

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bq\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php)

## Editorial.

### NEW MEMBERS.

The following have joined the Baptist Historical Society since our last issue :

Mr. H. L. Hemmens.

Dr. H. R. Williamson.

Mr. G. W. Terry.

\* \* \* \*

### OUR ANNUAL MEETING.

The Committee have regretfully come to the conclusion that war conditions again prevent our Society arranging an excursion or public meeting during the Spring Assembly. All B.U. and B.M.S. engagements are to be crowded into three days, Monday to Wednesday, and it is inevitable that College reunions and other functions will clash with official meetings. We have no desire to add to the congestion; but look forward to the time when our excursions, which have proved so popular in recent years, can be resumed.

The Society's present officers and committee are willing to serve for the ensuing year, except that Mr. Farrer desires to retire from the committee, and Mr. C. B. Jewson has accepted an invitation to take his place.

The treasurer's statement for 1940 will be found on another page. The deficit on the year suggests that he will welcome subscriptions for 1941 as early as convenient.

\* \* \* \*

### KEACH'S HYMN-BOOK AND RIPPON'S TUNE-BOOK.

Two hundred and fifty years ago, in 1691, Benjamin Keach published a book of nearly three hundred hymns called *Spiritual Melody*, and one hundred years later, in 1791, John Rippon published a selection of two hundred *Psalm and Hymn Tunes*. Clearly, had the times been normal, here was the opportunity for an attractive dual celebration; even a Lecture-Recital was a possibility. But it cannot be fitted into the Assembly. We hope, however, to print articles by Dr. Whitley on the Hymn-book in July, and on the Tune-book in October.

Dr. Whitley has made the interesting suggestion that at one or more of the Assembly sessions, hymns from Keach's book should be sung to tunes from Rippon. We would go further,

and suggest that Dr. Whitley should conduct the platform choir of Baptist Union Officers and past-Presidents in rendering the hymns. Nevertheless, we are afraid the joy of witnessing this will not be given to the audience, for it has to be admitted that Keach's hymns have long since ceased to be useful. He was a pioneer in hymnology, but his gift was not comparable with that of Isaac Watts or Charles Wesley. It is possible, for example, that his hymn, "Shine forth, O Lord, upon our souls," was sung at the close of the 1691 P.B. Assembly; but we can hardly imagine our 1941 Assembly giving an inspired rendering of the second verse :

We have had a sore winter's day,  
A pinching time was here;  
Now let such weather flee away  
And springing time draw near.

We look to the Programme Committee to arrange such fare that no delegate will leave the City Temple saying, "A pinching time was here."

\* \* \* \*

#### THE FORWARD MOVEMENT.

At the time of writing, the comparatively small sum of £15,000 is needed to complete the million pounds for church extension that were to be raised in the ten years terminating at this Assembly. It should, therefore, be fairly certain that the incoming President, Mr. R. Wilson Black, J.P., will have the joy of announcing the completion of the task to which he has given himself with such amazing devotion. It will be said of him as it was said of one of old, "He was worthy, for he loveth our nation and hath built us a synagogue"; but in Mr. Black's case it will be not one but many churches. With a zeal for church extension akin to that of Spurgeon, he has travelled North, South, East and West, laying foundation stones and conducting opening services. After the bustle of recent years he will find the Presidency a rest-cure.

Two other names must be mentioned. Of Mr. O. H. B. Starte, C.B.E., it can surely be said that he came to the kingdom for such a time as this. It is no disrespect to him to say that ten years ago his name, denominationally, was unknown. Now we are all familiar with his initials, and recognise behind them a brother beloved who avoids the limelight and toils unceasingly, no detail being too trivial for his notice.

Our General Secretary, the Rev. M. E. Aubrey, C.H., was the one who had the big vision. When Sanballat and Tobiah and Geshem laughed and thought in trivial sums, he spoke of a

million pounds. The sites and bricks and mortar that could be purchased with that sum gripped his imagination; and by pen and speech he has inspired Eliashib and Zaccur and Meremosh, and the inhabitants of Zanoah, such as Association Presidents and Secretaries and Treasurers, aye and the nobles of the denomination who, unlike the ancients, have "put their necks to the work of the Lord." Our secretary has looked beyond bricks and mortar. Within the walls of these new buildings he has visualised the men and women who will be won for Christ, and the strong churches which will be built up; therefore he has not failed to remind the denomination that a true Forward Movement is one concerned with spiritual issues.

There is one outstanding difference in this Fund compared with the Century, Sustentation and Superannuation Funds. Those Funds were represented by cash paid to headquarters, so that the capital monies remained intact under the control of the Baptist Union. At the outset of the Forward Movement probably most anticipated that this Fund would likewise be paid to headquarters and be allocated from there. It took time to realise that a comparatively small sum only would be paid to the central fund, and that practically all the monies would be retained and disbursed locally. The scheme was very complex, and the commissioners have had difficult issues to face in deciding what were "new monies," and whether all rebuilding and alteration schemes were genuine cases of "church extension." However, even though borderline amounts and projects have been included, the effort has been a truly magnificent one. No previous decade has seen such widespread chapel building, and the results for good will be far-reaching.

A great opportunity for statesmanship now faces the denomination. The pre-war distribution of population has probably gone for good, and sites are needed in the new districts which will house the future townships. Moreover, enemy action has destroyed many church buildings and seriously damaged others. Quite unwittingly, and certainly against his inclinations, Hitler has partly solved the problem of redundant churches, for it is unthinkable that money will be squandered in rebuilding downtown churches to serve a population that is not there. Some means must be found of preventing a thorough-going isolationism, supported by antique trust deeds, from crippling the churches of the future.

## The Solidarity of Humanity and the Moral Order.

ONE'S first feeling in considering the idea of "solidarity" is that one has raised again the ancient and endless discussion concerning the One and the Many, the Universal and the Particular, between Realism and Nominalism; or, at least, has stumbled into some side-chapel of the Cathedral of Philosophy to listen to a subsection of the great debate. Our experience is of the Many and the Particular. Has the One and the Universal as real an existence, or even more real as Plato and the Realists affirmed? When we say "solidarity", certain great words loom before the mind—Humanity, Race, Nation, Proletariat and the like. What do they represent, and what is their relation to the particular and individual? Do they stand for greater realities, for higher and more enduring values? These are urgent questions, forms of the greatest of questions: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him and the son of man that Thou visitest him?" Comte repudiated metaphysical abstractions, but, as we all know, he exalted "Humanity" into an object of worship as the only reality, and declared that the individual was a pure abstraction. Is it true then that humanity has the immense solidarity of the eternal sea, and that men are but spray blown by the wind? It is from another angle and a nobler philosophy that General Smuts still echoes "the purely individual self is a figment of abstraction", a dictum that invited the comment of McNeile Dixon, "however much an abstraction he may be, the religious and legal systems place upon the individual the burden of responsibility for his own character and conduct".<sup>1</sup> And this we know is true even of those modern political and social creeds which deify Race or Nation or State or Class. The individual is at least "real" enough to be taxed or imprisoned or shot in the interest or supposed interest of the "solidarity". And it is the individual who is hypnotised by the great words, who puts soul and life into them, and who will live or die for whatever they stand for in his faith and imagination. We may not meet with him in philosophical or sociological or even, at some periods, in theological discussion. But we meet him in every street, and him only do we know in our commerce with the world. As Charles Lamb said: "Have not these creatures that you and I profess to know *something about* no faces, gestures, gabble, no folly, no absurdity?" One is tempted to be flippant and to ask, what face or gesture or gabble has any solidarity?

The truth is, the one thing of which we have absolutely

<sup>1</sup> *The Human Situation*, 177.

certain and immediate knowledge is not of any solidarity but of our own individual selves, the self-conscious, thinking, willing beings that we are. Newman declared that in his childhood he was equally and luminously certain of a God over and against himself, but that raises another though intimately related issue. It is upon the reality of the self, the individual self-consciousness of the human being, that we must proceed in any fruitful consideration of "solidarity". It is the individual and not the solidarity that is primary in knowledge and experience. According to Jewish and Christian teaching, God made man in His own image, but it was an individual man. It is not something vague and vast called Humanity or the Race that is made in the image of God, but Tom, Dick and Harry, though the likeness may not be a striking one. It is the danger of all "solidarities", both in theory and practice, to treat them as abstractions, or to subsume them into a class which is nominally greater but actually less than they, that is to deny the image of God. Of all such solidarities it may be said, as was said of that great solidarity, Babylon of the Seven Hills, their "merchandise is . . . the souls of men".

And yet the matter is not as simple as was supposed by the philosophic and economic doctrinaires of last-century Individualism. "Suppose a man alone on a desert island" they begin, but a man cannot begin alone on a desert island, or develop under such circumstances. The individual may be the reality of experience but we only experience him as a social being. We know ourselves as dependent for our very self-consciousness on what is not ourselves in a human environment. Personality, in short, is always social. As one of Bernard Shaw's characters puts it: "There's all sorts of bonds between all sorts of people". A man is not a lonely pebble on the beach, which remains a pebble because it is alone, however pebbly the beach. He enters at birth into a system of relationships and dependencies, an inheritance of interests and values, which are essential to his existence and growth as a human being. The image of God only emerges under these conditions, and it is to these necessary conditions that the word "solidarity" can properly be applied. A natural solidarity is that system of mutual relationships and inter-dependence into which a man is born, or with which he comes to be associated in the traffic of life. It is when these mutualities are regarded as existing apart from individuals, when they are hypostasised and endowed with quasi-personality, that they defeat their own end which is the making of personalities. This is the fallacy and peril of such conceptions as "corporate personality". The phrase sounds as though it described some impressive reality, like the Shakespearean word *honorificabilitudinitatibus*, but it has as little substance in it. It

is at best a personifying metaphor, at worst an idolon, a Moloch to which men are sacrificed. That the peril is no imaginary one is patent in the world of to-day, when to the "corporate personality" of Nation or State the individual is ruthlessly offered up, existing, as he is regarded, not as an end in himself, but as a mere means to the ends of the solidarity. The current disparagement of the individual can be reflected even in Christian thought as when Nygren in so fine a book as his *Agape and Eros* seriously declares that the belief in the infinite value of the human soul is not Christian but one of the errors of nineteenth century theological Liberalism. It is true that the individual cannot exist or develop apart from social relationships, but it is equally true that society centres in the individual and cannot exist apart from the relationship between individuals. And the ultimate test of any society is the quality of individual life it fosters. It is this value that must be maintained in any Christian thinking on solidarity.

