in the presence of spiritual force, in Love creative, Love triumphant, the soul becoming flame rather than snow, and dwelling upon what to do, give, and be, rather than upon what to shun." It is not by scrupulously observing rules, and keeping precepts and multiplying prohibitions that we demonstrate our sonship. These are the morals of the Pharisee, and the heathen who know not God.

There is more hope for a man who sins greatly than for a man of negative and beggarly virtue. Sonship is shown in the love that prompts thought and action, and in the finer humanity that love creates; and there is no sonship where there is no brotherhood. "He that loves not his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen?" To know ourselves to be the children of God is to recognise all men as His children, and to reverence all. The infinite value of every soul is intrinsic and not dependent on its material or moral standing; and the Father whom we would serve in love can only be served in His children. The filial love of Jesus was manifest in His boundless and heroic love for sinful men, and in nothing was His Sonship more apparent than in the richness and breadth of His humanity. His was an inclusive personality, not in any metaphysical sense, but in its comprehensive understanding and sympathy. In the filial life there is a Shakespearean quality, and indeed in his broad humanity Shakespeare is, so far, more Christian than Dante. The greatest saints are the most human saints. Peter, Francis, and Bunyan who loved "to make friendship with all," are more truly Christian than some whose names are more august. A conception of Christianity which excludes any type of humanity, or that sets any limits to our sympathies, is alien to the mind of Christ. The Gospel brings us out into a large place where a man can breathe, and into kinship with the whole family of God. And in this great humanity there is, for the believing child of God, no other imperative than Christly love, love as Christ has interpreted it in His words and deeds; and being the imperative of love it is limitless in its range. Law is stiff, and moral codes become prisons to the soul. Love in its action is of infinite variety, and is measureless in its sweep and freedom. And, as the children of God in the family of God, it is our motive and sole direction. "All divinity," as John Donne says, "is love or wonder." It is not the imitation of Christ that marks the Christian, for the imitation even of Christ can become an external thing. It is the reproduction of His life in the springs of thought and feeling. And the Spirit of God, which, as St. Peter says, is "given to them that obey," not only reveals Christ to us in a Sonship which grows more luminous, He—in that revealing—transforms us into the same obedient sonship as from glory unto glory.

4. The Spirit of Sonship is the Spirit of Gratitude and Faith.

All that the Father has is ours in Christ, and all His will is accepted as a will of grace. Jesus Christ was a Son in His Father's world, delighting in the beauty of it, and gratefully

accepting the bounty of the table His Father spread. He possessed the world as only one who is its Master and never its slave can do. As He was pure all things were pure to Him. He was no ascetic despising the body, rejecting the life of the senses. He came eating and drinking. The antithesis between matter and spirit was not in His thought. All things were holy to Him—the dawn on the heights and the silver dusk, the trailing vine and the yellow corn, bird-music and the laughter of children. Marriage was a divine mystery; fatherhood a veiled theophany. He made wine a sacrament, and bread a heavenly food. Nothing God had created or ordained was evil or to be refused. Was not earth the footstool of God, and the sky His burnished throne? God, that is, is the underlying Reality of the whole natural order. If Jesus denied Himself any earthly good, it was not as condemning it, but for His work's sake; even as He had power to lay His life down that He might take it again. Possessing the world He could renounce it, for renunciation is impossible where there is no possession; and renouncing it He possessed it more completely. As Traherne says: "Was He not the Son of God; and Heir of the whole world? To this poor, bleeding, naked Man did all the corn and wine, and oil, and gold and silver in the world minister in an invisible manner, even as He was exposed lying and dying upon the Cross" (*Cent.* 60). And into all this wealth of creation and of all the gifts of God the Christian enters as by right of sonship. All things are his for his delight and increase of life; his is also the genius with which God endows the thinker, the artist, and the poet. It is not Christ who has banned culture or the searching mind; or has dashed the cup of natural joys from the lips of men. All human faculties are sacred, and all pure enjoyment is of God. It is indeed better, as He said, to enter life maimed than to be cast out. To gain the world and to lose the soul is, in the end, to lose both soul and the world. But the maimed life is not the ideal life. The ideal life is that in which all the senses and all the powers of man minister to the life of the Spirit which sanctifies them. And where there is realised sonship the world is ours, and all that is in it. It is a true word of Chesterton's Alfred, addressed to the heathen Danes:

> Therefore your end is on you,
> Is on you and your kings;
> Not for a fire in Ely fen,
> Not that your gods are nine or ten,
> But because it is only Christian men
> Guard even heathen things.

The strong tendency, constantly reappearing in the religious world, to substitute "Touch not, taste not, handle not" for the

righteousness of Christ is a lapse into will-worship and legalism. Except where love is the motive, or fear of personal weakness, or necessary self-discipline, it is definitely unfilial and anti-Christian. The son of God is free in his Father's world. He is the heir of God, joint-heir with Christ; and possessing the world and not being possessed by it he can use it royally; or, if need be, can renounce it freely, reflecting in dim majesty the unutterable Act of Him who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich.

Further, it is a grave error to suppose that it is only through sorrow and pain that the Father touches us to nobler sonship. There is a discipline of joy no less potent to the growing soul. In all the bounty of life, in its light and loveliness, in the good gifts of the body's health, and the mind's energy, and the heart's affection, He deals with us as with children from whom He would withhold no good thing. And it is part of the tragedy of life that so many miss the needful joy through folly and sin, their own or others', and the mis-shapen social order in which they live and which works evil from generation to generation. But to be human is to be woven into the seamless web of life; and in vicarious and in sympathetic suffering the Christian accepts the conditions of his humanity, and his union with God Who bears the whole. In the family of God the strong bear the burdens of the weak, not of compulsion but willingly. And in patience and labour, in wrath and pity, in self-sacrifice and service, the Christian seeks to make available for his brethren the joy of his Father's world, and the grace that is his in Christ; for the redeemed life is a redemptive life, filling up that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ.

In the same filial spirit as he accepts his own joys and his obligations, he accepts his own sorrows and the afflictions that life holds for him as for all the children of men. There are inevitable pains and disappointments, toils and anxieties, consequences of mistakes and sins which forgiveness does not remove, to make life hard and sometimes bitter to the taste. Life itself is dangerous, and the highest life moves along perilous edges where vigilance and valour alone can preserve it. Temptations change their character but not their intensity or deadliness as we leave the lower levels. But to be reconciled to God is to be reconciled to all His ways, natural and supernatural, and to life as He has ordained it, including the cost of moral growth and fidelity. It is to believe that the same Love which created joy has willed trial, and that both are needful; that Love is the ultimate reality of the universe, and all things work together for good to him that loves God. "Religion," says James of

Harvard, "makes easy and felicitous what in any case is necessary." When God is recognised as Father, and the Spirit of Christ cries "Abba" in our hearts, the whole order of life, in its weal and woe, becomes what God intended it to be, a redeeming order; so great a change does sonship make. Life is not so much the school where we learn lessons as the means the Father uses in moulding souls, in creating spiritual beauty, in making us meet to be partakers of His glory. And in all its height and depth life is accepted by the Christian, not with stoic fortitude, but with faith's surrender to a Wisdom and Love and Redeeming Power that subdues and uses all things to a purpose too great to be immediately understood and too divine to fail.

5. The Spirit of Sonship is the Spirit of Fellowship.

The filial life cannot be a solitary life. It exists and can only be sustained by brotherhood. Christian humility is the recognition of our dependence, not only upon God, but upon our fellow-men. And the Church, which is that part of the family of God which has recognised itself in knowing the Father through Christ, is the sustaining fellowship. It is not a little garden walled around; it is rather land redeemed from a waste which has still to be redeemed. It is the Kingdom of God in so far as that Kingdom has earthly embodiment, and it has no final frontiers short of the ultimate bounds of humanity. It is not confined to any place, or to any age, or to any one ecclesiastical organisation. It is universal, and it reaches back through the centuries to the beginning and forward to the end. It is no merely human society, to be made or unmade by the will of man. It is "The Church of God which He purchased with His own blood." It is the custodian of the Gospel of Christ, the keeper of the keys of the Christian ethic, the "pillar and bulwark of the truth." It is greater than any individual, and its life is an infinitely larger life. It supplements and corrects the individual faith by its wider vision and its ampler experience. It is the sphere of the Spirit, for it is through its continuing and expanding life that the Spirit leads men into the full truth of Christ. Less even than prophecy can the mind of Christ be of any merely private interpretation. Nothing less than the Church can suffice for so great a work, and the Church in its lengthening life. Into the Church the Christian is born of the Spirit of God, and in this great Fellowship is heir to all the riches of Christ in all His saints, for the confirmation and perfecting of his sonship.

In the Church as visible and localised he is to find the inspiration and instruction he needs, but he finds as he brings, and to receive he must give. In the human imperfections of his

brethren there is opportunity of spiritual gain; for in necessary service, in the exercise of patience, in mutual forgiveness, in the love that suffers long and is kind, brotherhood is proved and enriched. If a man sees not his brother in one who has the vision, however dim, of the Father, how can he recognise a brother in one who has not the vision? In the Church first, and if anywhere, must he realise the brotherhood without which his sonship is a vain imagination, and the Fatherhood of God the most pathetic of human illusions. And for him and for all his brethren there are means of grace, the fellowship itself, the preaching of the Word, and the sacraments; remembering always that as Coventry Patmore has said: "To some there is revealed a sacrament greater than that of the Real Presence, a sacrament of the Manifest Presence which is, and is more than, the sum of all the sacraments." By all these does the Spirit operate, not magically but spiritually and morally, keeping Christ before the eyes of His people, and witnessing to His presence in their midst. In the Process of Salvation the Church has its great and necessary place.

The Process of Salvation is the development of sonship in all its implications; that sonship which is the fulfilment of the purpose of God when He laid the foundations of the earth and the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. It was for the bringing of many sons unto Glory that the Author of our salvation was made perfect through suffering. The same perfection is to be ours, and except that He suffered the worst that we might know the best, His way is our way, and His life is the norm of ours. The Process of Salvation may seem full of risk, and its demands upon us too great for our infirmity. Who is sufficient for these things? I thank God, through His Son Jesus Christ, He is sufficient. For in the whole process there is the energising of the Holy Spirit, and in the heart of the Christian there is the assurance, given in the Cross of Christ, that the redeeming love of God, Who worketh all things, will perfect that which concerneth him. God is in earnest about our salvation, and in His will is our peace.

B. G. COLLINS.

Ideals of Freedom.

AS Nonconformists, not to say Protestant Deputies,[1] we are accredited as the advocates and guardians of freedom. We claim, not without some justification, that the modern conception of freedom had birth in our church life. Even a historian like Troeltsch gives the "sects," as he calls them, the chief credit, as against Luther and Calvin, of being in this respect the pioneers of the modern world.

But what sort of freedom is it that we can advocate to-day? Is the word now anything more than an outworn shibboleth? Is there any real content, relevant to the modern world, that we can put into it?

I must say that I did not set down this subject because I felt I had a contribution to make, but, to be frank, because I wanted a contribution making. I do not offer light so much as ask for discussion. What I mean is we need to-day a new definition. The old concept has to be charged with fuller meaning. . . . And perhaps none more than religious people, and particularly ourselves, are called upon to think out that definition and present it to a confused and bewildered world.

Let us begin by looking at some of the aspects of the prevailing confusion.

Here is a statement by a doctor—that he does not believe in the blood test for motorists charged with being under the influence of drink because it would be an unwarrantable interference with the liberties of the subject. The "liberty of the subject"—it is quite a familiar phrase, and as you know, it is used to justify all kinds of action and legislation, or rather lack of legislation. It conveniently leaves out of account the liberty of the unfortunate people who are killed by the drunken motorist, and it reminds us of the very old story of the boy and the frog. . . . "What is sport for you," said the frog, "is death for us." There has been much freedom of that sort in all ages, freedom for the few at the expense of the many. It was that sort of plea that was used to justify almost every kind of exploitation, notably the exploitation of the workers by an unjust economic system in the era that is just closing. It is related, of course, to ideas of property—a man can do what he likes with his own. The revolt against that conception of freedom happily is widespread to-day, one of the features of our time—only those who rebel against it have not yet apparently found a satisfactory idea to put in the place of the one they reject, and often they claim

[1] Delivered at Annual Meeting of the Dissenting Deputies, October, 1938.

for themselves just the very kind of licence which they condemn when they happen to be victims of it. The French Revolution attempt and failure to establish liberty, equality and fraternity should warn us against expecting any easy solution.

How to secure the liberty of each and all in an ordered community, or in other words, how to resolve the conflict between the essential needs of the community as such and the legitimate desires of the individual—that is one of the major problems of all time, made not easier of solution by the complexities of our civilisation. The individual's legitimate desires have risen enormously, while the community has become almost coterminous with the race. Hence the matter which could be simply solved when it was a question of Hodge and the village pump has taken on altogether new dimensions, now that life has drawn to itself all the advantages and otherwise of a scientific age.

I only need to mention such anti-social influences as drink, immorality of different kinds, obnoxious publications, gambling, and so forth, to remind you of the difficulty. Almost all civilised nations have gone some way in the attempt to control by limiting individual action in the interests of the State. But almost everywhere we find lack of clear-cut principle. In England, for example, we have a certain control of the film and of literature, and a certain feeble control of the press, but it is not easy to see on what principle, if any, the censorships are based. It would look as though there are several conflicting interests combined, one of which undoubtedly is money. Witness, for example, the Football Pools, from which the State now draws enormous revenue.