The "solidarity of humanity" has been assumed in Christian thought from the beginning. Until modern times it was accepted as axiomatic that the human race was one great family derived from an original pair, and involved in one tremendous moral catastrophe which befell them at the outset of human history. The Christian shape of the doctrine derives from the writings of St. Paul, though it holds a subordinate place in them, and is not essential to the apostle's gospel. It is not necessary to enlarge on the use he makes of the Hebrew story of Adam and Eve, or on his assumption that men are mortal because the first man sinned, or on his curious assertion that death reigned from Adam to Moses though men were not guilty of sin, not having the Law. We do not regard the Genesis story as historical fact, and so cannot use it as he did. However valuable as a picturesque myth or allegory, however spiritually suggestive, the ancient narrative may be, it can no longer be regarded as the foundation for belief in the solidarity of humanity. But if we no longer believe in Father Adam or in his sin, how can we believe that humanity is a family and involved in a primitive disaster? Science does not help us much. St. Paul declared on one occasion that God had made of one blood all the nations upon earth, or so the familiar version not misleadingly translates his words. And it is true that human blood is the same everywhere, but the significance of the fact is altered considerably if, as is asserted, the blood of certain anthropoid apes answers to the same tests. "The essence of modern science" says Jeans, "is that man no longer sees nature as something distinct from himself." Evolution in some form or other is not to be denied, even if it remains at present an "inspired conjecture." But there

is no certainty that man emerged at one definite point of time or spread from one centre. There is no such thing in the world to-day as a "pure" race, but it is difficult to believe that the Negro, the Australian black-fellow, the Mongolian, and the European, are the descendants of one primitive people, still more of one primeval pair who must have been unlike any of them. We know there have been races different from any existing one, and the ancestors of none, and which have become extinct. The materials at our disposal are extraordinarily confusing—Combe Capelle, Cro-Magnon, and Negroid man, for instance, obviously unrelated but side by side. And yet the lowest type of which anything is really known, Neanderthal man, so low as to seem scarcely human, manifestly believed in a future life; and anthropology shows that all primitive peoples have reacted religiously to their environment, and in much the same way.

Again, if we think of human solidarity in terms of mutual relationships, for which much more is to be said, it is at least very discontinuous. There have undoubtedly been vast movements and admixtures of peoples and cultures from pre-historic times, but what solidarity, cultural or other, had Europeans with the natives of America before Columbus, or more recently with the fenced kingdom of Japan or the millions of China before the Gates were forced open? or with the unknown tribes of Central Africa before Livingstone made a highway for the Gospel and much else? It is in our own time, and due mainly to the triumphs of science, that the world has grown small and universal relationships established, not always with the happiest results. In its Christian meaning and implications, human solidarity cannot be discovered or realised in superficial contacts or merely economic connections. Even the Federation of the World, despite Tennyson, would not necessarily be synonymous with the Brotherhood of Man. The solidarity of relationships on the level of material interests does not, of itself, produce the great values of moral obligation, of love, of reverence for the human soul. The modern young person's question, Why should or shouldn't I? still awaits the answer in the wider field. If the reality of God and of the spiritual nature of man be denied, then the ground is taken away from any faith in human solidarity as Christianity affirms it. How that spiritual nature came into existence, whether by Immanent or Transcendent divine action, is of minor importance. Its reality is the assumption of all Christian work for men, and it is verified in all missionary enterprise apart from any question of racial origins. If we affirm our faith in human brotherhood, which is a solidarity of relationship, it is because we believe in a universal relationship to God as the Father of the spirits of all men, irrespective of their natural history. We come to men



through God. The solidarity of humanity is, for us, a religious affirmation, and like all Christian affirmations it stresses individual values.

There are, however, two important truths suggested by the ancient myth, especially as interpreted by St. Paul and in Christian theology. The first is the universality of sin, or as it is sometimes called "solidarity in sin," which can only mean that all human relationships are affected by sin because all human beings are sinful. "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." St. Paul associates the universality of sin with the sin of the first man, but it is notoriously difficult to understand his thought even if it was clear to himself. Did he think of the human race as mystically present in Adam, and so symbolically guilty of his sin? Did he think of all his descendants as being physically in him, as the writer of Hebrews thought of Levi in the loins of Abraham when the patriarch paid tithes to Melchizedek? Or, as is possible, did he suppose that by his sin Adam introduced into human nature the evil impulse, the *yetza-ha-ra* of the Rabbis and Kant's "radical evil," which, of course, leaves Adam's own sin unexplained? All these interpretations have their defenders. But another strand in the apostle's thought on the myth approximates to the modern evolutionary standpoint, or is not inconsistent with it. He had no high opinion of the original status of Adam. He was "of the earth, earthy." He was the "natural man" who precedes the "spiritual man." St. Paul does not follow up this line of thought in connection with the universality of sin, or the result might have been interesting. In any case, the story of the Fall of Adam stood in his thinking not only for a fragment of pre-history, but for significant history. It described the condition of humanity itself as "fallen," or more specifically, it expressed the fact that all men sin.

It is not irrelevant, in considering this matter, to point out that neither the myth itself, nor the apostle's treatment of it, justifies the language often used of the genesis of sin. It is not represented as "an outrage on the divine Holiness," or in words once widely quoted, "a blow in the face of the Almighty." It is not described, either in the story or by St. Paul, as a revolt against "the Eternal Law of Righteousness"; and obviously the prohibition to eat of a certain tree was as arbitrary as the prohibitions in fairy tales, unless, as is hinted, the divine powers feared an awakened intelligence in man. Nothing has ever been gained by hysterical rhetoric on the subject of sin. It is natural that as men were led to relatively high ethical conceptions of God, as the Jews were, the idea of sin should be increasingly moralised; and more particularly that the fact of Christ should

create the specifically Christian conviction of sin, which is not to be expressed in heated declamations. But there is something unreal and unconvincing in denouncing human sin through a loud-speaker, and especially in speaking in awestruck and horrified tones of the guilt of primitive man or of men who, like children, are still in a primitive state. The myth, with its fairy-tale quality, is probably nearer the actual truth than any book of Dogmatic Theology. Perhaps in connection with some totally irrational taboo, perhaps in some incredibly primitive form of Isaiah's Temple experience, the consciousness of sin was awakened in man. It is impossible to discover the form in which sin entered human life, and it is probable we would not recognise it for what it was if we found it.

The apostle, in one of his most daring insights declared once and again that the Law of Moses was given in order to waken sin to life. "Had it not been for the Law," he says, "I should never have known what sin meant,"<sup>2</sup> and the consciousness of sin, once awakened, gave him no rest until he found rest in Christ in a life that transcended the transient Law. And the Law, he says, itself inviolable and unachievable, was given for this dread purpose! Shall we not follow the implications of his insight further, and be bold to say that the sense of sin, in however primitive a form, was awakened the moment man became perceptive of something in his environment that made a demand upon his spiritual nature, and in so doing quickened it into feeble life, that is, the moment he was truly man? He knew sin in the same action that revealed him to himself as a moral being. Sin is universal, because human nature is constituted in the tension between a demand and an instinctive resistance, and nothing can be more incredible than Dr. Matthews' suggestion that it took God by surprise.<sup>3</sup> To pursue the problem further would bring us into a realm of mystery in which all things are dark. It is enough to recognise the truth, as the apostle recognised it, that the myth shadows forth the universal condition of man. He is constitutionally sinful; and it is the neglect of this fact that lays in ruins the New Jerusalems which men seek to build with their own hands.

The second truth suggested by the ancient story is that the consequences of sin are not confined to the sinner, but are transmitted through the solidarity. St. Paul believed that as the result of his disobedience the first man was doomed to death and to be the ancestor of a mortal race. It is to be doubted whether this was in the mind of the original writer, but it is not necessary to re-examine the significance of the myth. It is sufficient to

<sup>2</sup> Rom. vii. 7 (Moffatt).

<sup>3</sup> *God in Christian Thought*, 241ff.

note that the causes of hardship and pain, and all the evils of human life, are traced back to the primeval act of folly. It is, of course, an artless explanation of what Winwood Reade called the "Martyrdom of Man," and the tremendous challenges of the Book of Job are the answer to this and every other explanation that rob man of his dignity by banishing mystery from his woes. Yet in its artless way the myth suggests to us one of the grandest conceptions that ever dawned upon the human mind, the conception of "the moral order of the world" and "the Eternal Law of Righteousness". It appeared in different civilisations in the East and West during the same period, the first millennium before Christ. "O", wrote Sophocles the Greek, in the lines so greatly loved by Matthew Arnold, "O that my lot may lead me in the path of holy innocence of word and deed, the path which august laws ordain, laws that in the highest empyrean had their birth, of which heaven is the father alone, neither did the race of mortal men beget them, nor shall oblivion ever put them to sleep. The power of God is in them, and groweth not old". Isolated from their context in the tragedy in which they occur and in Greek life and religion, they do not suggest to us what was the fact that the "august laws" were impersonal, and that the moral order assumed was based on the natural order and the ancient ritual cycle. It has been shown that the great conception of a universal order which is both spiritual and material rose everywhere, from the Aegean to China, on the basis of archaic ritual cultures.<sup>4</sup> Among the Hebrews, on the other hand, though ritual was with them as with others, the starting point of development, the conception of divine law was never impersonal as it was elsewhere. The ideas of "the eternal Law of Righteousness" and of "the moral order of the world" did not arise among them in that form because from first to last their God was personal and the only law they knew was the Will of a personal God. Mainly through the teaching of the prophets, their religion was moralised, and it was recognised that the will of God was ethically holy, and that He required righteousness rather than ritual service from men. Ancient religion was shaken free from all archaic survivals in the great monotheism which declared that heaven and earth were full of the glory of the Holy One of Israel. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. For He hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods. Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? And who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart . . .". The words recall the aspiration of Sophocles, though they were not spoken in the same world of religious faith. But had the faith of the prophet and

<sup>4</sup> Dawson, *Progress and Religion*, 121ff.

psalmist a firmer foundation in human experience than the faith of the Greek and those others, even to the far Orient, who believed in a universal order and the law of *Dike*, eternal Justice? The great Greek Tragedians, including Sophocles, portrayed a world in which the ways of whatever Powers may be were past finding out, and in which the Law was indistinguishable from blind Nemesis and Fate. The Melian philosopher Diagoras was banished from Athens on a charge of irreligion. He had said that there was no justice in the heavens, but it was a hard thing for a Melian to believe in after the massacre at Melos. In the pages of Thucydides the story is told for all generations to read and in its moral setting. In course of time, it was Fortune and not *Dike* in which men came to believe, or if not Fortune, then a Fate as fixed as the order of the stars. And it is significant that both in the East and West, as men ceased to look for signs of an Eternal Law of Righteousness and a moral order of the world, they turned from the visible order and the experience of life, and sought for a union with the Absolute, under one form or another, which would give peace. They saved their souls by rejecting the world of phenomena and by a flight of "the Alone to the Alone". But the Jews could not take that road. Their faith was not in an impersonal moral order, but in a personal God who ruled the world in righteousness, and who dealt out punishment and reward to men and nations according to His just and holy Will. His Will, in fact, *was* the moral order. But this faith faced the challenge of history and individual experience no better than the non-Jewish faith, as the outcries in many a psalm, the bewilderment of a Habakkuk, the futile attempt of an Ezekiel to deny that the consequences of sin flowed from father to child, and above all the tremendous protest of "Job", bear witness. "Ye say, God layeth up his iniquity for his children. Let Him recompense it unto himself, that he may know it." It is true that Jewish faith survived the shock of disillusionment, and it was also by turning away from the present world of experience but in a different way from others, in affirming a moral order which was yet to be, a coming reign of God. But, whatever grounds there may be for this hope, it does not touch the problem or answer the questions raised by the fact of consequences in a solidarity. It is nothing less than the problem of divine justice in this present world.