Further, while the State is trying to feel its way in those respects, we have the modern humanism, which seems to encourage individuals in every form of self-expression, teaches the desirability of indulging instincts and passions, and would obviously demand from the State a fairly clear field for this indulgence. "The State and the law," says Bertrand Russell, "should take no notice of sexual relations apart from children"—that is to say, he would allow the fullest licence. Yet his very next sentence is that "No marriage ceremony should be valid unless accompanied by a medical certificate of the woman's pregnancy"—a very severe restriction and obviously quite unnecessary on any elevated conception of marriage.

So the problem arises on many sides, and with almost every aspect of life. Where must individual licence cease in the interests of the common good? And how can freedom be defined in terms of an enforced discipline?

When we come to propaganda and the attempt to limit the activity of mind and compel opinion we touch the most important

part of the subject. Many are ready to restrict anti-social actions, but what about anti-social ideas? It is easy to say that ideas are more potent than actions, and that therefore this restriction is both more urgent and logical. But how far can that go? and what about Milton's great argument for the freedom of thought and speech? How does that argument look in the modern world?

Hitler has a great deal to say about propaganda in his book *Mein Kampf*, and we see his theory being worked out in the new State forms that have arisen. The theory is—use every form of propaganda and use it vigorously and rigorously. Then if a State is doing that ought it not to allow contrary propaganda to exist? Logic would say "No!" Why spend money to advocate a theory and at the same time allow the enemy to nullify it? Does not propaganda, if taken seriously, carry with it the inquisition? I mean when it is a matter of life and death, as the old theologians thought and as the modern State-builders believe.

We all recognise that the State is bound to compel in the matter of hygiene (smallpox, etc.). There the propaganda, so to say, has to be swallowed. Then why not in the matter of State-craft, which, it is claimed, is equally important?

Our own attitude on the question of venereal disease is typically British. We urge people suffering from these diseases to get a cure, and we make it easy for them. But ought we not to compel? Ought not compulsion to be the penalty of contracting the disease? The danger, as any one knows, is to the unborn children. By the same argument men like Dean Inge would radically interfere with the individual life. Shall we say, then, that there is a place for compulsion and a place for persuasion, and that the real problem is to find when the one is right and the other wrong?

Again, how far ought teachers in our schools to hand on to the children their political views? How far can they avoid it? In fact, are not children always the victim of propaganda—*compulsory* education? And is not Hitler right in assuming that most people are just overgrown children? Something like this is the argument of the Soviet in the matter of religion—a reminder that many of the policies in Europe that are offensive to us are not mere matters of expediency but are based on ideas.

Take again the freedom of the Press in England. Do we mean by the phrase, freedom to publish the stuff that is published? And what about the taunt that our so-called freedom of the Press is only the freedom of moneyed interests? One has only to think of the devastating effect of advertisements to realise that here is a major issue. Has the Press the right to

tyrannise over the mind of the people merely because people are not able to discriminate?

Well, these are the sort of questions facing the mind to-day. It is not merely that old battles, as for example the right to freedom of worship, have to be fought over again. It is that new aspects of life demand a much more coherent conception of freedom itself. Even we who are the advocates of it become inevitably at points the strenuous defenders of restraint and compulsion. The paradox in such a phrase as "the Nonconformist conscience" is not always realised. We have some idea of binding men in order to set them free.

However, to point out these difficulties and inconsistencies is easy, although I venture to think it is not altogether unprofitable. How to move to some sort of constructive thought, that is the difficulty. I will point out some of the conflicts of ideals which are troubling the modern world and which, I think, have to be resolved before we can get forward. At bottom it is a question of philosophy of the interpretation of life, and that itself is uncertain in our time.

First, I think, we have to decide whether life has to be keyed up to the good of the individual or to the good of the community as such. Or is there a third alternative that both these "goods" come together? Our first inclination is to say that they are not and cannot be antagonistic, that the individual and society grow side by side, that man can never win through to complete satisfaction save in a completely satisfying society, and equally that a true society cannot exist without satisfied people. We have learnt in late years, and we are not likely to go back on it—that environment is part of personality. All thinking is now social, and rightly so. But while we admit all that, a decision has to be taken—and for the time being at least it is a decision of the "either/or" type. Either the individual first or the community. If we decide for the individual, then that will to a large extent determine the form of the resultant society. Or, again, if we make the community central, we subscribe to the production of a new type of individual.

In Germany the State is everything. Life is keyed up to the idea of the State. Ultimately, it is conceivable, the State may become a thoroughly well-organised community in which the inhabitants will live a reasonably ordered and sheltered life. But by that time the inhabitants themselves will be different. I think that is clear. In proportion as the totalitarian State is a success, in that proportion it will modify human nature. So you might have a machine-dominated age in which the inhabitants were far more automata than people are to-day. There is no strenuous communal organisation that does not have this effect

of moulding the individuals to a certain pattern. Is that individual pattern the supreme thing or is it secondary?

On the other hand, if we decide that all life and endeavour should move towards a certain development of the individual, then we are bound to put up with many weaknesses in the body politic. The communal organisation cannot be nearly so rigid. I do not see myself any real escape from that dilemma.

At the moment the democratic nations oscillate between the two ideals in peace-time, and go clean over to the State ideal in war-time. The totalitarian nations are on the war footing all the time. Is this the real difference between Democracy and Totalitarianism? Anyway, that is the peculiar nature of the challenge which Bolshevism and Fascism present to us who historically have always stood for the primacy of the individual. We have held that there is an ideal to which individual life should move. The moving towards it has involved a large amount of individual freedom—relying on persuasion wherever possible. So far we have been willing to take the risks to society which that policy involves. But can we continue to take those risks in the modern world?

I will merely point out here that it is becoming more difficult. Everywhere under the spirit of fear the freedom of democratic States is tending to shrink. Even in theology the old prison house of a closed dogmatic is being offered to us again as a safe and happy shelter against the winds of free criticism. In England we turn on our past and begin to visualise an united Church of England—one closely-knit State Church, or at least territorial Church, which will be an escape from the difficulty of living amid the clash of opinion and the variety of custom. If I said the movement towards unity in the Church is a step towards the totalitarian outlook, I should be criticised, and perhaps I should be wrong. But I do say it is an indication of a certain lack of faith in the democratic principle, even in democratic countries. We hold that religion cannot be compelled, that it ceases to be religion the moment the compulsion element is brought in. We maintain it depends entirely on persuasion. Then the logic of that position is the "sects," as history proves. Every scheme of unity has had to rely on some sort of compulsion at the last, and to me it is not without significance, and not by any means a feeble support for our conception of life that the most vital religion to-day is in the countries which have been "plagued," to use the current jargon, "with our unhappy division." It is here, perhaps, where we touch the nerve of the whole matter—compulsion cannot be used to condition the higher life of the soul without injuring that higher life and maybe destroying it altogether.

So much, then, for the problem of the individual and the community. The more limited problem raised by humanism hardly needs to detain us, as the guidance with regard to it is fairly clear. What measure of freedom is necessary in order that the individual may be truly himself? Well, we do not believe that a man steadily grows to manhood by the unbridled or even the carefully calculated indulgence of his appetites. If psychology of a kind supports the humanist, psychology of another kind and life especially supports his opponent. The appetite grows by what it feeds upon. Sex indulgence to-day demands sex indulgence to-morrow, and the end of licence in all these matters is not the doing away of awkward inhibitions, with the consequent release of personality, it is "slavery to sin." That story we have read many times, and it is not a story likely to impose on ministers of religion. The real freedom is related to the good life, and the good life comes only with the proper organisation of the instincts, which after all is the very nature of personality.

It may be, on this point, that the ground needs going over again. It may be that there is room for a re-statement of Christian Ethics for our time. Maybe some of the lingering shreds of an earlier asceticism need to be finally cast aside. But that will not affect the main position, namely, that personal freedom and inner stability cannot be attained apart from a life-long discipline. That the discipline need not be irksome when undertaken at the bidding of a religious sentiment we all know.

This leads to my last point. It would seem that freedom cannot be defined save in relation to the ideal. The average man usually means by it release from something difficult or troublesome. That is one of the pernicious notes of our time, struck by almost every publicist who wants the popular vote, and struck, too, by many who are quite unconscious of the implications of it. Take the old cry—"democracy in the workshop"—it was by no means always the expression of a desire to do good work in congenial environment. Often it became little more than the aim of doing the minimum for the maximum benefit. I mean there was no great idea of public service at the back of it. And that is the condemnation of quite a lot of democratic politics—the emancipation of self from particular burdens rather than a willingness to shoulder burdens that of necessity have to be borne. And when it broadens out beyond that it often becomes no more than the emancipation of class, rather than the good of the whole.

Of late years freedom has come to be defined almost exclusively in terms of escape. The race is tired, has lost its nerve. But obviously true freedom can only be conceived in relation to a full and positive ideal of man and human life.

What shall that ideal be? Lippmann says "Maturity." He doesn't make clear what he means by that, but he says it is the function of what he calls "high religion" to make it clear.

I accept his latter statement. It is the function of religion to present the ideal which alone can give content to words like freedom, development, maturity, and apart from which such words are utterly misleading.

It is an interesting question to ask how far our Christianity can foot that bill.

With that question I have to stop, for the simple reason that I cannot go any further. I do not believe that it is possible for any apocalyptic seer in the world to-day to sketch in detail the perfect state of society. The crowds of orators who are doing it are not, in my judgment, apocalyptic seers. J. S. Mill was frank enough to admit that if all his schemes were realised even then the race would not be happy. Nor do I believe it possible to sit down and sketch the perfect man. The truth is both man and the race are growing. And any solution on one level presents immediately new problems and new tasks. Which means that at any point freedom is always relative. There is no finality in a finite world. And if freedom is related to the ideal, then it is always an aspiration more than a realised state. That we have to remember. But to remember it is to save freedom itself. There is no mechanical fixed framework into which we can fit human life. Perhaps the truth is that while we cannot see the goal we have some indication of the way. And salvation is found by moving in the right direction, rather than by actually attaining. The direction, we believe, is given in the salvation connected with Jesus Christ. It is His truth which will make us free. If so, to interpret that and make it clear for our time is the supreme task of religious leadership to-day.

ARTHUR DAKIN.

Faith of our Fathers, by Florence Higham, M.A., Ph.D. (Student Christian Movement Press, 5s.)

It is not surprising that the literature of the seventeenth century grows apace, for that period had much that is pertinent to this day's problems. This study of men and movements is based primarily on sources, particularly the writings of the men themselves. Great figures pass before us: Lancelot Andrews, John Robinson, George Herbert, Laud, Baxter, Bunyan and others. They belong to the common heritage of the Church of Christ. We need to know all we can about them, and this book, written with sympathy and scholarship, is a valuable contribution towards a fuller understanding of them and their ideals.

State Morality.

IN the *Spectator* for February 3rd an article appeared over the signature of Dr. Edwyn Bevan bearing the arresting title, "Should States be Unselfish?" We know only too well that in actual policy and practice States are apt to be otherwise; but the point of Dr. Bevan's argument was that in the nature of things unselfishness, an admirable virtue in individuals, was forbidden to States as something definitely wrong. Such a pronouncement from such a quarter appears to support certain tendencies in our modern civilisation which are far from being desirable; but it should be recognised at once that Dr. Bevan's purpose was not by any means to argue that moral imperatives exist for individuals but not for national or imperial communities. He affirms, however, that for States and Governments these imperatives are restricted to the ethics of justice and equity, and fall short of the law of love; they can never demand self-devotion: for no State policy has any right to be generous and altruistic to the point of national self-sacrifice. Governments, he declares, exist "to secure the interests of the people they serve, and it would not be admirable, it would be a gross breach of trust, if they were 'unselfish' in the sense . . . [that] they spent the blood and treasure of their own people in a cause from which their own people did not derive an adequate profit."

Now whatever view we may take of this contention, it is plain that it deals with a subject which affects us all, and our convictions concerning it lie at the roots of our moral life as a people—and indeed as individuals. For we all belong to the State; we are all encouraged—never more so than now—to identify ourselves with its aims and activities, just as we are all taught to regard it as the organised expression of our own genius and character as a people. To teach, therefore, that the State—the highest expression, save the Church, of humanity's life—must always be incapable of generosity and of high, sacrificial decision, and must always, though with just regard for the rights of other States, seek its own self-interested ends—to teach this must be to inculcate a doctrine which cannot but affect the character of the individual citizen.

For, on the face of it, it seems to offer the simple citizen a very depressing and cynical picture of his world. National generosity, self-sacrifice, and heroism in the protection of the weak—these virtues, which his history-books taught him to regard as part of his country's tradition, now appear to be faded out. As between States, they have no right to exist, and when they do exist they change their character and become "gross breaches

of faith." What pride, then (the simple citizen may ask himself) can one take in belonging to a close corporation concerning which, in an uncertain world, only this is certain, that never on any account, no matter what urgencies, distresses or inhumanities might exist outside its frontiers, nor what poignant appeals might be made for succour—never in any circumstance could that national corporation or imperial syndicate be expected to intervene, except on terms of "adequate profit"? And if all other States are the same, and this not by reason of general human infirmity, but of right, and according to a profound philosophical principle—well then, what is left for a simple citizen to do but surrender his ideals and make terms with the inevitable? "I am no longer anti-Government," says a disillusioned revolutionary in one of Ignazio Silone's moving stories, "I am anti-life."

Dr. Bevan's argument, however, is clearly stated. It is based upon the analogy of the ethical relationship between a trustee and his ward on the one hand, and the outside world on the other. The trustee's duty is to see that all the capital intrusted to him is soundly invested, and all the property maintained so as to preserve, and if possible increase, its value. Obviously this does not carry with it a liberty to indulge in fraud in his ward's interest; the rights of others must be scrupulously respected; but just as obviously this principle of strict honesty and justice must not be stretched to the limit of charitable benevolence. The trustee has no right to be charitable at his ward's expense, no matter how heartbreaking may be the appeal of the needy but extraneous "case." If, of course, a benevolent response were found consistent with his ward's interests—if, for example, a profitable loan could be negotiated on good security—then, naturally, the appeal could be favourably considered; but to make an advance without reasonable expectation of "adequate profit" would be "definitely wrong."