There are no conceptions still current among us which need closer examination than these of "an eternal Law of Righteousness" and "the moral order of the world". Unless we are going to live by catchwords we must ask, if we use them, what exactly we mean by them. Do we mean that there is a Law in human affairs analogous to a natural law which distributes

justice to every man? Do we mean that men and nations are living in a moral order, as they are living in a physical order, in which the innocent are invariably triumphant in the end, and the wicked as invariably perish by their own devices? It is a comfortable faith, especially for the successful in life, but it is not in accordance with fact. Undoubtedly there are moral elements in every human story, man being what he is, but he is very bold who affirms that in every story it is the moral element that is decisive. *The Bridge of San Luis Rey* teaches a most pertinent lesson. It is only by ignoring many facts that one can maintain that it was a "moral order" which decreed the fall of this nation and the ruin of that man. The maxim of Ecclesiastes "Be not over much wicked," or the Greek proverb, "nothing in excess," is nearer the truth. There are even historians of indisputable authority who agree with Sir Charles Oman; "I can only see a series of occurrences—and fail to draw any constructive moral from them". In any case, what kind of justice is it which in its operations in the solidarity, makes no distinction between the innocent and the guilty but overwhelms all in a common doom? It is a justice which, to all appearance, is as indifferent to personal values as a Russian bomber over a Finnish town. Browning may say :

Man lumps his kind i' the mass; God singles thence  
Unit by unit.

But does the supposed "moral order" confirm the conviction of that profound Christian poet and teacher? Surely, if anything is clear, it is that whatever the "moral order" may be, it is not an order of distributive justice. The great tragedians, from Aeschylus to Shakespeare, see things otherwise, and the last unanswerable word is with them. Antigone, for obeying the law of heaven rather than the law of man, is entombed alive, and Cordelia lies dead in the arms of Lear.

Nevertheless this frustrate belief in a "moral order", an "Eternal Law of Righteousness" that presides over the destinies of man, must mean something or human life would be altogether meaningless. Even Tragedy must signify—perhaps that a world without tragedy in it would be less noble than a world in which it is possible, perhaps that there is a greatness in the human spirit which is revealed only in the darkness of defeat, and which challenges the finality of death. "Why is light given to a man whose way is hid, and whom God hath hedged in?" asked Job, and part of the answer is surely in Job himself confronting his fate and towering above his calamities, holding fast to his integrity in face of heaven and earth, his light unquenched though the whirlwinds of God burst on him from the four corners

of the world. In his naked humanity he was proved greater than the universe that crashed around him. And there is that light in the human spirit. The vindication of moral values may be hard to discover in the world, but they are alive in the soul. In spite of all events the passion for justice remains. "I have within my soul a great Temple of Justice" said Euripides, and none knew better than he what moral chaos there was without. "Justice" said George Eliot wistfully, "is like the kingdom of God; it is not without us as a fact, it is within us as a great yearning". And if we ask whence came this birth of justice in the soul, we must answer that the immediate, though not the ultimate, source is in the very solidarity in which the great moral problems arise. It was in the necessities of social order, even of the most primitive kind, that moral values emerged. No society could exist without some recognised ethical standards, and from the beginning religion and morals have been inextricably mingled. Religion itself, according to some, is a form of sociology. It was the sanctions of religion that gave authority to the moral claim of the solidarity on the individual. There was progress and growth in ethical ideas, partly due to the growing complexity of society, and probably even more to individual insights and leadership. But the progress was within the solidarity, and even the Hebrew prophets, the most amazing line of men in history, were the products of the national religion and ethic they sought to purify. It was in the solidarities that the great values of justice, freedom, truth, mercy and love, were fostered. Can there be such a thing as a purely individual and original religion or ethic? Reference has been made to Newman's saying that in his childhood he was luminously certain of his own soul and of a God over against him. He was an exceptional person with exceptional religious susceptibility, but others who are not Newmans can say much the same thing. But was that certainty unmediated? Was his awareness, not of an undifferentiated Something beyond him, but, of a *God* to whom reverence and obedience were due, unrelated to the fact that he was born in England, into a deeply evangelical home, and surrounded from his birth by English and evangelical influences? Was not he, like the rest of us, profoundly in debt to the cultural, religious and ethical solidarity to which we belong? We need not hesitate to acknowledge that debt to society and the obligations that debt imposes upon us, because it is through the solidarity that God Himself has touched us and kindled within us the light of moral values and, in them, demands our unconditional obedience. Religion and ethics are more than "a form of sociology". No naturalistic account of them can explain the authority of conscience and the sense of sin, the growing inwardness of the moral claim, the conviction that life

is not worth living if there were not things worth dying for, the imperative which compels a faithful soul to confront even the solidarity when, swept along on what St. Augustine calls "the torrents of custom", it is untrue to its values or will not follow the gleam that is in them. The solidarity is one of the great means by which the Spirit of God has revealed the realities upon which the true life of humanity depends, and in so revealing has disclosed something of the Eternity which shines above the ambiguities of Time, and which claims our loyalty.

If the experience of solidarity disproves an order of distributive justice, on the other hand it is no part of the Christian religion to maintain its reality. The teaching of Christ lends it no support. He would not allow that the victims of a fallen tower were morally distinguishable from others, or that the man born blind was afflicted for his own sin or the sin of his parents. He did not, of course, deny that there were consequences of sin as there were consequences of folly and ignorance, and that these consequences flowed out through the whole life of the solidarity. But He did not interpret these as demonstrating "the moral order of the world". On the contrary He emphasised what appeared to be the vast moral indifference of things, the apparent absence of justice from the human situation. "Then shall two men be in the field; one is taken, and one is left: two women shall be grinding at the mill; one is taken, and one is left." Where is the distributive justice in that? But it is true to life. "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?" is the only reply the strange householder makes to his aggrieved labourers who rightly complained that there was no justice in his wage-system. But above all there are the great words, so often sentimentalised but in their realistic truth sweeping away many well-meaning theodicies, "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust". In that seeming indifference to all moral values, the indifference which has driven so many into unbelief, He saw the outskirts<sup>5</sup> of a divine patience and forgivingness that was the negation of all "orders" of distributive justice. He accepted the fact of human solidarity in which the problems of justice arise. In His baptism He associated Himself with the multitudes who came to the waters of repentance. His public ministry closed with the great lament over Jerusalem. Unlike His forerunner, He entered into the closest relationship with His fellows, and especially with those whose claim to social fellowship was rejected. None ever stressed the value of the individual soul as He did, or dealt more directly with the individual need. But His message concerned the Kingdom of God and knew nothing of a

<sup>5</sup> Job xxvi. 14.

solitary salvation. No ethical teaching was ever so inward and searching and personal as His, but it assumed the solidarities of life with all their opportunities and tensions. The interwoven texture of humanity which does not yield its meaning to the test of retributive justice will, He taught, yield it to the test of a redemptive love, and along all the threads the vibrations of that love will pass, because it deals with men not according to their deserts, but according to their value to themselves and to God, which is the finest justice.<sup>6</sup> Burdens borne of necessity but accepted in a generous spirit become occasions of brotherly service. The inescapable sufferings of the innocent, endured willingly, become vicarious and sacramental. The highest life, He said, is the life that finds itself in losing itself, and, accepting brotherhood with all, realises a divine sonship. He called into existence the Church, a new super-racial solidarity based on faith in Himself, and in its midst instituted the Memorial of a Sacrifice for the whole world, in which mercy and truth met together. In the end He stood revealed to faith as the Eternal Son who, by an infinite act of grace, came into the solidarity of humanity, and never deceived by our infidelity, having loved us, He loved us even to the Cross and beyond. Christ and His Cross transform the whole human situation, so that there is no problem of innocent suffering in the New Testament, no complaints against the justice of God. He does not give an answer to our questionings about the "moral order". He lifts us to a level where they cease to have meaning.

If the historians fail to find evidence of a "moral order" in human affairs, it naturally follows that they discover no "Providential order", no indication of a divine purpose. "I can see only one emergency following upon another as wave follows upon wave" says Fisher, and his view is typical. Arnold Toynbee approaches nearest to a spiritual interpretation of history when, rejecting emphatically the materialistic doctrine, he uses the Chinese Yin-Yang philosophy, and "represents the course of history under the suggestive figure of the inspiration and expiration of the World Spirit",<sup>7</sup> but these alternating cycles cannot yield the idea of a divine purpose. This idea belongs to revealed religion and is valid only within its sphere. It is the mainspring of the Old Testament and the joyous faith of the New. If we believe in a providential order, it is because we believe in the incarnation of God in Christ and in His redemption, and from within the citadel of that faith see history as culminating in Him. If that faith is vain and the experience of redemption goes for

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Barry, *Relevance of Christianity*, 196, on "transmuted justice."

<sup>7</sup> Matthews, *Purpose of God*, 162; cf. Lloyd, *Christianity, History and Civilisation*, 188ff.



nought, then, with the secular historians, we must abandon the idea of a divine purpose in history. But our view of humanity and its future is conditioned by the Christian view of man as sinful and needing redemption. It is to the credit of the Christian Church that, wholly in the beginning and for the most part since, it has been under no illusion about the state of the world, or has believed that mankind could be saved from its ills by its own wisdom and power. It has always proclaimed the need of salvation from a radical evil that poisons all life and all relationships, and in the end makes all human effort a ploughing of the sand. Babylons and Bastilles are all rebuilt in other forms. The world needs a redemption which is from above, an invasion of divine grace and supernatural power, and this is to be found only in God's saving work in and through Christ. The Church itself is the consequence of that great divine intervention; it is the "new man" created in Christ Jesus, the "new race", as it once called itself, in which the purpose of God is being fulfilled. It is a Light shining in the darkness in faith that at the last all the darkness shall vanish and in Christ all men shall be one, reconciled to one another because all reconciled to God. There are times when such a faith seems desperate indeed, and it never has been easy, but its foundation is Christ. "He said not" wrote that sweet-souled mystic Julian of Norwich, "Thou shalt not be tempested, thou shalt not be travailed, thou shalt not be afflicted; but He said: Thou shalt not be overcome."

But the Christian Church, like all other solidarities, is imperfect and sinful, even though the life of Christ flows through it; and even when its hope is fulfilled and it has no boundaries but the frontiers of humanity itself, still there will be sin and sorrow and frustrating death. Our Lord taught us to pray "Thy Kingdom come", and the powers of the kingdom are even now at work, but to ignore the eschatological reference is to misread not only the prayer but the Person and work of the Saviour. Here, we but "taste of the powers of the world to come". In this world of time and space, Humanity is a Jacob, and even though it bears the new name and the sun rises over its Peniel, it halts upon its thigh. It is not within the limits of earth that God's eternal purpose can be fulfilled. It is in Eternity only where awaits the multitude no man can number out of every tribe and nation and age, and who cannot be perfected apart from those who follow them, nor these apart from them, that God's will will be done, and His purpose accomplished—"to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth . . . in whom also we were made a heritage, having been fore-ordained according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will".

B. G. COLLINS.

## The Religion of Abraham Lincoln.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN was the eighth President of the American Republic; eighth, when we count in historical order, but certainly not eighth in order of merit. Some enthusiasts would put him first. But against that must stand the claims of Washington and Thomas Jefferson (and possibly posterity will put Franklin Roosevelt in front of all). Lincoln had little opportunity of displaying constructive power. He saved the Union from disaster, but he did not live to heal the wounds the Civil War had made. We know he had plans, and unquestionably much bitterness would have been averted had he been spared to prevent the army of "carpet-baggers" from descending on the unhappy South. As it was, Booth's pistol-shot robbed America of one of its greatest sons, and it frustrated what might well have been the finest epoch in Lincoln's career as a statesman.

But if his claims to be the greatest of American Presidents can be disputed, few would deny that to the outside world he is the best known and probably the most revered. Washington was "the father of the nation," and Thomas Jefferson had constructive genius of a remarkable kind, but neither made the appeal to the universal human heart that we find in Lincoln.

There was such a homeliness in "our Abe", the story of his rise from the obscure poverty of the backwoods to fame and power at the White House was so romantic; the words he spoke, particularly at Gettysburg and in his Second Inaugural, were so simple and yet so profound, that people instinctively felt drawn out in trust and admiration towards him. He was a man of the people, and in him the common man felt that he found expression.