And this, according to Dr. Bevan, illustrates the relation between State and people. The State is the trustee, the people are the ward. We may assume also that the national or imperial territory and revenue, with all other assets, constitute the ward's estate. Therefore, for a Government (and the action of Governments is the action of States) to embark upon a policy of heroic "unselfishness" and pledge the blood and treasure of its own people in a cause, however good, from which they did not derive an "adequate profit," would be a gross breach of trust. States cannot be unselfish. For, moreover, even if the ward (the people) expressly charged the trustee (the Government "acting for the State") to make this sacrifice of blood and treasure—even so, the trustee might not be justified in yielding. For the ward may not really know his own mind, may not be unanimous

within himself, may be obeying only a rash and temporary impulse, or may not appreciate the possible consequences of the action he urges; in which case the wise trustee may well set aside his ward's mandate as one that does not represent his ward's better judgment, and is therefore ill-informed and irresponsible.

* * * *

Now it may be admitted that arguments from analogy call for close examination, and in this instance we may be justified in inquiring if Dr. Bevan's analogy is comprehensive enough to sustain the ethical inferences which he draws or the conclusions which he indicates. For is it dealing fairly with the complicated human situation as it exists to-day to invite us to concentrate upon an analogy in which we are presented with a trustee and his ward on one side and an unspecified, nondescript accumulation of needy "cases" on the other? Or, if it is not wholly fair to Dr. Bevan to say that his analogue presents only a trustee and his ward against a background of troublesome and esurient outsiders, at least it must be said that the whole emphasis of his analogy falls upon the obligation of the trustee to the ward, and that the existence of other wards and other trustees is recognised only to show that there is no real bond between the first pair and the others—between *any* pair and the rest—save that they should deal justly by one another.

But is it not true that, in this reference, all our ethical thinking is likely to go astray if it begins with the nation and not with Humanity? Our duty to Humanity takes ethical precedence of our duty to the national State. Nothing has transpired in the last hundred years to invalidate Mazzini's exhortation to his Italian working-men in 1846:

> "Your first duties, first not in time but in importance, since without understanding these you can fulfil only imperfectly the rest, are to Humanity. You have duties as citizens, as sons, as husbands and as fathers, duties sacred and inviolable; but that which makes them sacred and inviolable is the mission, the Duty, which your nature as *men* demands of you."

Therefore, if Dr. Bevan's analogy is to represent the human situation, must we not enlarge it? Must we not bring *all* the wards fairly into the picture and show that they are members of one and the same family? And must we not show, therefore, that all the trustees discharge their responsibilities within that family—that is, that each trustee represents the interests, not of an isolated individual, but of a ward who is brother to all the other wards and who possesses a share, however unequal, in what

is really the family estate? In other words, before we begin to draw profound ethical inferences about the duties of a national or imperial State towards its people and towards other peoples, must we not first of all recognise that Humanity exists and that all nations belong to it? Humanity is the family and the nations are the individual members of that family; the common family estate, however unequally parcelled out, is the world and its resources: and States and Governments exercise their functions within this comprehensive relationship.

Of course, it may be urged that this picture, agreeable though it may be to moralisers of an idealistic sort, is well outside the sphere of political realism. But "realism" in the political sense hardly defines the limits of Dr. Bevan's argument, for the question which he poses is not primarily a question of political expediency but of ethics—"Should States be Unselfish?" And certainly Dr. Bevan would not object to this elaboration of his analogy as a representation of an ideal polity. It is indeed in line with the idea of so close a link-up of States as to make it consistent with the self-interest of each to serve the interests of all—an idea which it is possible to trace in faint outline in his own article. But in the sphere of ethics, does not this idea represent obligations and responsibilities that are already with us? Humanity is not a fantasy or an expectation, but a moral fact; the solidarity of the human race is a fact; it is a fact that all nations and peoples are related to one another as members of the human family. That this fact is not reflected in the actual organisation of the world does not constitute a denial of its existence. To work it out into a *polity* belongs to the responsibility of States as trustees, collectively, of the interests of mankind.

Now to grant the validity of this enlargement of Dr. Bevan's analogy is to concede that the simple relationship of trustee and ward, from which he draws his ethical inference, has now become vastly more complex, so that the inference needs re-examination. We must imagine a *family* of wards, each with a trustee in charge of his interests. Suppose, then, that by reason of some natural calamity, or by the sharp practice of one or more of the trustees, the property of one of the wards were taken out of his hands and he himself reduced to beggary: would any one of the remaining trustees be justified in defining his obligations as governed by one sole consideration—his regard for the material interests of his own ward? Would he be justified in saying, "I will agree to help only if there is adequate profit in it"? For Dr. Bevan concedes, or rather insists, that the trustee's devotion to his ward's interests must be subordinated to the rule of justice. He may not over-reach others to secure advantage for his ward. Therefore he must acknowledge an imperative

superior even to his ward's interests. At what point does this imperative cease to function?

What, in any case one might ask, would the wards themselves have to say in this matter? Would there be no such thing as family feeling, no family loyalty, no regard for the family's good name? Can there in no conceivable set of circumstances emerge a crisis in which the utter need of one member of the family—perhaps by reason of some flagrant breach of faith practised in the name of another member—becomes so pressing and poignant that in the presence of its urgent claims all considerations of self-interest must give way to the demands of kinship, of family honour? And must we be told that no trustee who knows his duty ought to allow his ward to recognise these higher claims except on a basis of "adequate profit"?

In that case two questions arise. One is, What does Dr. Bevan mean by "profit"? (And if the trustee must concentrate upon the "interests" of his ward, what are the limits of those "interests"?) Is it not precisely here that we are brought into that region of paradox into which all ethical considerations are apt to lead us? Is it indeed "profitable" to sacrifice everything to "adequate profit"? What shall it profit a ward if, through his trustee's single-eyed devotion to "profits," he increase his estate and lose his soul? The trustee must regard his ward's interests as always the decisive consideration? Then is there not a possibility that by so doing he will betray them? Will it be to his ward's *interest* that, for the sake of his "interests," he lose his honour, his good name, through a selfish disregard for the good name of the family? Verily his action may be strictly "just" and "within the law," but by offering such a defence he may defend himself not at all, but utterly expose and rout his reputation.

And this is no academic quibble, no piece of irrelevant casuistry. Dr. Bevan's article was called forth by our foreign policy in relation to the Spanish question. Clearly that specific question cannot be discussed here; but one must press the main issue: Is it true to say that a Government, acting for the State as trustee of the interests of the people, can never, without a gross breach of trust, pursue a policy whose aim is other than "adequate profit" for its own country? Is not the State (and the Government acting for the State) the trustee also of a nation's honour, its conscience, its *morale,* its loyalty to the cause of humanity; and may not these imponderable but most precious values conceivably be destroyed by a policy of "adequate profit"? Moreover, is it not exactly in terms of these imponderables, in terms of honour, of self-sacrifice, of chivalrous devotion to the weak and oppressed, that States and Governments are apt to

describe their policies in the critical hour? And does it belong to the honour and fidelity of trustees that they should dupe their wards with monumental lies? To argue that any doctrine of the altruism of States could be perverted by zealotry into something bizarre and ruinous is beside the point; just as it is beside the point to affirm that States must be duly mindful of their own interests. What is in dispute is that States are principled in a necessary selfishness, that each one is a close corporation whose policy must always be that of "adequate profit" for itself, and that on no account can it act generously and sacrificially or recognise the claims of any cause as higher than its own interests. Such a theory, endorsed by the wise and prudent, and elevated to the level of a moral principle, seems to constitute a denial of Humanity and a real degradation of the currency of conscience.

And so we come to the second, and final, question. Dr. Bevan, in his analogy of the trustee and his ward, assumes that all judgments and decisions rest with the trustee, who has the right to over-rule the will of his ward. This is an analogy which is certainly applicable to Totalitarian States and their people, but does it apply to democratic Governments? One had imagined that, in theory at least, the broad lines of national policy, whether self-interested or generous and self-sacrificing, were determined by the people: but apparently, even in respect of democracies, Dr. Bevan thinks otherwise. "Might a Government [he inquires] not conscientiously sacrifice the interests of its own people for some other people, if it had first ascertained that its own people desired the sacrifice?" And he replies: "It would, I think, be enormously difficult for a Government to be sure of this—to be sure that, if there was some wave of generous emotion which made the people cry out for an action by which its own interests were sacrificed, the full implications and consequences of the action were realised, and whether, if they were realised, the people as a whole would still be willing to consummate the sacrifice." The popular mandate may be set aside as emotional and irresponsible if it challenges the one inviolable principle of the selfishness of States.

GWILYM O. GRIFFITH.

A Student's Appreciation, 1817.

(The following letter, sent by a student to the committee of the Stepney Academical Institution on the 27th May, 1817, may be suggestive to present-day students.)

"THE four years on which I entered, 3rd August 1813, being nearly expired, I take the present opportunity of expressing my gratitude for the favours I have received through your patronage. Next to being called by the grace of God from darkness to light, and to the great work of the Christian ministry, I consider my being placed at Stepney one of the greatest blessings Heaven could bestow. Here I have been led more fully to perceive the darkness of the human mind. Here, while engaged in the study of the Bible, I have been led to behold more clearly the exceeding riches of Divine grace, and the suitability of the Saviour to man's necessities; and I trust I may say that here too the fire of devotion has been strengthened. I know that it is frequently said that, in societies of this kind, the student's mind is so taken up by literary pursuits that piety is suffered to languish, and not infrequently to die. What may have taken place in other institutions, it is not for me to say: to one thing I can bear testimony that, in your institution by regularity of discipline—by earnest and affectionate admonitions—and, above all, by holiness of life our Tutors have ever led us to consider piety as the first thing to be regarded; as that only, which can sanctify our studies and make us blessings to the Church and to the world.

"To my Tutors, as well as to you, I shall feel myself indebted to the latest period of my life, and affection for them, I hope, will ever be cherished in my breast. I trust the instructions which they have imparted will not be as seed sown on a barren soil. It is my earnest prayer that they may have to rejoice over me as a son whom they have brought up for the service of the sanctuary. If I feel one regret, in reviewing the period I have spent in this house, it is that my acquisitions bear so small a proportion to the advantages with which I have been favoured. Yet, I trust, I have tasted so much of the pleasure of study as will not only induce me still to engage in it but will lead me to consider it a source of the purest and highest enjoyment. On leaving this place I look forward to the more stated engagements of a minister with mingled feelings of fear and joy. Wherever I may be placed by providence I trust it will ever be my determination to know nothing among men but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Adhering to the truths which He has taught I would pray, and humbly hope to prove a blessing to the Church, and an honour to your Institution."

Richard Baxter and "The Reformed Pastor."

"ABOUT thirty years ago [actually on February 26th, 1907] the late T. H. Martin, of Adelaide Place, Glasgow, read a most searching paper to the West of Scotland Ministers' Fraternal on *The Reformed Pastor,* by Richard Baxter. It left a very profound impression, and sent many a man back to Baxter with fruitful results. I have read a great many books on the work of the ministry, but in my opinion Baxter's classic has a quality all its own, and the reading or re-reading of it at the present time might go far to renew our fitness for our great task."

From a letter signed "One of Them" in the *Baptist Times,* December 22nd, 1938.

By the kindness of Dr. Martin's son, the Rev. Hugh Martin, M.A., we are privileged to print the paper.

* * * *

"No man," says Macaulay, "stood higher in the estimation of the Protestant Dissenters than Richard Baxter. . . . The integrity of his heart, the purity of his life, the vigour of his faculties, and the extent of his attainments were acknowledged by the best and wisest men of every persuasion."

A brief sketch of a man who reached such a position in his day is desirable before we proceed to consider the book which is our special concern. Baxter was born at Rowton, in Shropshire, on November 12th, 1615. In his own narrative of his life and times he says that his father "had the competent estate of a freeholder, free from the temptations of poverty and riches; but, having been addicted to gaming in his youth, and his father before him, it was so entangled by debts that it occasioned some excess of worldly cares before it was freed." About the time of Baxter's birth, however, his father came under religious impressions, and seems to have reformed his life. He became the object of scorn on this account to his former associates, and as his son remarks, "all who sought to serve God in sincerity were called by the name of Puritan, Precisian and Hypocrite," so uncommon was a life of godliness in those times.

His father's conduct was so true and consistent that it led to Baxter's own conversion when a youth of sixteen. He has left behind him a catalogue of the sins of his boyhood—among

which the worst he could mention were irreverence towards his parents and occasional gaming for money; while he adds, what few boys would consider a matter of conscience at all, "I was much addicted to the gluttonous eating of apples and pears, which, I think, laid the foundation of that weakness of my stomach which caused the bodily calamity of my life. To this end and to concur with naughty boys that gloried in evil, I have often gone into other men's orchards, and stolen their fruits, when I had enough at home."

Baxter's early education was utterly negligible. He suffered from incompetent teachers, men of worthless character, who were supposed to give him private tuition. From his sixteenth to his nineteenth year he was a pupil teacher at the endowed school at Wroxeter, where he seems to have acquired little strictly scholastic knowledge except "as much Latin as enabled him to use it in after life with reckless facility." Still, he appears to have used his time in private study and reading to considerable purpose. The mental capacity he afterwards displayed could not have been wholly dormant, and the foundation of his immense erudition must have been laid in these early days. His youth covered years in the history of England which were filled with political and religious events ominous of revolution. He could not have escaped their influence had he wished to do so. Indeed, it is obvious that his bent of mind was such that he launched eagerly upon the sea of speculation which opened before his adventurous spirit. During the three or four years which elapsed before he began his ministry at Kidderminster—which were spent in teaching in schools at Dudley and Bridgnorth, and in occasional attempts at exercising his gifts as a preacher—he was in deep mental trouble. He had to fight his way against the spectres of the mind that opposed him at every step towards the light. He so abhorred self-deception that he was determined, he says, to probe every question to its utmost; and though he emerged victorious from the conflict and was a man of profound convictions, he bore the marks of the severity of the struggle all his life.

He was called to the curacy of the Kidderminster Parish Church in March, 1640, though his legal appointment was delayed for a year. It came about, he tells us, in this wise. "The Long Parliament, among other parts of their reformation, resolved to reform the corrupted clergy, and appointed a Commission to receive petitions and complaints against them; which was no sooner understood but multitudes in all counties came up with petitions against their ministers. Among these complainers the town of Kidderminister drew up a petition against their minister; as one that was utterly insufficient for the ministry, unlearned,

preached but once a quarter, which was so weakly as exposed him to laughter and persuaded them that he understood not the very substantial articles of Christianity, that he frequented alehouses and had sometimes been drunk, and more such as this." The vicar, conscious of his inability, hastily agreed with his parishioners that a curate should be appointed—when Baxter was chosen by a unanimous vote.

Then, says Baxter, his ministry had scarcely begun when his intellectual questionings assailed him afresh, doubts of the truth of the Scriptures, of the life to come and of the immortality of the soul, insomuch that "under the pretence of sober reason," he was almost drawn to "a settled doubting of Christianity." The outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, however, brought him out of this labyrinth where he was winding his painful and solitary way, to consider the stern realities of life. He was obliged to retire from Kidderminster for a while on account of his sympathy with the party of the Parliament, and was invited by Cromwell to become chaplain in his own regiment. This he declined, but was induced later to become chaplain to another regiment under Colonel Whalley. While holding this post he seems to have been much disturbed by the religious and political opinions current among the sectaries, as he calls them, in the army. Being still a Churchman and an episcopalian he thought it his duty to dispute with them, and many pitched battles ensued. He describes one of them, held at Amersham, thus: "When the talking day came I took the reading pew and Pitchford's cornet and troopers took the gallery, and I alone disputed with them from morning until almost night." Too old and wary a campaigner to retire in the presence of the enemy, he naïvely adds: "I staid it out till they first rose and went away." Cromwell viewed these polemics on the part of Baxter with undisguised aversion. "He would not dispute with me at all," says the good man, with evident surprise.

At the close of the Civil War, Baxter returned to his charge at Kidderminster and worked there for fourteen years, during the whole period of the Commonwealth, undisturbed. His ministry was blessed with extraordinary success and brought him undying fame as a preacher and pastor. He succeeded, indeed, in changing the whole aspect of the town from a religious point of view. The commodious church was so crowded that five galleries were one after another erected within it. He was a strict disciplinarian, and would allow none but the worthy to come to the Lord's Supper, a great innovation in an established church, where it was the custom to grant indiscriminate communion to all and sundry, and an innovation which brought him a good deal of trouble. Multitudes were converted by his faithful

word and example, and a lasting improvement for good was produced far and wide in the West of England.

In addition to his own labours, he was often consulted by men in high places on many questions of Church and State which were being fiercely agitated. He was invited on one occasion to preach before Cromwell, the Lord Protector, when his sermon was not altogether pleasing to the chief auditor. Cromwell sent for him afterwards and held a long discussion of four or five hours' duration in which Baxter did not get his own way, apparently, for he complains that Cromwell uttered a long and tedious speech for over an hour before Baxter could get a word in! The fact is, Baxter had not a clear mind on the principles of civil and religious liberty for which Cromwell stood, and did not arrive at Cromwell's standpoint until long after this period of his life. It was after the Restoration of Charles II. that Baxter began to change his mind and became a Nonconformist. He had already imbibed a profound respect for many Dissenters who were among his personal friends, and it was when he saw these godly men being persecuted, as he says, by ungodly bishops, that he altered his views. Two considerations finally determined him to join the Nonconformists entirely; first, the want of discipline in the Church of England and the promiscuous giving of the Lord's Supper; and secondly, the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, which required him to say that there was nothing in them contrary to Scripture, "a wholesale order," he says, which he could not endorse.

When the Act of Uniformity came into operation in 1662, Baxter and two thousand other ministers threw up their livings and became the virtual founders of modern Nonconformity. Attempts were made to retain many of the more able and noted of these ministers, and Baxter himself was offered a bishopric by Charles II. which he declined. He was once invited to preach at Court, when his sermon of two hours on the dangers of a sensual and worldly life was so distasteful to the king that he remarked that "Presbyterianism was clearly not the religion for a gentleman."

Baxter also had an audience, along with other divines, with the king, whom they tried to dissuade from the reactionary policy his advisers were thrusting upon him in church affairs. Baxter's own account of what he said is worth quoting, as showing the honesty and boldness of his speech. "I presumed to tell him that the late usurpers so well understood their own interests that to promote it they had found the way of doing good to be the most effective means, and had placed and encouraged many thousand faithful ministers in the Church, even such as detested their usurpation. Wherefore I humbly craved his majesty's

patience to ask that he would never suffer himself to be tempted to undo the good which Cromwell had done, because they were usurpers that did it, or discountenance a faithful minister because his enemies had set him up." Such plain speaking could not be palatable to Charles and his advisers.

It is unnecessary to pursue Baxter's career as a Nonconformist in detail. Suffice it to say that he was subject to all manner of persecution under the various Acts passed against dissenters. He was not allowed to preach except on sufferance, he often changed his residence, and lived mostly in retired spots, since the Five Mile Act prohibited from living within that distance of any corporate town under pain of arrest. He did not remain idle, however. Books and pamphlets on all the questions of the day issued from his pen with astonishing rapidity. He is responsible for no less than 168 separate productions, which if put together would fill sixty octavo volumes.

His writings finally brought him into trouble. He was several times in prison for short terms for venturing to preach, but his publication of a commentary on the New Testament, in which he animadverted strongly on the character and conduct of certain bishops, led to his final arrest in 1685, in the reign of James II. He was brought into the Court of King's Bench before the notorious Chief Justice Jeffreys who furnished Bunyan with the features of Lord Hategood. Calamy relates the course of the trial, which was a scandal and a disgrace. When Baxter appeared he pleaded for time to prepare his defence. Jeffreys burst into a storm of rage. "Not a minute to save his life," cried the judge, "I can deal with saints as well as with sinners." The Court was crowded with Nonconformist and Church of England divines who loved and honoured Baxter. At his side stood Dr. Wm. Bates, the most eminent of the Nonconformists. Two Whig barristers of great note, Pollexfen and Wallop, appeared for the defendant. When the former began his address the judge interrupted him. "Pollexfen, I know you well. I will set a mark on you. You are the patron of the faction. This is an old rogue, a schismatical knave, a hypocritical villain. He hates the liturgy. He would have nothing but long-winded cant without book." And then his lordship turned up his eyes, clasped his hands and began to sing through his nose, in imitation of what he supposed to be Baxter's style of praying: "Lord, we are Thy people, Thy peculiar people, Thy dear people." Pollexfen gently reminded the Court that his late Majesty had thought Baxter deserving of a bishopric. "And what ailed the old blockhead, then," cried Jeffreys, "that he did not take it?" His fury rose to madness. He called Baxter a dog and swore it would be no more than justice to whip such a villain through the city.

Baxter's second counsel attempted to interpose, but was browbeaten and compelled to sit down. Baxter then put in a word for himself. "My lord," said the old man, "I have been much blamed by dissenters for speaking respectfully of bishops." "Baxter for bishops!" cried the judge. "That's a merry conceit indeed. I know what you mean by bishops, rascals like yourself, Kidderminster bishops, factious, snivelling Presbyterians." Baxter again essayed to speak, and again Jeffreys bellowed, "Richard, Richard, dost thou think we will let thee poison the Court? Richard, thou art an old knave. Thou hast written books enough to load a cart, and every book as full of sedition as an egg is full of meat. By the grace of God I'll look after thee. I see a great many of your brotherhood waiting to know what will befall their mighty don. And there is a Doctor of the party at your elbow. But by the grace of God Almighty I will crush you all." Then one of the junior counsel proceeded to show that the words in Baxter's book would not bear the construction put upon them in the indictment, but as soon as he began to read the context Jeffreys shouted, "You shan't turn Court into a conventicle." The Chief Justice would hear nothing, and prepared to deliver sentence. Then Baxter ventured on the remark, "Does your lordship think that any jury will convict a man on such a trial as this?" "I warrant you, Mr. Baxter," said Jeffreys. "Don't trouble yourself about that." And he was right. The Sheriff had a packed jury, who instantly returned a verdict of guilty. The sentence was two years' imprisonment. Jeffreys further desired to have Baxter whipped at the cart's tail, but this was disallowed by his brethren on the bench. So ended a trial, like many another in those days, which was a perfect travesty of justice.

Baxter was released early in 1687, before the two years were up, by the intervention of his friends. But he never wholly recovered from the effects of his confinement, though he lingered in ill-health for several years and died on December 8th, 1691.

The amount and quality of Baxter's work constituted a marvel to his friends. They never could understand how one who from his youth was afflicted with various chronic diseases, and held soul and body together only with difficulty, could accomplish so much. Sir James Stephen, in his essay on Baxter, speaking of the difficulty of characterising him in a few words, says, "Men of his size are not to be drawn in miniature." He speaks of him as "calling to his aid an extent of theological and scholastic lore sufficient to equip a whole college of divines, and moving beneath the load with unencumbered freedom."

Baxter's two most famous books are *The Saints' Everlasting Rest* and *The Reformed Pastor*. I now turn briefly to review

the latter. Doddridge said that this was "a most extraordinary performance, and should be read by every young minister, and the practical part of it reviewed every three or four years; for nothing would have a greater tendency to awaken the spirit of a minister to that zeal in his work for want of which many good men are but shadows of what they might be."

As a modern book on the ministry it might be considered defective in various ways, the growth of the Church in many directions and the changed circumstances of religious life having altered our conceptions of ministerial duty. But in the prosecution and enforcement of the essential motives of the minister's work it cannot be surpassed. When we leave out its references to the controversies of Baxter's own day and make all allowance for the archaic terms he uses, and the quaint old-world allusions which were customary among his contemporaries, the prime thought of the book is well worth earnest study.

Baxter was asked by the ministers of the county of Worcester to preach to them on a Day of Humiliation which they proposed to hold on December 4th, 1655. He was unable through ill health to fulfil his engagement, but the sermon he had prepared was expanded into the treatise and published. It is dedicated "To my Reverend and Dearly beloved Brethren, the faithful ministers of Christ in Britain and Ireland." In the course of his dedicatory remarks he says: "If it be objected that I should not have spoken so plainly and sharply against the sins of the ministry, or that I should not have published it to the view of the world; or at best that I should have done it in another tongue and not in the ears of the vulgar; and especially at such a time when Quakers and Papists are endeavouring to bring the ministry into contempt . . . I confess I thought the objection very considerable, but that it prevailed not to alter my resolution is to be ascribed to the following reasons. (1) It was prepared for a solemn humiliation agreed upon. (2) It was our own sins that the confession did concern, and who can be offended with us for confessing our own sins, and (3) if the ministry had sinned only in Latin I would have made shift to admonish them in Latin; but if they will sin in English, they must hear of it in English. (4) Too many who have undertaken the work of the ministry do so obstinately proceed in self-seeking, negligence, pride and other sins that it is become our necessary duty to admonish them. If we saw that such would reform without reproof, we would gladly forbear the publishing of their faults, but when reproofs themselves prove so ineffectual that they are more offended at the reproof than at the sin, I think it is time to sharpen the remedy."

The general plan of the work is as follows: 1. The Over-

sight of ourselves, its nature and motives. 2. The Oversight of the flock, its nature, manner and motives. 3. The Application as to the use of personal humiliation and as to the duty of the pastor's work. The best part is undoubtedly the first, dealing with the minister's oversight of himself. It is that part which is most universally applicable, much of the two other sections being local and temporary in character. I cannot do better than give you a brief resumé, quoting as often as may be Baxter's own terse and pungent language.

WHAT IS IT TO TAKE HEED TO OURSELVES?

1. See that the work of saving grace be thoroughly wrought in your own souls. Many a tailor goes in rags that maketh costly clothes for others; and many a cook scarcely licks his fingers, when he hath dressed for others the most costly dishes. God never saved any man for being a preacher, nor because he was an able preacher, but because he was a justified, sanctified man and consistently faithful in his master's work. Can any reasonable man imagine that God could save men for offering salvation to others while they refused it themselves, and for telling others those truths which they themselves neglected and abused. It is a common calamity and danger of the Church to have unregenerate and inexperienced pastors, who worship an unknown God and preach an unknown Christ, and pray through an unknown Spirit, and recommend a state of holiness and communion with God, alike unknown. He is like to be but a heartless preacher that hath not the Christ in his heart.

2. Keep your graces in vigilant and lively exercise. Preach to yourselves before you preach to others. If you publish the distempers of your own soul, as you cannot help doing, you will affect your flock. When I am cold my preaching is cold and when I am confused my preaching is confused. Watch over your own hearts, keep out lusts and passions and worldly inclinations, keep up the life of faith and love and zeal. Be much at home and be much with God.

3. Take heed to yourselves lest your example contradict your doctrine. If you unsay with your lives what you say with your tongues, you will be the greatest hindrances of your own labour. This is the way to make men think that the Word of God is but an idle tale, and to make preaching seem no better than prating. It is a palpable error of some ministers who study hard to preach exactly and study little or not at all to live exactly. How curiously (i.e. carefully) have I heard some men preach and how carelessly have I seen them live! They that were most impatient of barbarisms, solecisms, and paralogisms in a sermon could easily tolerate them in their life and conversation.