And yet it may be doubted whether this impression can always be justified. There are elements in Lincoln's character that cannot be included in an entirely simple synthesis. "Reticence degenerating at times into secretiveness is one of his fixed characteristics," says Professor Stephenson, and there are episodes in his life that are not easy of understanding. This may account for the feeling that in spite of all his greatness Lincoln does not command the utter allegiance of some. An interesting sidelight on this was an experience at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1939. A party of us were returning from Atlanta, and at Louisville we held a meeting at which several of our company spoke, one of them being R. L. Child, of Bristol, who proudly remarked that on that particular day on our way to Louisville we had visited the humble log cabin where Abraham

Lincoln was born. He then said something about the world's debt to Lincoln, and this stirred the Southern soul of Dr. Sampey, the President of the great Louisville Baptist Seminary, who had been appointed to express the good wishes of the Louisville people to the delegation. In the course of his remarks he referred to Lincoln. "A great man? Yes," he said; "but I reckon that General Robert E. Lee was a greater." There was behind this something deeper than the jealousy of the Southerner for the hero of the South. The remark was a pointer to the fact that Lincoln in character was something less direct and sincere than Lee, surely one of the finest Christian gentlemen that history speaks of.

It has been argued (notably by Edgar Lee Masters) that Lincoln was a good deal of an opportunist, a man without definite convictions who largely took his colour from his environment, and became to a large extent what political circumstances made him. Such an idea is obviously unjust, and it does not square with the facts. But it only serves to emphasize the point that Lincoln's character is not as simple as many people imagine.

We must not labour this fact too much, but undoubtedly there are episodes in Lincoln's career that are perplexing. These, however, may perhaps best be explained by the fact that his whole mental and spiritual development was slow. He could never, like some men, see in a flash where truth and duty lay; he had to examine the situation in all its bearings, and feel his way to the right conclusion. Once his mind was made up he never wavered, but in the process of reaching his decisions he was diffident of himself and leaned heavily on others, often to his own great disadvantage. This is very conspicuous in the early stages of his Presidential administration, when he often seemed to fumble, both in civil and military affairs. It was not until 1862, after nearly eighteen months of war, that Lincoln finally and firmly took the reins into his own hands, because it was not until then that he saw his way clearly, and resolved, whatever happened, to pursue his own course.

We see the same uncertainty when we come to deal with his religion. For long years he ruminated in silence, refusing to identify himself with anything positive; so much so that he was often misunderstood, and ideas were fathered upon him that were certainly unjust. It was only towards the end of his life that he began to speak out clearly. But his word, when it came, was the word of a prophet, and as such it has been received by the world.

Lincoln, interesting to note, had Baptist connections. His father, Thomas Lincoln (a somewhat shiftless character), settled after his marriage (1806) at Elizabethtown, which was a Baptist

stronghold. Baptist ideas were in the air, and apparently they sufficiently impressed Thomas Lincoln to make him feel that if he were to be anything in religion he must find his home among the Baptists. But with that casualness of mind that characterized him, he did not join a church. From Elizabethtown he wandered off into the remoter parts of Kentucky, and there he took to farming of a not too serious kind. It was at Sinking Spring Farm (near Hodgenville) that Abraham Lincoln was born in 1809. There was a Baptist Church some two miles away, and probably the Lincolns had a connection with it. Seven years later, when struggling with another farm (Knob Creek), Thomas Lincoln was baptized by William Downs, a minister of the "Separate Baptists." The same year saw him once more on the move with his family. He settled at Pigeon Creek, Indiana, and there he helped build the Baptist Church, a log hut 26 ft. by 30 ft. He prided himself on making the pulpit and window frames, but curiously (or characteristically) enough he did not join it until 1823, when he received his transfer.

For us the interest of all this lies in its connection with his famous son whose religious background, we can see, was Baptist, but Baptist of a somewhat sketchy kind. His father's slackness could hardly be considered a strong recommendation to a boy who in so many ways (as we know) differed from him. Moreover, preachers in these backwoods areas were hard to come by, and services were both occasional and to a growing boy rather uninspired. Abraham Lincoln must have attended church with reasonable frequency, however, because by his fifteenth year he had acquired quite a reputation as a pulpit mimic. To the great delight of his companions he used to repeat the sermons verbatim with an exaggerated emphasis on the preacher's voice and delivery.

But in Lincoln's case we have two facts to remember. First, he and his father never could hit it, and this affected his attitude to the Church. Secondly, and more important, he was naturally self-contained, and where it came to the deep things almost secretive, until he was perfectly sure that he knew where he was. "Abe," said his step-mother (his own mother died when he was nine) "had no particular religion—didn't think of that question at that time—if he ever did," and then she added (more sensibly, perhaps) "he never talked about it"; in the way of revealing his own inner thoughts, that is.

But gradually he drifted away from church connections, and his attitude led to a good deal of perplexity. It is plain that he disliked the popular theology of his time. Revival excitement (such as the backwoods villages loved) left him unmoved or annoyed, while hell-fire sermons only made him

angry. We are told that he used to read and recite passages from Burns's *Holy Willie's Prayer* and the *Address to the Unco Guid*, poems which must have increased his dislike of conventional Calvinistic Baptist preaching. As a result, when he was free to choose for himself, he gave up church attendance altogether. He also read anti-religious books (notably Volney's *Ruins of Time*), though he continued at the same time to read the Bible. Occasionally he would tell a story or drop a remark that hinted at his reaction from orthodoxy; and, as a consequence, all kinds of impressions about his anti-religious views were spread, and in due course proclaimed to the world as a whole.

John T. Stuart, his first law partner, declared that Lincoln was "an open infidel," and that he "always denied the divinity of Christ." David Davis, on the other hand, said (what was more likely to be true) that "he never talked about religion," and "though he had no Christian faith he did believe in a Creator." Others alleged that he took Christianity for granted, though his Christianity was more after the fashion of Theodore Parker than strictly orthodox. Finally, we have the testimony of his wife. "Mr. Lincoln," she said, "had no faith and no hope in the usual acceptation of these words. He never joined a church. But still, I believe he was a religious man by nature. He first seemed to think about the subject when our boy Willie died, and then more than ever about the time he went to Gettysburg. But it was a kind of poetry, and he was never a technical Christian."

All this is very puzzling unless we see it in relation to Lincoln's character. His slow development is observable here as elsewhere. Manifestly he revolted from the kind of religion that suited his father. But that he was ever an "infidel" no one that knows him can think. He slowly formed his own conclusions; and though admittedly they were somewhat hazy, they were at least his own, and unlike a good deal of orthodoxy they got their value from a living relation to life. "I have never united myself to any church," he said, "because I have found difficulty in giving my assent without mental reservations to the long and complicated statements of Christian doctrine which characterize their Articles of Belief and Confessions of Faith. When any Church will inscribe over its altar as its sole qualification of membership the Master's condensed statement of the substance of both Law and Gospel: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and thy neighbour as thyself,' that church will I join with all my heart and with all my soul." This represents Lincoln's deepest conviction and the man who could so speak might be unorthodox, but he could hardly be called irreligious,

much less anti-religious, and most of us would agree that he was nearer the Kingdom of Heaven than many who can more accurately tithe the mint and anise and cummin of theological opinion.

It was not, however, till towards the end of his life that Lincoln began to speak freely about the deep things he had slowly wrought out for himself. God, he believed, is over all, just and wise and good, and any true statesmanship must take cognizance of His will. Especially did Lincoln feel this as he brooded over the sad fact that even the best of men can come to take opposite sides about great moral issues, as they did in the Civil War. Both parties claimed to be right, and both unquestionably contained in their ranks multitudes of sincere and thoughtful Christians. Who was to say where the truth and justice of things finally lay? Only God, said Lincoln, with deep and fervent piety; and as he beat out his faith in Providence amid the clash of arms itself, he gave us perhaps the noblest expression of the truth we are ever likely to see.

He sketched it first in a private paper he wrote for his own edification in 1862. "The will of God prevails," he said. "On great issues each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both *may* be, and one *must* be wrong. God cannot be *for* and *against* the same thing at the same time. In the present Civil War it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party, and yet the human instrumentalities working as they do are of the best adaptation to effect His purpose. I am almost ready to say that this is probably true, that God wills this contest and wills that it should not end yet. By His great power on the minds of the now contestants He could have either *saved* or *destroyed* the Union without a human contest. Yet the contest began, and having begun, He could give the final victory to either side any day. Yet the contest proceeds."

Lincoln here is still groping his way to a final understanding of the problem. Where is God in human events, and what is the relation of His will to them? Somehow he shapes and controls, and His judgments are always better and wiser than we can see. War and peace, evil and good, pain and pleasure, are all in the texture of life; and even the things we shrink from and hate must be subdued by God's power to the purpose He has before Him.

So Lincoln wrestled for peace with the problem of his country's sorrowful strife. He tried to see above both North and South to the meaning of the Civil War for the nation as a whole; and his final word he gave to the world in his great Second Inaugural, March 4th, 1865, surely one of the finest

declarations that Lincoln (or anyone else) ever made on this theme of Divine Providence. Speaking with magnificent impartiality for the South (in arms against his government) as well as the North, he said:—

“Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God’s assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men’s faces; but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered—that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. ‘Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.’ If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offences which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern therein any departure from those Divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman’s two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, ‘The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.’

“With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation’s wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”

Lincoln, as we have seen, was called an “infidel”, and by the orthodox among Christians he was looked at somewhat askance. But can anyone that really knows him doubt his deeply religious character? In theology, as in politics, he took his own way, slowly, sometimes reluctantly, but thoughtfully and sincerely. One might say of him that as he grew in stature with God, so equally he grew in power with men, and his closing years were a tribute to his slowly developed, but deeply rooted piety.

HENRY COOK.

## A Baptist Governor for Carolina?

THOMAS WALCOT of Ireland was considered for this post in 1682. It seems worth considering his qualifications, and why he was never appointed. First a word as to the situation.

Charles II. was very liberal in everything that did not affect him personally. He gave a wonderful charter to Rhode Island, presented millions of wooded acres to Penn, who made Pennsylvania a second refuge for the persecuted, and sold to a syndicate another vast tract used by the Indians south of Virginia, with the right to make this a third Dissenters' Home.

The Fundamental Constitutions were drawn up by John Locke, who made certain of religious liberty: but he knew nothing of wild country and the problems of settlers, so that a workable constitution was drawn up by a Baptist immigrant. There was a little friction between the actual colonists and the seven Proprietors, of which a token is that Joseph West was chosen by the Council to be Governor in 1671; then Sir John Yeamans came next year from the Barbados to represent the Proprietors; on his death in 1674, West resumed till 1682. Such facts show that differences were easily adjusted, and that the Proprietors had no rigid policy as against actual planters.

Now, the leading Proprietor was Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, who from 1644 had a most consistent political record, as what an Englishman calls Leader of the Opposition. He always held to Parliament, sat in Cromwell's parliaments and on the Council of State, but opposed Cromwell's autocratic rule from 1656, opposed Richard Cromwell, was a commissioner to invite Charles in 1660, for which he was created Baron Ashley. Opposed Clarendon and the vindictive royalists, backed the first Declaration of Indulgence, and the second in 1672, when he was created Earl of Shaftesbury. Found next year that Charles had behind his back made a secret treaty and become a pensioner of his cousin Louis XIV. Became a virulent opponent of Charles, as a liar like his father. Led a parliamentary opposition, till in sixteen months Charles dissolved four parliaments and never called another. He was imprisoned on a charge of treason, and offered to withdraw to Carolina, where he would have been the Resident Proprietor and Governor. But the grand jury threw out the indictment, saying there was no case against him. Thus in 1681 he was again head of a constitutional opposition in England, and had to look for a Governor to replace Joseph West. His attention was directed to Thomas Walcot.

This man was of a Suffolk family, it would appear; but he had carved out a career for himself. He had been in the army



led by Cromwell to Ireland, and by the end of his drastic campaign was Captain-Lieutenant in Ludlow's horse. Like Ludlow and Shaftesbury, he was a sturdy upholder of parliament. For instance, when Cromwell dismissed a parliament abruptly, stationed major-generals to keep the peace, paid them by confiscating a tenth of all royalist estates, many in the army were shocked at his abandoning the Good Old Cause, and drew up a petition for more legal methods. Ludlow asked Walcot to distribute 300 copies in Ireland. Cromwell countered by paying off the whole regiment, settling it on lands in Wexford confiscated from the Irish under the last Act to which Charles I. assented—a most legal and parliamentary proceeding! Walcot thus became a great landed proprietor, and brought over his family. He must have had plenty of cash also, for an audit of 1656 shows £63,221 11s. 2d. paid to his regiment.

When, however, Sir George Booth led a royalist rising in 1659, Ludlow, as commander-in-chief for Ireland, formed an Irish Brigade, commissioning Walcot, and sent it across. In the cross-currents, he was arrested at Chester as a known republican. He escaped, went to London, and taxed Monk with betraying the Good Old Cause by his lukewarmness. Monk gave him a passport to return to Ireland. When, however, Monk in a few months restored Charles, Walcot was not sure where he stood, and in June 1660 left Dublin for England; a report went to London that he was a dangerous Anabaptist. But the Act of Indemnity and oblivion sufficed, and he returned to his estates.

There he seems to have dwelt quietly for a score of years, not figuring at all in public life. In the voluminous correspondence of the Governor-General the Duke of Ormonde, he does not seem to be mentioned in all this period. Just once he is heard of in English affairs, for when Charles issued his second Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, a licence was secured that his house at Bungay, and that of John Allen in the same town, might be used for Congregational and Baptist worship—a combination quite unparalleled. It does not imply that he was living there, only that the house belonged to him. Of course, it had no permanent result.

Now, this Declaration was dear to Shaftesbury, and the trifle shows the two men had religious freedom in common, as well as political principle. When, therefore, ten years later, Shaftesbury was casting round for a Governor, he sent and asked Walcot to come over and see him.

But Shaftesbury had two irons in the fire, and was considering also whether he should appeal to arms against the proceedings of Charles. Walcot was sounded whether he would take a commission as colonel, and whether he could bring over

good swords from Ireland. Although this was much like the doings of thirty years earlier, long covered by the Act of Indemnity, it was certainly Misprision of Treason to conceal these overtures; and when he was afterwards tried for this, he avowed it.

When Shaftesbury threw up the game in 1682 and retired to Holland, Walcot accompanied him; probably the Carolina iron was again heated as the original plan.

But a few dangerous malcontents who had been in touch with Shaftesbury had evolved a different scheme; that when Charles and James were returning from Newmarket to London, the plan once worked out to assassinate Cromwell should be carried into effect. Thé Guards should be engaged at the Rye House, and in the scuffle the two brothers should be killed.

When Shaftesbury fled, the bad precedent of Titus Oates and other informers was followed; conspirators turned King's Evidence, and arrests were made. Walcot had returned to England, apparently with a rather clear conscience; he took a journey from York to Norwich, thence to London, apparently through the older family estates. He was laid up in town for some weeks with the gout, while his name was given by informers as concerned in both plots, and search was being made for him in Ireland. He seems to have then openly surrendered, and offered to explain all his doings. He certainly was brought before Charles in council, like his compatriot Colonel Blood twelve years before. But he was no informer, and gave evidence that inculpated only one man, Ferguson the Scot, well out of harm's way. This did not mitigate his offence, and he was committed to prison, being the first to be tried, 12th July, 1683, at the Old Bailey.

A very full account was published by the lord mayor, and it shows perfect fairness except in that two things were intertwined, "conspiring the death of the king and raising a rebellion in this kingdom." The former he denied, the latter he admitted. Of the informers, far the most important was a barrister who had been implicated in both schemes, and was saving his neck. As his name was West, it is desirable to find if he was related to Joshua West, Governor of Carolina, who was in danger of being replaced by Walcot. Conviction did not occupy the jury ten minutes, sentence followed, and on 20 July a warrant was issued for his execution.

Glemham Hall is named, near the Alde in Suffolk, twenty miles south of Bungay. Conviction carried the loss of all property, and an undignified scramble followed for the spoils.

However important Walcot appeared to the Government, public opinion was stirred more deeply by the trial of Lord

Russell at Westminster, so that our man was soon forgotten. It seems a great pity that Shaftesbury ever swerved from his intention to send him out as Governor to Carolina. As a tried soldier he might have saved disasters from the Indians. As a successful planter in Ireland he might have guided the economic life of the planters on the Ashley and Cooper rivers. As a Baptist, he would soon have made the Carolinas a mighty stronghold for his co-religionists.

W. T. WHITLEY.

## A Voyage to Canada, 1841.

THE original of the following letter from her aunt, Mrs. Futvoye, was found among the papers of Miss A. M. Purchase, of Romsey, who passed away recently. Miss Purchase was a great-grand-daughter of the Rev. Abraham Booth, and a daughter of the Rebekah mentioned in the letter. Mrs. Futvoye was born in Hackney in 1805; her father, Isaac Booth, of the Bank of England, died in 1840, and shortly afterwards she sailed with her two children for Canada to join her husband. She died in Canada in March, 1848. A memorial notice of Eady Futvoye and her sister, Martha Booth, from the pen of Charles Stovel, will be found in *The Baptist Magazine* for July, 1848. The letter gives an interesting glimpse of travel conditions one hundred years ago.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

\* \* \* \* \*

QUEBEC,

June 2nd, 1841.

My dear Mother,

As I was quite unable to keep a journal during our voyage, I will attempt something of the kind now. I will not attempt to describe my feelings on leaving my maternal roof, although I was better than I expected; but I felt I was acting in the path of duty, and that I was encouraged to take those steps by one of the fondest and best of parents, now safely landed on a happier shore, and you, my dear Mother. I often picture to myself how many anxious hours you have had concerning me, but I hope you will have received my letter in due time sent by Halifax Mail, which left here on the 28th of May. I feel much better than when I wrote those letters, but am still not quite strong again, and I have begun this letter to send by our very kind friend that I might take time.

We felt very much when our dear friends left us in the cabin, and I think they must have felt more when they returned in the coach without us. Mrs. Brown very kindly made my bed

and Mr. Windass, our 1st Mate, made Mrs. Lloyd's. We were obliged to go to bed that night at nine as no lights were allowed in the docks after that time. It was a dull night indeed; the cabin and berth appeared so small. We were up very early in the morning and arranged our clothes comfortably in the drawers, and put our cabin to rights. After breakfast we went on deck and remained there till Abraham and Mr. Martin left us with the pilot at Gravesend. It made us feel rather low-spirited to see them going away from us in their small boat. After that we dined off shoulder of mutton and baked potatoes, which I partook of as I wished to try and keep off sea sickness, but it was of no use. Captain B. after dinner told us he thought we had better write what letters we wished as the pilot might leave early, but he could see if we had not written as we did we should not have done so at all, for as soon as we had sealed them we were so sick. I was sick seven times the first hour; and it did not abate until I went to bed. Mrs. L. and the dear children were very sick, but the children were only sick the first three days. Ours lasted when the weather was at all rough until the day we landed. I was so exhausted. I was unable to take any meat or soup the whole of the voyage although so many nice things had been provided. We had preserved milk, preserved soups de'carrots, etc., bottled greengage, currants, cherries, damsons, and gooseberries, which were made into nice tarts. The steward also made very nice plum puddings. I think I should have done better if I could have had some baker's bread—I missed that so very much. Rebekah knows I like it. Hills biscuits and the gingerbread nuts were a great comfort to us, also the apples and lemons and the nice seed cake Marianne put in the hamper of her making. I wished we had brought more apples, but then I am fearful they would not have kept. I could take an apple when I have not been able to taste anything else. They only lasted three weeks out of the seven. They would not have kept longer. The beef, which was so nice, that you potted for me, became mouldy, and I was obliged to throw it away. The steward made me very nice gruel, which I generally took for my supper, and arrowroot or sago for my dinner. There was great plenty of everything that could be provided for our comfort—bottled stout, ale, brandy, wine. Captain had a medicine chest and Mrs. L. was obliged to take a great deal of castor oil, etc. I only had to take medicine once and that was just before I landed.

Captain B. was very poorly for a day or two with a pain in his chest. I gave him one of my poor man's plaisters which relieved him very much. We were very anxious until he was better—he is such a steady, kind and fatherly man. After we had been on board about a week I complained of my bones aching

with the hard bed, as the bottom of the berth was wood. He immediately had it removed from both of them, and the men put sacking which made it much more comfortable for us. I am afraid if I begin to tell you of Captain Brown's kindness I shall fill many sheets of paper and then I should not find words to express how grateful I feel for all his kindness to us. On the Sunday after we sailed we thought the weather rather rough but the Wednesday was rather worse, and soon after Captain was gone to bed Mrs. Lloyd said she thought the ship was splitting. He, to satisfy us, immediately got up and sat in the cabin between us all night. It was not rough, although we then thought so, for we did indeed have three rough days and nights on the 23, 24 and 25 of April. They are days long to be remembered by us. I shall never forget it when all hands were on deck, even to the cabin boy, Tom. I think Mrs. L. was more timid than myself, though I dreaded it most before we sailed. The dear children enjoyed those rough days. Isaac said, "Oh, Mama, what fun! I must send my Grandmama word about the plates and dishes rolling about, the pudding rolling out of the dish, and the seats which had been fastened down were even torn away." Captain B. was particularly fond of Julia, and it was quite amusing to see him assisting Steward in dressing her, for we were often quite unable to dress ourselves. Many, many times has the steward undressed me. I shall not forget the first time when I was so helpless, he said, "You need not be afraid of me." He was a very steady man, which made it comfortable for us.

June 7th.

On the 4th of May we saw a great many birds swimming and iceburghs to be seen. 5th May was very cold; too cold to go on deck. I was then getting very anxious to be near land, but feared we should not reach Quebec by my dear George's birthday. On the 6th we were on the banks of Newfoundland and the First Mate caught a cod weighing 14lbs, which we had for dinner the two following days. It made an agreeable change, as they began to be tired of fowls. I tasted the cod; it was very nice. I suppose we thought it nice from seeing it caught. On the 8th a land bird came on deck which was caught and the Captain wished to keep alive for Julia till we reached Quebec, but it was put in the hole with the fowls, and our pig, for we had one on board, killed it and eat it. Julia was much concerned when she heard it was dead. We were exactly five weeks without seeing land, and you may imagine how pleased we were when we were told we were coming near land, and still more so when I was led on deck to see it. When I took the last glimpse of my much loved native land it was in the hopes of being spared of one day seeing it again—but I must leave that subject.