4. Take heed to yourselves that you want not the qualifications necessary for your work. What knowledge is needed, what acquaintance with the fundamental principles of religion, with the exposition of Scripture, with the subtleties of conscience and with the prejudices that keep men from the truth? What men should we be in skill, resolution and unwearied diligence, in order to convince our hearers, to let irresistible light into their consciences, to screw the truth into their minds and work Christ into their affections, and to drive sinners to a stand? Will a common measure of diligence and ability and prudence serve for such a task as this? I know that laziness hath learned to allege the vanity of study and how entirely the Spirit must qualify us for our work—as if God commanded us the use of means and then warned us to neglect them; as if it were His way to cause us to thrive in a course of idleness and to bring us to knowledge by dreams when we are asleep, or to take us up into heaven and show us His counsels while we think of no such matter, but are idling away our time on earth! O that men should dare by their laziness to quench the Spirit —and then pretend the Spirit for the doing of it! Take heed therefore lest you mar the work of God by your own negligence.

Consider then some motives to awaken us to this duty toward ourselves.

1. You have a soul to be saved and a heaven to win or lose, and therefore it concerneth you to begin at home. Shall we fail ourselves, and all because we preached so many sermons of Christ while we neglected *Him,* of the Spirit while we resisted Him, of faith while we did not ourselves believe, of repentance while we continued unpenitent, of a heavenly life while we remained carnal. Believe it, sirs, God is no respecter of persons: He saveth not men for their coats or callings; a holy calling will not save an unholy man.

2. Take heed to yourselves because you have a depraved nature and sinful inclinations as well as others. If one thief be in the house he will let in the rest. One sin inclineth the mind to more; a small disease may cause a greater. Many a noisome vice may spring up again that you thought had been weeded out by the root.

3. Take heed because the tempter will ply you with temptations more than other men. If you will be leaders, you give the larger mark. The devil is a greater scholar than you and a nimbler disputant and will trip up your heels before you are aware. He will play the juggler with you undiscerned and cheat you of your faith or innocency and you shall not know that you have lost it. You shall see neither hook nor line, much less the

subtle angler himself, while he is offering you his bait, and the bait will be suited to your temper and disposition.

4. Take heed because there are many eyes upon you. You cannot miscarry but the world will ring of it.

5. Take heed because your sins are more aggravated than other men's. You sin against more light and knowledge. Your sins have more hypocrisy in them, and are more perfidious to the cause of religion.

6. Take heed because your great work requires greater grace.

7. Take heed for the honour of your Master and His truth. As you may render Him more service, so may you render Him more disservice than others.

8. Take heed because the success of your labours depends upon the spiritual fitness of the instrument God uses. He cannot use the self-seeker, the man of unserious mind, or those unfaithful to the call of duty. Specially are they unusable who live in sin, for that man cannot be true to Christ who is in covenant with the enemy. A traitorous commander that shooteth nothing against the enemy but powder may cause his guns to make as great a sound as those that are loaded with bullets, but he doth no hurt to the enemy. The people themselves will not regard the teaching of a man who does not live as he preaches, for all that a minister does is a kind of preaching. They will take the pulpit to be but a stage, where ministers must show themselves and strut and play their parts.

In the second section of the Treatise, that on the Oversight of the Flock, there is little to arrest attention in the first part regarding the nature of the work. When, however, he comes to discuss the manner in which that work should be done, it is well to pause here and there, as for instance on the matter of preaching.

We must throughout our ministry insist chiefly upon the greatest, most certain and most necessary truths, and be more seldom and sparing upon the rest. The great truths are those that men must live upon, which are the instruments of destroying men's sins and raising the heart to God. If we can but teach Christ to our people, we shall teach them all. And all our teaching must be pain and simple, suited to the capacity of our hearers. If you would not teach men, what do you in the pulpit? If you would, why do you not speak so as to be understood? It is commonly simple, ignorant men that are over curious and solicitous about words and ornaments. As Aristotle makes it the reason why women are more addicted to pride in apparel than men, that being conscious of little individual worth, they seek to make it up with outward borrowed ornaments, so it is with empty worthless preachers.

And moreover our work must be done with great humility. We must so teach others as to be ready to learn; and not proudly venting our own conceits as if we had attained to the height of knowledge. Pride is a vice that ill beseems them that lead others in a humble way to heaven. Let us take heed lest when we have brought others thither, the gate should prove too strait for ourselves. We must also work in a reverent spirit, as in the presence of God, not using holy things as common. Especially ought we to keep up earnest desires and expectations of success. All who preach for Christ and men's salvation should be unsatisfied till they have the thing they preach for. He is never a true preacher who is indifferent whether he obtaineth the ends of preaching and is not grieved when he misseth them. I know that a faithful minister may have comfort when he wants success, and our acceptance is not according to our fruit but to our labour, but he that longeth not for success can have no comfort, because he is not a faithful labourer. Therefore must we cherish a deep sense of our own insufficiency, and our entire dependence on Christ and His Spirit.

In the third section, which contains the Application of the whole subject, the most interesting part is that in which he deals with the uses of Humiliation, and this he does in the most incisive manner. He first deals at considerable length with the sin of pride and points out how subtly it may enter into the character and work of a minister. It may arise from the office he holds, from the desire of winning vain applause for mere oratory, from the possession of superior knowledge, even from the fame of godliness.

Then he turns to the sin of negligence, which may show itself in the neglect of study, in slipshod preparation for the pulpit, in trusting to mere promptitude of speech in delivery; or it may show itself in drowsy preaching, which neither awakens conscience nor moves the heart. Then there is the sin of a worldly, temporising policy which makes the preacher afraid to speak out his mind.

It is unnecessary to enter into the chapter upon the duty of personal instruction of the flock. Much of it is obvious, much of it is irrelevant to the custom of our churches and, indeed, would not be submitted to by our people. I will conclude with one paragraph of a general character. "What have we our time and strength for, but to lay them out for God? What is a candle made for but to burn? Burned and wasted we must be, and is it not fitter it should be in lighting men to heaven and in working for God than in living to the flesh? How little difference is there between the pleasures of a long and of a short life when they are both at the end? What comfort will it

be to you at death that you lengthened your life by shortening your work? He that worketh much, liveth much."

T. H. MARTIN.

JOSEPH BUNYAN was christened at St. Cuthbert's, Bedford, on November 16th, 1672. He was apparently son of John, the eldest son of the great John, who had been released from the County Jail in May: the evidence was given in our *Transactions*, II., 255. He married in St. Paul's, 1694, and buried his second child two years later. Dr. Brown could find nothing further about him.

It is a reasonable guess that the following entries refer to him, or to his son. The fourth Duke of Bedford decided to rebuild Woburn Abbey. Stone was quarried at Ketton, carted to Wansford, barged to Bedford. "February 14, 1748/9, to April 29, 1749. Joseph Bunyon's bill of stone carriage from Bedford for Woburn Abbey for His Grace the Duke of Bedford, £20 14. 0." The estate accounts, published by the British Archaelogical Society, vol. III., page 158, show also the final deal: "His Grace John Duke of Bedford, Debtor to John Tuffnail for loading beer for twenty load of stone and lead and reeds, the last load carried by Joseph Bunnion the 20th of January, 1749 [i.e. 1749/50] . . . Joseph Bunnion 4 quarts, 1s. 4d."

W. T. W.

Early Days at East Street, Walworth.

THE "village" of Walworth—the name sounds strangely to those who know Walworth as it is to-day, with its street markets, its busy thoroughfares, its crowded population—yet so it was only about 150 years ago. Then, as now, London's suburbs were developing, but at that time they were only two miles from the centre. Then, as now, some landowners seem to have realised the added value to their estates of a church or chapel; and so it is recorded that a Mr. Penton, whose name survives to-day in Penton Place, Walworth, when selling some of his land to a Mr. Clutton, stipulated that a place of worship should be erected on part thereof. The expectation was that the building to be erected would be used by the Church of England as what, in those days, was called a "Chapel of Ease" to the Parish Church of St. Mary, Newington, which then stood in Newington Butts, its site being marked to-day by the clock tower, which will be familiar to many. The Parish Church seems to have had but a small congregation, and the offer was not accepted. About this time, however, Mrs. Mary Hills, of King's Row, Walworth, "because the village of Walworth was destitute of any place of worship where the Protestant friends of true religion could enjoy the public means of grace," opened her house for worship. To do this she had to obtain a licence from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and it is well to note that in the application for registration it is said to be for "religious worship by a congregation of Protestants dissenting from the Church of England who scruple the Baptizing of Infants, commonly called Baptists." The first service was conducted on Thursday, April 1st, 1779, by John Macgowan, of Devonshire Square, "in the presence of many well-wishers to the cause of Christ, who purposely attended to favour the undertaking." It was decided to continue the service each Thursday evening, neighbouring dissenting ministers, including Dr. John Rippon, having promised to serve in turn as lecturers. The attendance usually numbered more than could conveniently be seated.

But the way was opening for a more suitable meeting place. On June 8th, 1779 (only a few weeks after the first meeting at Mrs. Hills' house), Mr. Penton had conveyed a piece of freehold land in East Lane (now East Street) to Mr. Clutton on the condition to which we have referred, specifying the dimensions of the building to be erected, and that it must be erected within a limited period. Repeated offers to the Anglican Church having been declined, Mr. Clutton, mindful of the success of the dissenting meeting, offered to Mrs. Hills a piece of his land having a frontage of 70 feet and a depth of 100 feet, and, in addition, a

gift of 30,000 bricks. The offer was accepted because, to quote the Minutes, it was considered "that it might be the means of introducing the knowledge of God and practice of true religion more effectively than would be done in a private house, and that thereby an opportunity would be afforded, at a proper season, for such of the disciples of Jesus as should be so disposed to form themselves into a Christian Society, by entering into Church Union one with another under a settled pastor, and by conforming in Doctrines, Discipline, Government and Preaching to the pattern given to the Saints in the living oracles of Truth."

A building fund was opened at once, a Mrs. Sarah Cox promising £100. Trustees were soon appointed, and be it known that, in 1779, these daring dissenters included in the number of trustees two women. The total number—as in many churches—was thirteen, for that number never seems to have alarmed our dissenting forbears. Careful folks, too, were these trustees. They sent a deputation to Mrs. Cox to "request her to sign a paper to secure the payments of her subscription," and a later minute of the trustees, who usually met at the "Sir William Walworth," states that the deputation produced the security which Mrs. Cox had executed. On June 1st, 1780, the meeting house was opened, and arrangements were then made for the Sunday evening and Thursday evening "lectures" by neighbouring ministers, to whom a special letter was sent requesting them to be "very punctual," as any disappointment of a supply would be exceedingly disagreeable and might have an effect on the village very different from that which the united endeavours of the lecturers and trustees were calculated to produce. One wonders why the reference to punctuality was made. Half-a-guinea was paid to the lecturer for each service—by no means a meagre sum for a new and struggling society.

Less than twelve months after the opening services it was reported that the total cost of the building had been £583 18s. 1d., towards which £392 5s. 2d. had been subscribed. In order that the treasurer might not have to bear the deficiency until funds were raised, the money was advanced in varying amounts by some of the trustees. Among the efforts to raise funds was an annual dinner at Grove House, which seems to have been a tavern with tea gardens, a popular resort at Camberwell Green. At least on one occasion the charge for the dinner was 5s. each, but the records show that the attendance at these functions was not large.

There was a cellar beneath the chapel which was for a time let to a local publican. In later years it was used as a burial place, and when, some thirty years ago, the writer became moderator of the church, it had a more dignified name and was the crypt. It is interesting to learn from an early resolution

recorded in the trustees' Minutes that it was resolved that a proper opening be left in the centre ceiling to discharge the hot air, and to read that a resolution of the trustees required that a portion of scripture selected at the discretion of the minister should be read in the course of each Lord's Day morning service —before the first prayer.

The particulars of the opening service on Thursday, June 1st, 1780, read curiously to-day. First there was a hymn, then an introductory statement, and the reading of several passages of scripture and an opening prayer by Benjamin Wallin, of Maze Pond, then another hymn, sermon by Samuel Stennett on Luke vii. 5, then prayer and a further hymn, and a sermon by a Mr. Brewer on Psalm cviii. 25, then another hymn and prayer. The service was to commence at 10.30 a.m., and continued until 2 p.m. The collection amounted to £22 6s. 8d. Then the eight lecturers (preachers) during preceding weeks dined with the trustees and their friends at " The King's Head " : the number exceeded fifty.

Once more, in September 1780, when altering the hour of the Thursday evening service, the trustees seem to have thought it necessary to ask " the lecturers " to be " very punctual," giving the same reason as before. Early in 1783, at the suggestion of two friends, who undertook that the services should be no expense to the trustees, a Sunday afternoon service at 2.30 was commenced.

Meanwhile, the condition of the infant cause had grown serious owing to divisions and contentions among the trustees, and a circular was sent to those interested, in which the writers asked the reader " to reflect on your voluntary engagements to support the best interests in this neighbourhood which are in peril and must fall unless unanimity is restored. We beseech you therefore to consider that all private prejudices and all personal opposition ought to give way to the public good." So all interested were invited to dine with the trustees at 3 p.m. on August 20th, 1783, at the " Three Tuns " tavern, when, divested of all prejudices, the members were asked " to converse on those subjects on which we have formed different opinions, with that candour and disposition of mind which becomes those who are professors of godliness."

There is no record of this dinner, but at a later meeting regular prayer meetings were resolved on and two friends undertook a house-to-house collection. At this time the indebtedness on all accounts was just over £234.

Soon we find a curious step towards a settled ministry. The trustees, subscribers and friends of the cause were to meet for dinner at the " Grove " tavern, Camberwell, at 3.0 on the last Tuesday in June 1784, and the subscribers were then to be invited

to sanction a regular ministry. The dinner was held, but it is disappointing to read of no very substantial results. At length, however, in December 1784, a Mr. Moreton was invited to preach during the ensuing three months "with a view," and on March 24th, 1785, a special meeting was held to decide whether he be invited to preach statedly at Walworth. The vote, after various letters had been read, was taken by voice, but absentees who had given due authority to someone else were allowed to vote. The result was: For 24, neuter 4. His acceptance was notified by the end of the month, and it was agreed to pay him 52 guineas for a year's services, the afternoon services when held being conducted by supplies, and, although he continued thus to serve the church for some three years, he did not become minister.

The time was rapidly approaching when the necessity of forming a church was realised, and in June 1791, Joseph Swain, a member of Carter Lane, who is still remembered as a hymn-writer, began regularly to occupy the pulpit, and in the following October baptised twelve believers at Carter Lane and, next month, thirteen. These, with Swain himself, and possibly others already baptised (the records are not clear as to the number of members at the church's formation) were formed by Swain on December 13th, 1791, into a Strict Baptist Church. It is worth remembering that, during the preceding years when there was no church, the company of believers included a number of Congregationalists. There was no place for them in the newly-formed church, but there appears to have been no sort of split; some people withdrew and formed a Congregational Church nearby in York Street, now known as Browning Hall, receiving some compensation for their pecuniary interest in the chapel premises. It is good to hear that friendly relations were maintained between the two churches, the minister of the one being a not infrequent speaker at the other. We need to remember to-day, when so much is said of "union," that the spirit manifested at Walworth was not confined to Walworth—there was a similar cordiality between Hanover Chapel, Peckham, and Rye Lane Chapel when the latter chapel was erected.

Very shortly after Swain's ministry commenced a gallery was found to be necessary, but the Head of the Church had other plans and after, as men reckoned it, an all-too-brief ministry, Swain was called to higher service in April 1796. He was buried in Bunhill Fields; his funeral, attended by large crowds, was conducted by Abraham Booth, and memorial sermons were preached by Dr. Rippon and James Upton. At the time of his passing the church had 218 members.

At about this time a Sunday school, the oldest in the Lambeth

Auxiliary of the Sunday School Union, was formed, an early worker being William Brodie Gurney, one of the founders of the National Sunday School Union.

Quite frequently the church became the mother of another church (not always willingly, we think). As early as 1797 some hived off to form a church under one who had been a "supply," but evidently it had a short life only, and its location is unknown. In 1805 thirty-five members withdrew and formed what is now Walworth Road Church. When in 1818 Joseph Jenkins, the then pastor, retired, a number left and with him formed a church in Alfred Place, Old Kent Road, which has long since passed away. Other daughter churches remain to this day. In 1825 the minister, Richard Davis, issued a list of 106 members, twelve of whom remained from Joseph Swain's ministry—one of them was Henry Rogers, father of John Rogers, many years minister at Eynsford and moderator of the Kent Baptist Association. Henry Rogers' association with the church lasted forty-two years; he was a deacon eighteen years, and was buried in the graveyard in front of the chapel. When John began to preach out-of-doors, like so many other young men of the period, he was brought before the church as disorderly and "put by for preaching" for six months. In May 1798, he was again postponed and "advised to make himself more acquainted with the English language, and in the meantime to instruct children." In December of that year he was recommended as a student and as an itinerant preacher of the Kent Association. In 1801 he was again asked to preach before the church, and at last, in August of that year, by 39 to 4, he was called to the ministry. Next year he settled at Eynsford, where he ministered many years.

One incident, impossible in Walworth to-day, must not be omitted. One Sunday morning a young man, in the fields hard by the chapel, was shooting sparrows. A heavy shower came and he took shelter in the chapel, leaving his gun in the porch. Just then the minister announced his text: "Are not five sparrows sold for a farthing?" The young man had in his basket five sparrows which he had just shot. The sermon led to his conversion; he was later well known in our denomination as William Henry Watson, and his son, Samuel Watson, was equally well known. His memory is still cherished by some of us.

Other remarkable stories of the early days of Walworth might easily be told, but space does not permit. Its story of late years is of a struggling church in a changed neighbourhood with a Sunday morning market making direct approach to the chapel impossible, of heroic workers holding the fort with too little denominational backing and yet with blessing, till at length

the London County Council acquired the premises for housing, and, after attempting to carry on in a derelict Primitive Methodist Chapel, the church itself decided to disband. But if the building has gone, sacred memories remain, and still more, there is abiding fruits of its ministry, some still seed-sowing here, others gathered into the many Mansions.

HENRY N. PHILCOX.

THE CHURCH at Kensington Gravel Pits which sent the following letter is now known as Westbourne Grove Church. The request contained in the letter suggests several questions.

Rev. James Upton,
Church Street, Blackfriars.

Dear Sir,

The Particular Baptist Church Meeting at Kensington Gravel Pitts, at a special Church Meeting May 13th to take into consideration the best means of establishing Church Order and Discipline, the want of which was considered to be owing to the want of Male Members (having only three) of judgment and experience in those matters, it was resolved that a Committee be formed consisting of seven persons and that Messrs. Ivimey, Pritchard and Upton be respectfully requested to form the Committee, selecting two from each of their respective Churches, whom they deem competent for that Office. And this Church depute Mr. Thomas Worger, as their Representative in that Committee and pledge themselves not to choose a Minister disapproved of by a majority of that Committee, but the Church particularly request that none of that Committee be Preachers.

I am, dear Sir,
Your humble servant,
THOMAS FARMER.

Signed on behalf of the Baptised Church of Christ at Kensington Gravel Pitts.
May 1823.

John Newton and His Baptist Friends.

HAVING had cause recently to delve into the records of the life of John Newton, slave-trader and clergyman, I have been interested to discover many references to Nonconformists, and in particular to Baptists. John Newton met some of the foremost Baptists of his day, or indeed of any day. To gather together his comments upon them may not be without interest.

First, a word or two about John Newton (1725-1807). He will always be remembered for two things, his extraordinary career, and his hymns. In the *Olney Hymns* there are sixty-eight hymns from the pen of William Cowper, and two hundred and eighty from the pen of John Newton. Some of the two hundred are prosaic and halting, but certain of them have an immortal appeal; "Glorious things of thee are spoken," and "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," are two for which we shall always be indebted to Newton.

Newton's life was a dramatic one. He went to sea at eleven years of age. He had many narrow escapes from death. He fell a prey to evil companions. He was seized by the press-gang, and suffered all the barbarities of life on a man-of-war. His father purchased for him the rank of midshipman, and then he deserted. He was caught, arrested, put in irons, and then flogged and degraded in rank. He got his discharge from the Navy, came to utter destitution, and in despair entered the service of a slave-trader. He was treated with appalling cruelty by his master; his bed was a mat, and a log of wood his pillow. His mistress, a coloured woman living with his master as wife, made Newton beg for food from her plate. All this time he lived a life of utter Godlessness. But one day, on board ship in a terrible storm, Newton began to pray. And, "About this time I began to know that there is a God who hears and answers prayers." Also he saw that "there never was or could be such a sinner as myself." [1]

John Newton's circumstances improved; he became a slave-trader himself. But gradually he was led to give up his evil ways and the foul trade of a slaver, and was led into the ministry of the Church of England. At the first the way was blocked, and for a while he thought of taking the pastorate of a Nonconformist church; many offers were made to him by Independent churches. But finally he was ordained by the Bishop of Lincoln, and received the living of Olney, and then later that of St. Mary Woolnoth, London. Newton exercised a great evangelical influence, by his

[1] Except where mentioned the quotations are from *John Newton, an Autobiography and Narrative,* edited by Rev. J. Bull, 1868.

example, his preaching and his writings. He did much to raise the standards of the ministry of the Church of England; he was the Anglican Wesley.

In the interval between giving up the slave-trade and entering the ministry, Newton held the post of tide-surveyor at Liverpool. Here he came under the influence of a Baptist. At first Newton could not find any satisfactory preacher in Liverpool, the state of the churches was to his mind deplorable. Then he met John Johnson, a Baptist. And he says, after hearing him preach, " It was with regret I reflected that, through inattention or prejudice, I had deprived myself of his preaching for so many years as I have been in this town." Johnson was remarkable in that, in a day of decline, he was a fervent evangelist who sustained and multiplied the Cheshire churches.

Newton, from that date, attended Johnson's church with great regularity, not only on the Sunday, but also on the Wednesday evening.

The B.B.C. once founded an interesting series of talks upon the entertaining, if rather useless, theme of the course of history *if* certain things had happened. If it is permissible to speculate upon what would have happened if, say, Alexander the Great had not succumbed early in life to a fever germ, then it is permissible to speculate upon what would have happened if Newton had become a Baptist. He very nearly did join the Baptist Church at Liverpool. But, at last seeing that this could only be done on what he calls " full terms," meaning believers' baptism, he rejected the idea. He wrote in his diary, " As I do not see the necessity myself, I cannot at present submit. However I desire thankfully to receive so much of the ordinances under him (Johnson) as I can obtain. Oh, that the happy time was come when all the sincere worshippers of God were of one heart and mind ! "

Although Newton did not become a Baptist it appears that his views on baptism were for ever modified by his friendship with Johnson. In writing to a clerical friend, in 1792, Newton says, " I cannot undertake to vindicate every expression in our baptismal service. . . . The rubric tells us gravely that those who die in infancy may be saved if baptised; I believe they may be and are saved whether baptised or not; for I cannot think that the salvation of a soul depends upon a negligent or drunken minister, who cannot be found when wanted to baptise a dying infant. . . . The Fathers, or some of them did indeed speak of baptism and regeneration or the new birth as synonymous; but while Scripture, experience, and observation contradict them, I pay little regard to their judgement."

Whitefield visited Liverpool, and greatly attracted Newton. On January 2nd, 1756, Newton wrote to Whitefield a long letter

in which he gives a survey of the religious condition of Liverpool. Of the Baptists he says, "It is true we have the truth preached in the Baptist meetings; but I believe you know the particular disadvantages they are both under, so that, though they are useful to their own people (I trust, through grace, to me also), yet they seem not calculated for general usefulness."

When Newton settled at Olney he commenced to meet, within the Northamptonshire Baptist Association, many of the foremost Baptists of the day.

The first famous Baptist Newton met was John Collett Ryland. He wrote in his diary, "Our first interview an agreeable one. After dinner we had a little congregation. I began with prayer. He preached, from Matthew iv. 16." From this time the two men saw much of each other, even preaching for each other. Robert Hall, of Arnsby, author of *Help to Zion's Travellers,* called on Newton twice in 1766, and Newton wrote in his diary after the first visit, "A man of richest spirit."

Dr. John Ryland (John Collett's son) had many opportunities of meeting Newton, and many letters passed between them. In 1773, Dr. Ryland wrote to Olney in a very depressed mood. He wrote of error on every hand, and lukewarmness on the part of God's servants. He wondered if Christ was asleep, and cared not that the ship was going to the bottom. To this letter Newton replied, "The ship was safe when Christ was in her, although He was *really* asleep. . . . You are too anxious, and I am too easy in some respects. Indeed I cannot be too easy when I have a right thought that all is safe in His hands; but if your anxiety makes you pray, and my composure makes me careless, you have certainly the best of it. However, the ark is fixed upon an immovable foundation, and if we think we see it totter, it is owing to a swimming in our heads. Seriously, the times look dark and stormy, and call for much circumspection and prayer; but let us not forget that we have an infallible Pilot, and that the power, wisdom, and honour of God are embarked with us." [2]

In 1775 the Northamptonshire Association met at Olney. Now this Association was destined to infuse new life into the denomination, and its leaders were to include John Sutcliff, of Olney, who settled there in 1775. How then did these men, and these meetings, impress Newton? He wrote of one sermon, "The Lord was pleased to give me some softenings and relentings of heart. It is long since I had such an opportunity. O Lord, soften me yet more, and enable me to rejoice in Thy peace." Four Baptist ministers dined with Newton during those meetings.

In 1802 Newton was in correspondence with William Carey. Newton had a very high opinion of Carey. Dr. Buchanan, friend

[2] Cardiphonia, ii., 160.

of Newton, expressed himself in a slighting fashion on the subject of the Baptist missionaries, and Newton wrote a strong letter to him accusing him of looking down from his own position of ease and eminence upon men who were devotedly bearing the heat and the burden of the day. Newton added, "I do not look for miracles; but if God were to work one in our day, I should not wonder if it were in favour of Dr. Carey."

It will be realised that Newton's views on Dissent were very liberal. In a letter to a Presbyterian friend Newton sums up those views of his which enabled him to have rich communion with his Baptist friends, "How does Christ receive us? Does He wait till we are exactly of a mind? . . . Is He the God of the Presbyterians or the Independents alone? Do not some amongst you, and some amongst us, know with equal certainty that He has received them? Do not they, do not we, know what it is to taste that He is gracious? Does He not smile upon your ordinances and ours? Are not the fruits of true faith the same on both sides of the Tweed, and in every corner of the land? And shall zeal presume to come in with its ifs and its buts, and to build up walls of separation?"

It was no common man who could include in his circle of friends such men as Lord Dartmouth, Wilberforce, the poet Cowper, Robert Hall, Dr. Ryland, William Carey and the lowliest and poorest in his parish.

R. W. THOMSON.

Harry Wyatt of Shansi, by Ernest A. Payne, B.A., B.D., B.Litt. (Carey Press, 1s.)