There were several fishing boats came up to us off Plymouth, and Isaac told Captain B. I was very fond of mackarel, so he bought several, but I could only taste them once. We found the days very long, so we used, when well enough, in the evenings, to play at dominos, "Fox and Goose" and drafts. The carpenter made us a draft-board from my directions. He also made the children a cart large enough to draw each other about in it on deck. He is also a very steady man, and has been in Mr. Fletcher's employ twenty years. They were all, I mean the sailors, quiet and steady, and although there was no form of worship on the Sunday, it was pleasant to see them so quiet, and you would have been pleased to see Isaac walking round lending them his books and mine. There was only one that could not read. Mr. Windass liked Sarah's favourite book very much. I mean the *Family Monitor* that dear Martha gave me when I left.

I think the poor old carpenter pitied me very much, as did many of the others, seeing me so ill. Julia did not visit the cook so much as Isaac as he was a black man, but Isaac was very sociable with him, as well as all the others. I think Isaac would be able to tell the particulars of all the men, whether they had mothers, wives or sisters, etc. The children did not grow at all tired of being on board ship, nor do I think they would if they had been on board seven weeks longer. Isaac used generally to assist in pulling up sails and was acquainted with all their terms. Julia says she liked everything on board ship except being sick.

We found it very cold when at Newfoundland. We could not keep ourselves warm except in bed. I found my blanket shawl a great comfort. How pleased I was when Captain said we were near the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, and when we came into the river it was indeed a very pretty sight to see the houses scattered on each side and a great many churches with tin roofs and spires and the sun shining on them, for it was a most lovely day. Every hour I became more anxious to meet my dear husband, from whom I had been so long separated. I feared the meeting would be too much for me in my weak state, and dear Mrs. L. felt very much for me.

We arrived at Quebec on the 19th, between six and seven in the evening, with a great many other vessels from London, which kept us company down the St. Lawrence. It was a pretty sight to see so many in the river all outward bound, and I daresay many as anxious to reach here as myself. Two other vessels of Mr. Fletcher's had just arrived. Being late in the evening and so many vessels, it was not known we were in the Harbour until the morning, and no one is allowed to come on board until the Harbour Master and Surgeon have been on board. You can fancy I had no sleep that night, thinking I was at Quebec but

unable to see George. We were all up about six in the morning, but it was about eleven before George could get on board, and then we saw him at a distance in a small boat and all of us at the side of the vessel. He had a telescope looking at us and brought a bottle of Hartshorn in his pocket, thinking I might faint; but I did not, but was very sorry to see him looking so ill, but he had been very busy having a great deal to do, but I think he looks a great deal better, and is better, since we came, and I hope will continue so when we get more settled. There had been on the Monday before we arrived a very shocking accident—part of a rock fell and eight houses with the inhabitants were buried in the ruins. The poor creatures had been told to leave their houses as it was considered unsafe for some time. It is some distance from where we live, but the shock was so great to me just as we arrived that I shall never forget it. George had to see that all were dug out and buried, which was one great cause for his looking so poorly. Captain B. will tell you more about it.

June 9th.

You will wonder I do not say how I like Quebec. I have not yet seen much of it as I have only walked out twice a short distance and to Chapel last Sunday morning. I liked Mr. Atkinson, better than I expected I mean. The school rooms for the Chapel is not finished building and will not be opened until August. I feel quite at a loss not being able to speak French, and we have an old Canadian woman until I get settled with a servant, and she cannot talk English much better than I can French. They make very free. The moment I entered the house, she sat down on the sofa by my side and patted me on the back and appeared very glad to see me. She is very honest but a strange creature. Mrs. Musson has recommended me a servant and I expect her this afternoon. She is a Scotch woman and I am to pay her four dollars a month. I hope she will suit for she has lived in Quebec some time and will know the ways, for I am sure I shall be a long time before I know them. Washing is also paid by the month. They will not take washing as we do at home, *sweet home*. They take family washing at so many dollars a month. I have not done so yet, as I was obliged to have all ours that we brought dirty washed by the dozen, which was a large quantity.

June 10th.

My servant that I expected yesterday has not come and I hear that it is a very common thing for them not to come for two or three days after they are engaged to come. To-day is a close holiday—a very strict day among the Catholics.

We have had very warm weather here the last two or three

days. I have no thermometer yet, but when I have, I shall take an account of the weather as it will interest you, as yours does me.

Give my love to Martha and tell her I received her account quite safe; also Isaac did the Heartsease off his plant which he has often spoken of. My poor Auricula that I brought with me is living, but looks very poorly. It drooped sadly while on the water, but I hope it will revive again. I have had a great many flowers made me a present of. I need Rebekah to attend to them. I have also a little pig which requires great attention.

As this is rather a long letter and I wish to write several others I must conclude. I wish when you have read this you would send it to Mrs. Futvoye to read as I shall not have time to write so much as I wish to her.

And with love to all my brothers and sisters and all dear friends, many of whom I intend to write to in turn, believe me, my dear mother, ever to remember

Yours affectionate daughter,  
EADY FUTVOYE.

## Forty Years of Regent's Park College.

[Read by Professor Farrer at the College Annual Meeting, 20th June, 1940, on the occasion of his retirement from the position of Senior Tutor.]

**I**T was (to be precise) in 1894 that I entered as a student. Let me clothe the bare date with flesh and blood by adding that the senior student was J. E. Ennals, now Dr. Ennals, of South Africa, and that in the year above me were his younger brother Sidney, martyred a few years later in the "Boxer" riots, W. Sutton Page, later of Serampore, and Rowntree Clifford, now the unmitred bishop of Barking.

The Regent's Park College of those days seems now more like a pleasant dream of long ago than a sober reality. It is true that within a short walk of it, in Lisson Grove, there were slums and thieves' kitchens, which we visited to hold services on Sunday evenings. But the College itself, surrounded with ample grounds, and these again by the park, was a bit of *rus in urbe*. In spring and early summer the garden, with its flowering trees and warbling birds, was a delightful retreat in which to sit and read, or walk and talk. And quiet was our life in general. We were unconcerned about politics to an extent incredible in these



latter days. Our work we did on the whole with reasonable interest and diligence, and we enjoyed the humours of the classroom; e.g. the student who, after a class-examination, asked who was Priscillian, and on learning that he was an obscure Spanish heretic, groaned out, "And I've said he was Jerome's aunt!"; or another who confessed he had always thought that a statue of Cicero outside the New Testament classroom was an idealised portrait of the tutor, S. W. Green.

We were fortunate in having adjacent to the garden a playing-field, including tennis courts and cricket and football pitches—to say nothing of the interest taken in our proceedings by the street urchins outside the railings, and the swift and deadly sallies of their Cockney humour. There was a tall and lean student of rather lugubrious countenance whom they promptly dubbed "six feet of misery"; and a fussy little man who ran about the field incessantly without doing anything effective with the football: him they christened "Charlie's aunt still running." There was also the wordy game of debates—minor ones weekly, and an annual engagement attended by admiring relatives and sweethearts. In one of the latter I recall a fervid diatribe against Socialism which wound up with the ejaculation: "And that, gentlemen—er, ladies and gentlemen—is the rock on which Socialism must *flounder*."

There were still men in the House who had been with Dr. Angus. In his last years his great age and partial failure of mental vigour had resulted in some decline in the efficiency of the work of the College, and consequently in its reputation; and his successor's disastrous breakdown of health came too soon for him to have done anything material towards restoring its position. That task then was left to Dr. Gould. In the nature of the case he will supply a major part of these reminiscences. He was my beloved and honoured teacher, who more than any other shaped my thoughts on matters theological. His colleague, Green, was also a born teacher, to whom teaching was as the very breath of life. He clung tenaciously to his work for the College till the last possible moment; and when he had finally to relinquish it, with staggering swiftness he faded away. The lifelong friendship and co-operation between Gould and Green was as beautiful a spiritual phenomenon as I have been privileged to witness. Only on one point can I remember Green ever saying to me a word in criticism of Gould. Gould took relatively the largest share of the time-table for his Hebrew classes, and insisted on preparation for them being done, and occasional neglect of other tutors' work was apt to be excused to them on the ground of these engrossing Hebrew studies.

When I joined the staff in 1900 I was still very young, and

wholly inexperienced; there were still men in the House who had been my fellow students. But both staff and students showed me all possible consideration. Gould and Green at once took me into all their counsels, and put me wholly on a level with themselves. Throughout the twenty years of our co-operation there was never once the slightest tension or misunderstanding between us—a statement which I can gratefully extend to my second twenty, under our present Principal. I fear I have not always been sufficiently grateful for this, for it did not occur to me to regard it as anything but matter of course, until I happened to become aware that harmonious team-work on the part of the staff was not invariably the case in all theological colleges.

From the outset Dr. Gould took in hand, and steadily pursued to its completion, the redecoration of the buildings, which had, I believe, been almost wholly neglected during our previous occupation. The handsome moulded plaster ceiling of the large library looked uniformly grey. On investigation, however, it proved to have been painted in eight colours; it would cost £400 to renew that colouring, but the Committee felt that it ought to be done.

Dr. Gould also reduced the number of studies. Dr. Angus had preferred to have as many students as could be got into the house, holding that this was good for the subscription list! Dr. Gould would only take men of good promise, whether more or fewer. This enabled him to withdraw from use some unsuitable rooms, including one that I had occupied in my first year, and which, for some unexplained reason, was known as the "Astronomical." It had a fire-place, but no window—only a sky-light just above the work-table, which could be raised by a rope, and then admitted a hurricane of draught down my neck. One winter day I found a pile of snow on said table.

The garden was under the care of a man who left more than half of it a wilderness, and for the rest gave us annually the regulation red geraniums, yellow calceolarias and white marguerites. Dr. Gould engaged better gardeners, who reclaimed the wilderness and gave us varied and beautiful flower-beds. He was personally fond of the garden, and there were few days on which he did not stroll round, enjoy the flowers, and have a word with the gardeners.

In speaking of house arrangements, it would be unpardonable to omit all reference to the work of Miss Gould. Here, however, I must content myself with saying that she was as efficient in her department as the Doctor in his. All the house-linen was renovated, the "table" was improved, and students' health sedulously cared for.

To Dr. Gould as a teacher, I have not space to do justice.

His lectures in Church History, and later, in Christian Doctrine, were careful and competent without, I think, being found particularly inspiring. His proper subject was Hebrew and the exposition of the Old Testament, and here he was brilliantly successful. With almost monotonous regularity our College used to contribute the first man in Hebrew in the annual Associates' examination of the Theological Senatus of Free Church Colleges, which our students took before London University gave us an available B.D. examination. He loved the details of Hebrew grammar, every "jot and tittle" of it, and could inspire students with something of his own interest and enthusiasm. And he had limitless patience in drilling it into slow or untoward students. Only once did I see him within measurable distance of losing his temper. It was the end of Session, and we were revising the grammar for the second or even third time. In the class was a stolid Yorkshireman who, when asked a question, had an irritating habit of merely blinking and looking as if it was wholly unreasonable to expect him to know these things. The Doctor plied him with questions, but could get nothing out of him. His face reddened, and we prepared for an outburst. But with a visible effort he swallowed his wrath and merely said, "I think you might have known it by now."

The sermon class, under his presidency, certainly was a formidable ordeal. His standards were inflexibly high. He detested loose thinking and all triviality and vulgarity, and looked decidedly askance at anecdote. He rammed his criticisms home relentlessly—a practice which he more than once defended to me by saying that men were thick-skinned, and you must hammer hard to get through the crust of their self-complacency. Usually, however, his estimates were wholly right in their main drift. On rare occasions he was unjust, and then we were thankful for the presence of Green, who, with sober, tactful speech, did something to restore the balance. Gould used to trounce not only the preacher, but also the preacher's critics, if he thought them wide of the mark.