Harry Wyatt's forty-three years were crowded with activity. Scouting, Dentistry, R.A.M.C., Cross Sheet, Medical Training, China—the China stricken by war. His tragic death on the Kuohsien Road last May removed a medical missionary of outstanding character and devotion. His story is well told in this little volume, which is enriched by a photograph, three illustrations, and a map of North China.

My Guided Life, by J. Scott Lidgett, C.H., M.A., D.D. (Methuen and Co., Ltd., 5s.)

Originally published in 1936 at a somewhat prohibitive price, many will welcome this cheaper edition of a book which tells in a plain, straightforward way of the author's long and busy life. His interests have taken him into many fields of social, municipal and national life, and prominent figures constantly flit across the pages of this volume.

John Moore and "The Dying Experience of Alice Rawson," Heaton, 1697.

INTRODUCTION.

ALTHOUGH there is still much that it is desirable to know about the missionary activities of William Mitchel and David Crosley in the West Riding of Yorkshire, especially in their earlier days, yet discoveries may be expected from time to time, and in recent years several gaps in our knowledge have been filled in.[1] An interesting sidelight on this early missionary work, valuable as showing in a personal and concrete fashion the influence of these pioneers in the late seventeenth century, was revealed by the chance discovery of an old confession printed in a long-forgotten magazine. The labours of Mitchel and Crosley are mentioned in it, but it is the influence of John Moore, their disciple and co-worker, which comes to light more particularly.

In his *Manningham, Heaton, and Allerton,* one of a trilogy on the history of Bradford, William Cudworth noted the "first dated mention of the Baptist preaching house at Heaton,"[2] quoting a document of 1697 as his authority.

The document in question is entitled "The dying experience and advice of Alice Rawson." There is a scholars' adage which counsels the constant verification of references; it is an old and sage piece of advice. For Cudworth refers the reader to the *Cottage Magazine* of 1826 for this legacy of Alice Rawson's that he quotes; but an attempt to find it there will be without reward. Yet it does appear in that magazine, only in the fourth volume, issued in 1815, pages 188-196; it is not easy to see how this inexcusable and misleading error has arisen.

The document is preceded by a statement from the anonymous contributor to the effect that it was found "among some old manuscripts" and had "never appeared in print." The present location of this manuscript is unknown. It is not without interest to note that in 1815 the magazine was printed in Bradford, and its editors were to be communicated with at Leeds. Presumably the item was contributed locally. There can be little

[1] e.g. in *The Baptists of Yorkshire* (1912); *Baptists of North West England* (1913); F. Overend, *History of the Ebenezer Baptist Church, Bacup* (1912); articles by Dr. Blomfield and the present writer in the Society's *Transactions* (Vol. III., 1913) and the *Baptist Quarterly* (N.S., VIII., 1936).

[2] (1896), p. 236.

doubt of its genuineness; it bears its own marks of authenticity. Nor is there any reason to question its date, which was so fortunately appended—November 13, 1697. It is evident that it is printed in full.

TEXT.

"To my beloved brethren and sisters," it begins, "my near and dear relations according to the flesh. A word from your poor dying sister, Alice Rawson, being a brief account of the Lord's dealings with me, his unworthy handmaid, together with a few words of Christian exhortation and advice, which I desire you all to peruse and seriously weigh in your minds, and that you all may do so, I desire that some of you take that pains to write it over, that every one of you may have a copy hereof by you, or however [sic] to send this to one another.

November 13th, 1697.

"Grace, mercy and peace be abundantly multiplied to you all . . ." So she writes to show "how the Lord hath been pleased to begin and carry on his own work of grace in my poor soul, in casting me in the first place into deep horror of conscience, and again in enlightening, enlivening and raising me up to behold his reconciled face in Jesus Christ, and to live in the enjoyment of his soul-ravishing love . . ." She goes on to describe how "it is many years since the Lord was pleased to begin to work upon my soul by way of conviction . . ." until she saw herself the vilest of sinners, burdened with sin, terrified in her conscience "with guilt and apprehension of the fierce devouring wrath of a sin-avenging God," so that she spent her days "for a long time in mourning, heaviness and bitterness of spirit." She saw her insufficiency, emptiness and nothingness. Then she found peace, and in raptures of praise pours forth her soul.

"And I cannot but acquaint you, my dear relations, that the Lord hath been pleased to make use of William Mitchel, David Crosley and John Moore, chiefly and above any else, as instruments in his hands for the comforting and cherishing of me. But yet I have not walked all along in a comfortable, lifted-up frame of spirit, till of late, though I was scarce ever under the sound of their ministry, but the word was sweet and came with a lively efficacy to me, to the raising up of my soul: although when I was from under the word, the sweet reviving and comforting property thereof did not abide with me, but I frequently spent my time more in darkness and under clouds, in a low and humble frame: yet still adhering to and depending on God's everlasting mercy and unchangeable goodness in Christ: and the Lord hath been pleased to support and bear me up all along, putting his everlasting arms under me: giving me some

comfortable measure of contentment and patient submission to his will, in the many crosses, troubles and difficulties that I have waded through. Yet, blessed be God, I have continued in a sweet heavenly and comfortable frame all along, since April last, that I heard John Moore preach at Heaton upon Rom. v. 1.

"The quickening power and reviving, and the refreshing comfort which then sweetly distilled upon my soul have remained with me: and I have had a lively sense thereof ever since, to this present hour. O that peace with God! how sweet is it. He shewed from that text, that God's justified children have peace with God the Father through Jesus Christ, declaring among other sweet truths the nature and properties of this peace—that it is perfect, pleasant, and comforting—sure, heavenly, everlasting—and the blessedness of those that partake of it. Much comfort likewise was the Lord pleased to administer to me by another sermon of his, not long after this, in his opening and discussing upon that parable of the great supper in Luke xiv. 16, 17. Whence coming to the close of the 17th verse he shewed that all things that make for the justification and comfort of poor sinners here and for their eternal glory and happiness hereafter, are richly provided and made ready by God in and through Jesus Christ. Grace is ready—peace is ready—pardon is ready—a complete righteousness for their justification and acceptance with God is ready—heaven is ready—salvation is ready—and withal he bids them come! Yea he earnestly importunes and solicits them to come and feast their souls upon these things. Oh! what inward lively refreshings did I feel and do still enjoy from these sermons. Thus the Lord hath brought me out of the horrible pit and set my feet upon the rock . . ."

She proceeds with the rapturous expression of her joy in a style very reminiscent of Mitchel's "The difference betwixt Egypt and Canaan."[3] "Oh! what love is this: that God should have thoughts of good-will towards me even from eternity! for whatever some may say (as I have heard some argue) against election, yet I am fully satisfied that there is an election of grace, as Rom. xi. 5. Yea, and in humility be it spoken, that I am one of God's elect: though I have been much troubled in mind about this very thing, and could not for a long time be satisfied." She concludes with a series of final exhortations.

ALICE RAWSON.

Who was Alice Rawson then? The surname is not at all uncommon in the district, and pedigrees of various branches of

[3] *Baptist Quarterly*, N.S., VIII., pp. 167-173, 217-222. Articles by the present writer.

the family have been printed from time to time.[4] Local records yield many references to the name at this period. But Alice Rawson is elusive. In the assignment of a "colemine and colemynes" dated May 28, 1684, a John Rawson, of Denholme, collier, and Alice Rawson, "of the same, widow, late wife of Christopher Rawson, deceased, father of the said John . . ." are mentioned as granting a lease;[5] but both sign with a mark, which would seem to betray an illiteracy hardly according with the able powers of composition exhibited in the document above. The only Baptist Rawson discoverable is a William, who signed the Rawdon Trust Deed of 1712.

Her experience may usefully be compared with that recorded by William Mitchel himself in a letter of his, dated July 13, 1691, to some friends at York who had enquired about his welfare.[6] In answer to their third query, "How I have proceeded in the work of the ministry," he quotes the following personal testimony: "Yea, the last Sabbath day, one who had long been bound of Satan and kept in hellish horror, many times concluding there was no mercy nor help for her in God, but that hell and damnation would be her portion, the Lord was pleased in His abundant loving kindness to look on her and pour His grace and Spirit into her desolate soul and bewildered, mournful heart, which gave her such comfortable satisfaction that, after the exercise was over at night she declared with wet cheeks and many tears, before many people, what satisfaction she that day had found under the ministry, and what assurance she had of God's love." The lady's name is not mentioned, and it is unlikely that she will ever be identified with certainty, but Alice Rawson's mental conflict bears a striking similarity to that recorded by Mitchel.

Now in the registers of the neighbouring parish of Bingley, an entry of February 7th, 1666 (-7) records the marriage of Jonathan Rawson and Alice "Marciall." If it may be assumed that this lady is none other than the Alice Rawson in question (and it is a fair, if unproved, hypothesis), a highly interesting probability emerges for consideration. The name of Marshall is as well known as that of Rawson in the particular neighbourhood under discussion; indeed, it has been said, referring to Rawdon and Yeadon, that the Marshalls constitute "the oldest

[4] e.g. for the Bradford branch, J. Foster, *Pedigrees of the County Families of Yorkshire;* J. James, *History and Topography of Bradford; Genealogist,* N.S., XIII.; and for the Sheffield branch—J. Hunter, *Hallamshire,* ed. A. Gatty (1869), pp. 386 and 450; J. Eastwood, *History of the Parish of Ecclesfield* (1862), pp. 391-4.

[5] Bradford Historical and Antiquarian Society; Local record series, II.; *West Yorkshire Deeds* (1936), p. 57-8.

[6] Overend, *op. cit.,* p. 54.

family in these parts." But for the purposes of local Baptist history the records of the various Marshalls are of the greatest importance. Some reference to those of the name who were connected with the Rawdon Baptist circle will be found in an article by the present writer in the *Baptist Quarterly* for July, 1936 (VIII., 3, p. 171), and although it is unnecessary to repeat the information there given, one or two relevant facts may perhaps receive a new emphasis. The application which was made for the registration of the house of "John Moore of Rawden . . . for a publick meeting place for Protestant dissenters" includes the names of three Marshalls: Josias, Jeremiah, and John. It is to the care and thought of John Marshall that the Rawdon Church is indebted for such a full record of its earliest years, and no less than eight Marshalls signed the Rawdon covenant in 1724. The question which remains to be solved now is, how nearly, if at all, was Alice Rawson related to this Marshall family which figures so prominently in the infancy of the Rawdon Church? The mention of Bingley is also suggestive, for in his short account of the Baptist cause at that place Horsfall Turner begins by asserting that "amongst the pupils of Mr. W. Hustler at Bingley, about the year 1675 was John Moore, a native of 'Oakworth Hall, near Kighley,' born 1662. Heaton and Bingley are some three miles apart on the same bank of the Aire; Rawdon is on the opposite bank, a little farther away from both places.

Altogether then, it is not improbable that we are back among that earliest group of pioneers, already vaguely known and identified, from which, in the early eighteenth century, there was to emerge out of the Rossendale group an independent, fully fledged Baptist Church identified with Heaton and Rawdon.

HEATON AND JOHN MOORE.

It will doubtless be remembered that "a short epitome of the Faith and Gospel order of a few persons usually meeting att Heaton and Rawden in the west riding of Yorkshire," is one of the earliest records contained in the Rawdon Church Book (MS.). By 1697 there is no doubt that Mitchel, Crosley and Moore were Baptists, and they are honoured as the mainspring of the churches of the West Riding, but it is a matter of debate whether there was a Baptist church organised here as early as 1697;[7] although, of course, meeting houses for Baptist dissenters are spoken of before that date, e.g. at Horton, Bradford, in 1672.[8] Dr. Haslam noted a registered place at Heaton in 1689.[9]

[7] e.g. Overend, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[8] J. H. Turner, *The* (Northowram) *Nonconformist Register* (1881), p. 115.

[9] *Baptists of Yorkshire*, p. 115.

Heaton was one of the places where it is known Mitchel and Crosley preached in the last decade of the seventeenth century, and to their labours must now be added John Moore's. It was presumably at "James Garth's new building" at Heaton, mentioned in the records of the Pontefract sessions of April, 1695,[10] that they preached. In this very year 1697, Mitchel expressly mentions Heaton in a letter to Moore:[11] "Our discourse was about the meeting place at Heaton; for, indeed, as it was in David's mind to build for the Lord the house, so I, being desired by many (whom in Christ I love) resorting thither, had it in my mind to have come every 6 weeks that I might through grace have been a help to the poor of the flock, upon whom my heart chiefly is; for the fat and strong God Himself will deal with." He was in a very despondent mood, for he goes on, presumably referring to Heaton all the time, to speak his sorrow, neatly tabulated under six headings, the sum of which was that he had been wasting his time and had laboured among them in vain.

John Moore[12] (1662-1726), convert and particular friend of Mitchel (as their letters reveal), is less well known than Mitchel and Crosley. He figures often in the letters printed by Overend, to which frequent reference has been made; and it is worthy of remembrance that it is really due to Moore that the valuable Mitchel-Crosley correspondence has been preserved at all, for it is from Moore's manuscript copy that Overend derived the documents he printed in 1912. In the name of John Moore, houses were registered at Rawdon (1689), Guiseley (1695) and Horsforth (1697), all places in this neighbourhood.[13] In June, 1711, when he had been already ten years and more out of Yorkshire, Moore returned to preach a sermon[14] "at the old meeting house at Heaton"; this, together with two other sermons of his preached at Great Woodhouse, Leeds, in August 1703 and June 1719 (the former, it has been calculated, must have taken three hours to deliver) were printed in 1722 as "Some Gospel truths

[10] *ibid.*, p. 115.

[11] Overend, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[12] Some account of him will be found in a pamphlet of Dr. J. Haslam entitled *A Sketch of the Early Baptists and Yorkshire Baptist History*, 1707-1907, (1907), pp. 25-9. See also D. Glass in the *Baptist Quarterly*, N.S. III., 182.