But I must be careful to forestall a possible impression that Gould's criticisms were inspired by anything but the highest considerations. Beneath them all lay a great jealousy for the divine honour of our Lord, and a profound personal piety. This showed itself also, and most directly, in his conduct of morning prayers. I have heard many of his old students say that the best thing in their College course was the inspiration of those morning devotions. He never used forms, but always prayers of his own composing; and their never-failing freshness, depth and practical helpfulness, maintained day after day, year in, year out, afforded

unmistakable evidence of much time and thought devoted in private to their preparation.

Soon after his accession to the presidency came the re-shaping of London University, and with it the institution of examinations for theological degrees. Dr. Gould took advantage of the opportunity, and we became an affiliated school of the University, and sent our students in for the B.D. examination. It was, however, characteristic of his rigid integrity that he himself always refused to act as examiner where pupils of his own were competing.

The climax of his work for the College might be fittingly associated with the luncheon in celebration of its centenary in 1910, in which year he also brought out his excellent brochure on its hundred years' work.

I must not omit to mention the signal wisdom and tact which Dr. Gould displayed in the business of the College Council. He was careful to consult it on all matters of moment relating to the work of the College, and to encourage full and free discussion. His patience was specially tried by one member who grudged time spent in discussion, and wanted to settle matters by his own *ipse dixit*. More than once the Doctor had to suppress him, and always did it with studied courtesy, though he might fume about him a little to his colleagues in private. In all business of importance he usually got his way, but simply because what he said showed that he had thought more about the matter, and had better reasons for the view he took, than anyone else present. The most striking instance of this was the adoption of an age-limit for the staff. From experience of the very serious difficulties that had arisen from the absence of such a limit in time past he was determined that *he* would not be the occasion of any such difficulties, and that the date for his retirement should be settled while he was clearly in full possession of his mental powers. The Council, anxious to retain his services as long as possible, was against him almost to a man, including even his colleague, Green; but he carried in their teeth the resolution which requires retirement at latest at seventy. Curiously enough, in his own case events decided otherwise. When he attained that age the work of the College had been reduced by war conditions to a minimum, and he acceded to the Council's request to carry on until normal activities could be resumed.

It goes almost without saying that the last war marks the "great divide" in these forty years of the life of the College. It is that more than anything else that has served to make the Regent's Park College of the 'nineties seem an idyllic dream. Life since then has been a different thing—in how many ways I need not attempt to say. The changed conditions had the effect

of thwarting some cherished aims of the Principal; e.g. when Mrs. Rylands left us £5,000, he had eagerly secured that it should be primarily appropriated to providing a travelling scholarship for advanced students abroad. But the (I think) first and last holder was caught in Germany by the war, and had difficulty in getting back, and since then we have been glad to use the fund for more pressing purposes.

The resumption of work after the war brought with it a much fuller co-operation with New College, London, in a comprehensive system of joint classes, in theology as well as arts. This secured solid advantages. There was great stimulus for teachers in the fellowship of a larger staff, and in lecturing to much larger classes; and to students in being members of a larger body, including more varied types. But I must not indulge in any detailed reminiscences of these additional colleagues or pupils.

Perhaps in closing I may be permitted to record one conclusion that has been steadily impressed on me with growing force during these forty years. It is the extreme difficulty and delicacy of selecting the right men for the ministry. College Councils are sometimes blamed for having accepted this man or rejected that. But remember, you cannot estimate a man's spiritual quality by written examination, nor his character and ministerial aptitudes in a half-hour's interview. Hasty judgments have to be avoided. I have known men go through an entirely satisfactory college course and come to grief, or at least cut no ice, in the ministry. And I have known men about whom we had serious and repeated misgivings during their college course, who have made good, and sometimes much more than good, in the ministry. And how thankful should we be to reflect that the vast majority of our students justify their selection, and spend lives of good and faithful, if quiet, service in the churches. And so far as my own observation goes, in the few cases where men have left us for other denominations, their inability to acclimatise among us has been for reasons perhaps not wholly unconnected with their own personality, or its peculiar manifestations.

I must conclude, though I have said hardly anything of the present Principalship. There may be a suitable occasion later on for speaking or writing about that. Dr. Wheeler Robinson has maintained, if not surpassed, the traditions of our College in its best days; and we all hope that the new departure which he has inaugurated in Oxford with such conspicuous ability and success may be but the prelude to yet further progress that shall eclipse all the glories of the past. In Mr. E. A. Payne he has a coadjutor who will be able to second his efforts far more efficiently than I could ever do.

A. J. D. FARRER.

## Three Hundred Meetings of a Ministers' Fraternal.

**T**HE West London Suburban Baptist Ministers' Fraternal came into being in May, 1909. Since then there has been an unbroken sequence of monthly meetings which have afforded to the ministers of that area times of relaxation and mental stimulus, friendship and fellowship, guidance and inspiration. Minutes of the meetings have been faithfully kept by a succession of secretaries, and to turn over the pages is a source of great interest. One only wishes that some had been a little more generous with their notes and a little more legible in their writing.

The first minute tells us that "A meeting of local Baptist ministers was held at 1, Floral Villas, Lower Boston Road, Hanwell, on Monday, May 9th, 1909, attended by Gibbs, Smith, Clarke, Davies, Wells, Burnham and Allan Poole, the object of the meeting being to consider the question of a Baptist Ministers' Fraternal. After the reading of Psalm 122 and prayer, the question was fully discussed." The minutes conclude, "It was generally felt that a Fraternal of a helpful character had been successfully launched, and would have a prosperous voyage." The years have passed, and the hope has been realised. On June 3rd, 1940, the present members met at Jordans, Buckinghamshire, for the three hundredth meeting of the Fraternal, and under the genial chairmanship of the Rev. T. G. Pollard many happy memories were recalled. It is interesting to note that two who met on that first occasion have been members throughout—the Rev. W. E. Wells, who still maintains his ministry at Sudbury, and the Rev. Henry Smith, who now lives in retirement at Cowley.

Many great and honoured names have been inscribed on the roll of the members, that of John Clifford being the greatest. During the years of his retirement, which were spent at West Ealing, he was a loyal and faithful friend to his brethren, and gave of his best to the meetings and the discussions. Other Doctors who have been in membership are Townley Lord, E. J. Tongue and John Pitts. Professor Farrer, of Regent's Park College, has long been in connection, and was at one time secretary; whilst G. Henton Davies, now Professor of Hebrew at Bristol College, belonged to the fellowship during the period of his ministry at Hammersmith.

The meetings during this long period have varied greatly, both in character and subject. There have been the grave times and the gay, the serious and the light-hearted. The topics for discussion have ranged over a wide field. Politics—national,

denominational and international—have all been argued; theology, as one would expect, constantly cropped up; questions of worship and service, with one whole meeting given up to the children's address, find a frequent place; whilst outside subjects like the Brotherhood movement, the work of a Police Court Missionary, Psychology and Healing, Amusements, Freemasonry, Russia and Bolshevism have all been discussed; and often settled, at these gatherings!

There has always been the keenest interest in denominational matters in the Fraternal. At the present time the question of the polity of the Baptist Denomination is being discussed in a series of meetings; which takes us back to the first meeting, at which "it was agreed that Mr. Wells should deal with the new B. U. Proposals re ministerial settlement and sustentation at the next meeting." At this meeting, in June, 1909, it is recorded that "a most enjoyable afternoon was spent on the grass under the trees, the brethren listening to an admirable paper by the Rev. W. E. Wells on the B. U. Ministerial Proposals re settlement and sustentation, and a general discussion of the salient points. A majority of the members seemed to be in favour thereof, but there was a strong opposition to the proposed changes." Apparently Baptist ministers do not alter much in the changing years. Again, we find that some of the vexed questions that are before us to-day were discussed by the Fraternal long ago. On February 5th, 1923, "the Rev. Henry Smith introduced a very valuable paper on the value of Connexialism, or, Would a measure of Connexialism help our Denomination to-day? . . . Mr. Smith, who evidently felt that connexialism conferred benefits, acknowledged the value of our denominational liberty, but asked, 'Is our freedom a compensation for the weakness of our smaller Churches and the isolation of many of our ministers in remote places?' . . . An interesting and profitable discussion followed, in which the sentiments of all were expressed by a veteran minister . . . who said, 'Despite all the difficulties and disadvantages of the way and the work, thank God I am a Baptist minister.'"

The note of the Church Militant has been struck on occasion. For instance, in December, 1909, we are told that "the secretary was instructed to write to the Press in the name of the Fraternal, protesting against the Nonconformist Anti-Social Union, stating that it in no wise represented the attitude of Nonconformists to social reform. The following resolution was unanimously passed, 'That we, the Baptist Ministers' Fraternal of Ealing and District, protest against the Jesuitical plot against the Government of the Nonconformist Anti-Social Union, founded by the Rev. G. Freeman, and assert that it totally misrepresents the attitude of Baptist

ministers to the policy of the Government.' " At the same meeting, "after considerable discussion, eloquent and fervent, of election proposals, the Fraternal adjourned for tea."

Dr. Clifford was welcomed to the Fraternal at the meeting on May 8th, 1916. His gracious personality meant much to the Fellowship, and the records reveal how frequently he added to the discussion, and by his light and wisdom brought new truth to bear. He first addressed the Fraternal at its meeting in the following July, when he spoke on Sunday School decline and its remedies. It is worth while noting the Doctor's points to-day. "Amongst some of the causes of decline, he named (1) Sunday afternoon Scout Movement, (2) The growingly sporting character of Sunday afternoon, (3) The want of enthusiasm on the part of the teacher. Some of the remedies suggested were—we must generate a keener sense of responsibility for the child life of the nation by personal endeavour. . . . The grading of the Sunday School and the preparation of teachers were both strongly recommended." A few months later, in January, 1917, he spoke on the Gospel for the present day. Here again, the minutes give us some of the Doctor's points. "The despair of people is lifting . . . sacrifice was bringing out the best in men. . . . The spirit of the times must be met by (1) finding a faith in the God of the Gospels and emphasising a complete triumph of religion, (2) by stiffening the wills of the people and burnishing their weals, (3) by preaching a gospel of gladness and by seeking to comfort those who were cast down." In January, 1918, to the great delight of the brethren, Dr. Clifford spoke on "Fraternalism I have known." These experiences covered a period of nearly sixty years and fellowship with men in every denomination. At one of them Cardinal Manning was a fellow member, although, the Doctor recalled, he always stayed outside whilst prayer was offered. Reminiscences of Dean Stanley, Joseph Parker, William Chalmers, Gladstone and Disraeli were also brought forth on this occasion.

In September, 1918, the topic for discussion was, "Our Autumn Campaign." The secretary of that time gives scant place to the record of the paper, but much more room to Dr. Clifford's contribution. He writes, "Dr. Clifford crowned the conference." Again, there are words worth reading now. ". . . it is not a question of methods, but of personalities. He had always found the three months from October to December to be the best time for reaping. It was time for winning definite persons to discipleship, or to the avowal of discipleship, especially those between thirteen and sixteen, before the life got into the clutches of doubt. . . . Let the minister see what elements of truth have been missed in the course of his preaching during the



previous year. . . . Give special teaching on international fellowship. God is looking for the conversion of Germany and Turkey, and expecting them to co-operate in the extension of His kingdom. We ought to be. We ought to hold the convertability of nations as a fact of history that may be repeated. Get our people to expect it and pray for it. Without it a League of Nations will fail." "So," those minutes conclude, "our beloved campaigner, out of the rich stores of his own ministry, braced us for our fight."