[13] *Baptists of Yorkshire*, pp. 75, 114, 134. J. H. Turner, *Nonconformity in Idle.*

[14] *Baptists of Yorkshire*, p. 129. H. Dowson, *The Centenary*, p. 27. Cudworth, *op. cit.*, p. 236 (title of the sermon, "Christ the Mediator").

plainly stated . . ." and re-issued in a new edition, " with some account of the author, by J. A. Jones," in 1854.[15]

In 1853, Henry Dowson wrote[16] that " the old Heaton Chapel stood about one hundred yards from the present one : a burying ground was attached to it, but the site is all that remains; other buildings have displaced the former edifice." But the small Baptist community at Heaton did not long flourish separately; it either merged into the Rawdon Church, as was seen above, or it died out until 1828, when it was begun again, only to be dissolved twelve years later. In 1868 it was once again, and this time firmly, established.

Alice Rawson stands before us, then, a storm-racked soul, tortured with doubt, but one whose search for spiritual " comfort " seems to have been satisfied by the particular doctrines of our West Riding patriarchs; and if her sensibility should seem to us somewhat morbid, surely her state can be paralleled among many a contemporary autobiography. Her confession shows a power of rhetorical expression hardly to be suspected in an average worshipper among the Baptists of the time and place. Evidently she was " no ordinary woman "—unless, of course, her account was written up for her by someone who had that power. It reveals something of the influence which these early preachers wielded over their hearers, and something of their hard, clear, Calvinistic doctrine (she had no doubt of her election); and from the very style of the confession may we not perceive also, in the echoes of their fervent language, not a little of the passionate earnestness and urgency of their preaching?

FRANK BECKWITH.

[15] Haslam, *loc. cit.* J. H. Turner, *Ancient Bingley*, p. 166, gives instead of 1719, the year 1712. See also Dr. Whitley's *Baptist Bibliography* (16-722) and the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books. (" God's matchless love to a sinful world . . .")

[16] *loc. cit.*

Sixth Baptist World Congress.

WHEN one begins to write about the Sixth Baptist World Congress which is to be held in Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America, July 22nd-28th, significant facts too numerous and too varied to crowd into a single article present themselves and all but demand expression. To a man we agree that the Congress was never convened at a time in which there were more and greater problems. Economic uncertainty, social confusion, clashing moral standards, wars and rumours of wars, the crumbling of old foundations both in State and home, international distrust and hatred, the building of armies and navies, professional uplifters of the human race who themselves have not been uplifted by Divine grace, currents and counter-currents of thought in stubborn opposition, increasing taxes and mounting debts, schemes for social security on credit, racketeering in business, broken morale in thousands on doles and relief, create conditions which spread over the face of the earth like a pall of death. Evils are confederates which seem to be highly organised and skilfully directed to promote that which is hurtful and wrong and to put down that which is helpful and right. No artist could paint a picture of this day and use all of the threatening facts without making an exceedingly dark picture. It would cause us to cry: "Is there no balm in Gilead?"

But the people who are called Baptists will not despair, nor concede defeat, nor expect anything but ultimate victory. What could stimulate the human heart more than the fact that twelve million Baptists who know no lord but Christ Jesus will have a representative group of perhaps fifty thousand to meet in Atlanta in July to bear their testimony, to declare their message, and to assert to the world their faith in Paul's declaration, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid which is Christ Jesus"? The distressing condition of the world is not a precursor of utter collapse, but a demonstration of the utter failure of movements, enterprises, institutions and governments which are not built upon this foundation. This is the chaos out of which we may expect God to bring order, and our generation is a tottering house under which we must put the rock foundation.

I would be untrue to the Atlanta Baptists if I did not say that the motive which inspires us to do our best in making plans for the entertainment of the Baptists of the world is to make it possible for them to declare their message, their much-needed message, to their day and generation. We believe that unspeakable good will come to the human race as a result of a world meeting of Baptists which will give to them an opportunity to know one another, to understand one another, to find a common

approach to the problems of life and to generate within their own hearts courage and zeal to join hands around the globe in song, in prayer, and in sermon to tell men of all ranks and races that Christ's Name is the only name in which salvation can be found, and to declare to all believers that Christ must be enthroned in all the areas of life. The Baptists who come to the Atlanta meeting will return to their respective homes with a new vision of their task, with a new appreciation of their faith, and with stronger determination and courage to preach their message. Those from lands where civil authorities are laying heavy hands of persecution upon them will go back renewed in spirit like Elijah of old when they realise that there are many millions who have not bowed their knees to Baal, and those from lands of lethargy and indifference will be inspired by the heroism of their persecuted brethren to renew their zeal as Christ's ambassadors.

It is this conviction that brings the Baptists of Atlanta and their many friends of other Christian affiliations to join hands and hearts in preparing to entertain perhaps the largest group of Christians that ever assembled from the four corners of the earth. They are opening their homes to give hospitality, which means meals and beds throughout the entire Congress to all missionaries and visitors from other lands. They are converting the largest athletic stadium in the city into a meeting place by building a temporary roof over it, by erecting a tremendous platform in the midst of it, and by equipping it with loud-speakers that thousands may assemble for worship under the sound of one man's voice. I wish it were possible to relate in detail how the business houses, the civic groups, the Chamber of Commerce, the schools, the hotels, and other institutions of the city are volunteering to help to make the thousands of visitors comfortable while they are in our fair city; a city which I may justly say is ornate in natural beauty, rich in historic traditions, and known far and wide for its beautiful homes and churches.

It is quite obvious that the makers of the programme of the Congress are keenly sensitive to the challenges and the needs of this hour. Their choice of speakers and of subjects show that their aim is have the most capable men and women to discuss the actual problems we are now facing and to declare the truths upon which we are depending. It will be a great hour when Principal N. J. Nordström, of Sweden, reports for his commission on "What Baptists can do to avert War and promote Peace." Another high hour will be when Principal W. Holms Coats, of Scotland, presents his report on "'The Baptist Contribution to Christian Unity." Another great hour will be when Professor W. O. Carver, of Kentucky, U.S.A., reports for another commission on "Findings of the Oxford and Edinburgh Con-

ferences." But these are not all. There will be other messages by equally able men on the Church, religious liberty, problems of race, evangelism and missions, and the great doctrines of our Baptist people. We can say truthfully that for seven days Baptist leaders of the world will come together to discuss their common heritage and their common task under the direction of their common Lord. If Baptists are right in claiming that they have a distinct message which is indispensable to the coming of God's Kingdom upon earth, nothing can be of greater significance than for them to meet together as a body to intensify and deepen their fellowship in the interest of extending their influence and preaching their message.

The most frequently asked question about the Alliance is, "How many do you expect to attend?" This question no one can answer. In the city of Atlanta there are 195 Baptist churches with a total membership of 95,451. In the State of Georgia there are 6,579 churches with a total membership of 1,025,908. It will be possible for tens of thousands of Georgia Baptists to commute back and forth to Atlanta daily to attend the sessions. It is a fact that this next World Congress will be held in what is perhaps the greatest Baptist city of the world and in the largest Baptist convention of the world.

I cannot close without stating two of the greatest joys that the people of Atlanta are anticipating. They are looking forward with unspeakable delight to the privilege of having the Baptists of other lands in their homes as guests. More and more they are saying on every hand that no good can come out of this world meeting of Baptists which will exceed the mutual good that our people and our guests will receive from the friendships which will be established around their table boards. We are also looking forward to the privilege of having the preachers of other lands fill our pulpits on Sunday, July 23rd, not only Baptist pulpits but also the pulpits of other denominations. In addition we are arranging to have representatives of other nations speak to other church groups such as Sunday School classes and assemblies. We join in earnest prayer around the world that God will sanctify this great meeting to the good of humanity and to the glory of His great Name.

ELLIS A. FULLER.

Reviews.

Jesus and His Church (A Study of the Idea of the Ecclesia in the New Testament), by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D. (Epworth Press, 6s.)

The Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, did well to choose the New Testament doctrine of the Church for the subject of his Fernley-Hartley lecture for 1938. Prolonged discussions of the problems of Reunion have made it clear that their solution depends very largely upon the possibility of reconciling the different conceptions of the Church held by various Christian communions. Dr. Flew has wisely concentrated upon the New Testament data, and firmly asserts that in doing so he is not guilty of "a mere Protestant provincialism." It was also sound tactics on his part to give so much attention to the Synoptic Gospels, for that took him back to the teaching and ministry of Jesus, which all Christians concede to be the very fountain head of their life and faith. It also enabled him to deal with the question, so often upon the lips of modern men, "Did Jesus intend to found a Church?" In this connection Dr. Flew disposes of the argument of those who maintain that the eschatological strain in the teaching of Jesus precluded Him from envisaging a Church. The Kingdom, Dr. Flew shows, implies a Church, though the two are not identical. The mission of the disciples and our Lord's conception of His Messianic office also imply a community, the new Israel of God. Dr. Flew then sketches the kind of Ecclesia that our Lord had in view and shows that the five New Testament writers, Paul and the authors of 1 Peter, the Apocalypse, the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews held substantially the same ideas. His argument is built up with most meticulous care and profound learning. Indeed, there are times when we could wish that Dr. Flew had been content to state his own conclusions without supporting them with so many references to learned German works. Publishers' "blurbs" are usually to be taken with a grain of salt, but, in this case, their suggestion is fully substantiated that this book may safely claim to continue the well-known work of Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, though, of course, it deals with problems that had not arisen when Hort wrote nearly forty years ago.

It should also be said that Dr. Flew provides a careful and elaborate discussion of the promise to Peter, "On this rock will I build my church," and a fresh, though brief, account of both the missionary and local ministry of the apostolic Churches. He covers some of the ground covered by Dr. Headlam in his

Bampton Lectures (*The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*), but he does so in greater detail and (if the Bishop of Gloucester will forgive us for saying so) with a more profound scholarship which leads him to differ from the Bishop on a few small points. On another issue it is worth noticing that, incidentally, Dr. Flew makes out a good case for some modification of the opinion, made so popular by Gunkel, that there was no ethicisation of the conception of the fruits of the Holy Spirit prior to the apostle Paul.

Particularly welcome to all whose reading of the New Testament has driven them to stand for what their fathers called "gathered Churches," is Dr. Flew's repeated insistence upon two points. First, that men can enter the Church, which is nevertheless something "given," only by professing personal allegiance to Christ. Secondly, that the Church comes into being on earth only through the preaching of the Word, and, therefore, no particular Church Order is essential to its life. Order may be important, but it can never be equated with faith. "The authority of the New Testament," says Dr. Flew, "cannot be claimed for the view which would make the Word and the Sacrament contingent upon the office, rather than the office contingent upon the Word" (p. 257). There is nothing in the New Testament which can be equated with the claims which Ignatius advances for the ministry.

Dr. Flew has given us so much, and what he has given is so excellent, that we trust it will not appear ungracious if we mention three omissions which we regret.

(1) There is no reference to T. M. Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries,* a book which we rank as equal in scholarship and insight to that of Hort.

(2) Though Matthew xviii., 19 is cited, Matthew xviii. 20 is not. Our Lord's words, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," are the sheet-anchor of all whose Church polity is Congregational. They will never accept a polity which casts any doubt on Christ's willingness or ability to keep His promise to be with those who meet in His name. Dr. Flew has only one reference to R. W. Dale's writings, and we note that it is not to a work in which that typical Congregationalist discusses the New Testament doctrine of the Church.

(3) In discussing the question whether Jesus intended a Church, more could have been made of the argument that the two Sacraments which He founded imply a Church, for they are nothing if they are not social—a point which Bishop Gore was fond of stressing.

A. C. Underwood.

Christian Freedom, by Albert Peel, M.A., D.Litt. (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.)

In these days of totalitarian States, the Council of Congregational churches in the U.S.A. sent for Dr. Peel to tell what their denomination has done for the church and the world. A few years ago he proved a master in condensing the facts; these lectures show his power to diagnose and to prescribe. He replies to Mussolini's "Liberty is dead, and its corpse already putrescent," with the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail, and the reminder that they must be attacked; not with infantry drilled by manuals of the fourth or sixteenth centuries, but by an air force, eyes of the army, destroying the instruments which deal out evil. Recognising the wave of paganism flooding over Christendom, he calls us to free ourselves from excrescences which have hampered our freedom, and threaten to paralyse our thinking. What powers are ordained of God? Hitler and Stalin? Did Cromwell recognise a divine right in Charles Stuart?

Repeatedly he bids our churches use their freedom. Huge buildings often nearly empty, whose paid pastors absorb the rest of money available, have no warrant in scripture, no precedent in our heroic days; they stifle our power to convert, they entomb shrinking communities. Bunyan, supporting himself by anvil and pen, preaching in barns and fields, recalls us to first principles. Wheeler Robinson is quoted as to our Biblical basis: "On what can the Protestant base his acknowledgment of the authority of scripture? The intrinsic quality of the truth which the scripture contains." Then the claim that any United Church must recognise the sacraments is dealt with drastically, and Edinburgh is shown to have knocked a great hole in its bottom by its desire to include the Friends.

Our thoughtless inertia is challenged on three definite issues. Let us think closely, individually, on the subject of war; then in discussion hammer out a short-term policy as well as a permanent; and arrange to mobilise Christian opinion whenever a crisis arises. Let us use all the modern social customs for the spread of our views; motorcar as Paul used ships, radio as Jesus used the boat off-shore, gramophone as Mark invented Christian literature, cinema as the early converts illustrated in their lives the difference Christ had made. Let us recognise how our opportunity is shrinking every year; apathy led to the extinction of our faith over all Central Asia, persecution is stifling it in Russia and Rumania and Germany; the churches which are still free still have their opportunity.

W. T. Whitley.