Re-union was discussed in March, 1919, but here much of what Dr. Clifford said is left unreported. There is, however, this note: ". . . a message from Mr. Shakespeare to the effect that the Church of England knows it won't get re-ordination." At a later meeting the Lambeth proposals were considered. Then, Dr. Clifford said, "There were three types of piety. Autocratic, of which the Roman Church was the chief example; Aristocratic, which was the Episcopal, with its rule of bishops; and Democratic, which was illustrated by the Free Churches. The latter was not without its defects, but it was the type which was going to be successful. To go back to Episcopacy would be a terrible mistake, and new denominations would be undoubtedly raised up. . . . Whatever might be the result of the Lambeth proposals, he hoped that one would be a re-statement and a new declaration of Free Church principles. Then the occasion might yet be for the advancement of New Testament Christianity." In November, 1919, Dr. Clifford related his impressions of the Brotherhood Congress which had recently been held. He summed up by saying, "It was a sincere attempt to get the Churches out of their grooves and to realise some of the ideals of the true Church. . . . Jesus cared everything for souls, nothing for ecclesiasticism. Let us copy Him in His passion for the outsider."

It is not surprising to learn that at the last two meetings of the Fraternal attended by Dr. Clifford the subject discussed was "Personal Evangelism." As that was the subject of his last words to the Denomination in the Council Chamber, so also it formed his last message to his brother ministers in a more homely way. This great apostle of modern personal evangelism, as the minutes record him to be, utters a note of warning. The last words of his that were written here say, "The efforts of the Churches have been after bigness and quantity rather than quality . . . and there has been the consequent depreciation of the value of the individual Christian."

On December 3rd, 1923, the Fraternal recorded, "with deepest love and appreciation the great soul of our friend who has so recently been called home . . . the inspiration he always was, and especially when it was our privilege to hear him pray."

The graciousness of this revered leader is further borne out in the minutes of the next meeting, on January 7th, 1924. "A letter was then read from Miss K. Clifford, stating that Dr. Clifford had desired that the brethren of the Fraternal should each have one of his books." On several occasions it was the privilege of the Fraternal to pay tribute to the Doctor. His eightieth and eighty-first birthdays, his diamond jubilee as a minister, and the occasion of the conferring of the C.H. were all times that called for especial remembrance, congratulations and good wishes.

One good brother, who shall remain anonymous, since he is still with us, has always brought to the Fraternal's meetings something that was bound to excite lively discussion. On May 3rd, 1915, he "referred to a Holiness Campaign being held in his locality, and the 'Holiness' movement was thereupon analysed, criticised and anathematised to the general satisfaction of the company." Later on, he was bold enough to introduce a talk on *The Baptist Times*. This was in March, 1920. "He (the speaker) found that opinions about the paper varied considerably. Some thought the war occupied too large a space . . . others would welcome more about things outside the Denomination. . . . He thought it was not sufficiently representative of our traditions and history. He recognised the difficulties in the way of controlling the editor in these matters. The Council did not meet sufficiently often to be effective in these matters; and as for the Assembly, everyone knew how impossible it was to get anything done there." Other comments arising out of the discussion were: "*The Baptist Times* is neither representative nor distinctive." ". . . congratulated the reader of the paper on his handling of a very uninspired subject, and in criticising the conduct of *The Baptist Times* condemned the editor for refusing to publish a protest against the buildings of the Baptist College in Bristol being sold to the Christian Scientists." ". . . objected to *The Baptist Times* altogether. Neither lock, stock nor barrel satisfied him. The stories by Samuel Horton were feeble, and the language unchaste. For the cookery recipes, spiritual recipes would be a better substitution. The advertisements of such things as tobacco and humorous recitals were unworthy." ". . . strongly objected to the theology in the Sunday School lessons helps." "We then left *The Baptist Times* to its fate and adjourned for tea . . . and we afterwards departed our several ways with sunshine on our faces and in our hearts."

Apparently another burst of liveliness was raised by this same good brother on February 1st, 1932. ". . . introduced the subject of Freemasonry, giving the outline of a book published by the Rev. G. Percy Hunt, B.A. Apologising for introducing the subject, he said he had been amazed by the revelations made

by the writer, and felt he would like to unburden himself to his brethren and seek their opinion on the mysteries of the Craft which was making such great progress in England, and to ask if it was compatible with the Christian faith. . . . Unfortunately, no brother was present who was a member of the Craft, and to most it was a revelation new and surprising. Had our Brother Hoare been present he would have thrown floods of light on the subject, and dispelled the clouds of suspicion the subject had created." Brother Hoare was, however, present at the next meeting. "Mr. Hoare said he could not really reply to the attack that was made on Freemasonry by the book published, as he was bound by the rules and regulations as a Freemason not to divulge its secrets; but he would say that from all he had read of the attacks there was no truth in them, and that Freemasonry was distinctly Christian and not in any sense incompatible with Christianity. He ventured to confirm this statement by reading two rules for initiates which demanded faith in God and a righteous life. Several questions were then put to Mr. Hoare, and the discussion created a lively debate." We cannot leave the records of this member without noting one entry in the minutes regarding him, which seems to be full of either conscious or unconscious humour. On May 5th, 1913, "he was asked to provide a feast of reason for the next meeting."

The present minister of Bloomsbury Central Church, Dr. Townley Lord, added greatly to the fellowship of the Fraternal during his ministry at Acton. Unfortunately, the secretary of that period was very brief in his recordings, and much of what Dr. Lord said has been lost, apart from the titles of his talks. These make us yearn still more that the secretary had been a little more generous. On January 10th, 1921, he spoke on "The Spirit of Jesus and the Ideals of Democracy," and here we have something of what he said. "Three foundation principles were laid down. (1) Every man is valuable, more so than gold or other material property; (2) Every man is born free and entitled to freedom; (3) Every man has a right to a voice in the organisation of the society of which he forms part, non-possession of property notwithstanding. . . . The ideals of democracy find their real basis and chief emphasis in the teachings of Jesus Christ. . . . He discovered the real value of man, making him superior to institutions . . . but the Churches have often clouded the message of their Master; yet the failure of the disciples in no way invalidates their Lord. . . . The call of the hour is the presentation of these root principles of our Master's teaching with their application to present-day conditions. . . . Theology and speculation are subsidiary to these. There is no need to lower the flag of the Church, only to be true to our Lord's

words. . . . Democracy without Christ is a peril. . . . Ours is the opportunity to preserve the connection between Christ and the masses."

H. E. Stone, a veteran to-day of nearly a century, has long been connected with the Fraternal and still is a member, although advanced years preclude his attendance now. He has been very helpful in talks and discussion, and in February, 1933, he recalled "The Days of my Youth." "The memory of the past kindled his heart, we read, till it glowed with the old enthusiasms, and we all listened with the keenest delight and pleasure, also profit." He closed with these words :

Labour and sorrow, the Psalmist said, was the gift of fourscore years; And he almost envied the sleeping dead escaped from this vale of tears. But the Psalmist's heart was overwrought and his harp was out of tune, For the fourscore years have brought to me the sunny days of June.

The social side of the fellowship has figured largely in its history. Time and time again there appears a note in the minutes about the glorious teas that have been provided, and which, in one instance at least, more than compensated for other things. On July 2nd, 1934, "the brethren present awaited eagerly, but in vain, the arrival of the secretary with the minutes and the Rev. H. G. Hoare with the paper. Through a chapter of accidents, for which no one could be held responsible, neither of these gentlemen, nor their deputy and the relevant documents appeared. The Fraternal therefore proceeded to good-humoured conversation, and ended in a blaze of glory with a strawberry tea, generously provided by our host and hostess."

In recent years an annual outing has added to this side of the proceedings, and a happy day spent in the country has proved a means of grace and the cultivation of the spirit of friendship and fellowship; while the substitution of an autumn "Retreat" for one of the monthly meetings has proved of great worth in preparing for the work of the winter.

So the good ship, launched in 1909, still sails on its prosperous voyage, and the hope of the members of those days is still the fervent wish of the present brethren. May this monthly opportunity long continue to refresh and cheer our hearts!

F. C. M. PERKINS.

## St. Mary's, Norwich.

(Continued from p. 288.)

### V.

JOSEPH KINGHORN, 1789-1832.

A CHANCE contact brought about the most notable ministry in the history of St. Mary's. Richard Fishwick, of Newcastle, paying a business visit to Norwich, heard of the death of the Rev. Rees David and of the Church's need, and recommended to them Joseph Kinghorn, formerly a clerk in his lead works and now, with his help and encouragement, just completing his course at the Bristol Academy. So Kinghorn was invited, and came to Norwich. The need was met. This frail young man fitted exactly into a situation which might have been most difficult to fill. His keen intellect and fine scholarship appealed to the progressive element of well-to-do citizens which had been fostered by Rees David and now formed the Church's leadership; while his deep religious conservatism satisfied the members of the old school who were still the backbone of the fellowship, and his amiable disposition endeared him to all. Still true to the cautious habits of a vanishing age, the Church made no hurry to settle with their new minister. He came to Norwich in April, 1789, but it was not until the following December that they met to offer him the pastorate. For the first time in the Church's history the women were allowed to vote on the proposal, which was carried by a large majority. Kinghorn accepted the offer, and the ordination was arranged for the following May, when his father, the Rev. David Kinghorn, came from Yorkshire to take part in the ceremony, together with veteran Edward Trivett of Worstead, and William Richards of Lynn. After the day's solemnities the company adjourned to the "Labour in Vain" for the ordination dinner—its sign depicting a woman scrubbing a black boy, doubtless providing golden opportunities for the after dinner speakers.

Many faithful pastors have left their mark for good on the church at St. Mary's, but no name in its history is so revered as that of Kinghorn. The reasons for this fact are interesting. He was a great scholar, one of the foremost Hebraists of his day, but it is not as a scholar that he is remembered. His *Magnum Opus*, his edition of *Clavis Pentateuchi*, is now only a curiosity, interesting because of its connection with him. He was a leading figure in the Denomination, the chief of the conservatives in thought on the Communion question, and his own church was to win the victory for the liberal view which

he had opposed. As a preacher he was probably never so popular as his predecessor had been. The description his college principle gave to the Church held good all through his life :

“A sound scholar, an able though not what may be called a brilliant preacher, and of the most amiable disposition in the world.”

His greatness lay in a character of saintliness and unswerving devotion to God and God's people. He was a puritan. He described himself as a “perpendicular man”, swaying neither to right nor left. But there was no hardness in his puritanism; he had “the most amiable disposition in the world.” He was a pastor *par excellence*. Much of his work was in the homes of his people. He loved social intercourse, and such intercourse was never divorced from his religious and intellectual interests. Card playing he hated as “a dead stop in rationality, pleasantries and everything else that is important”—it would rob him of the conversation he loved, the fun as well as the deep exchange of thought and experience. He was fortunate in having among his members some who were able fully to share his interests. Intellectual pursuits were fashionable, and the well-to-do tradesmen who formed the aristocracy of Norwich found time to study languages, discuss literature, and debate questions of religion and philosophy. His friendship, however, was not confined to such. He was equally at ease in talking with a royal prince as with the humblest member of his congregation. Living through a time of revolution, war and change, in his habits as in his character he was unchanging—seeming to symbolise in himself the timeless truth for which he laboured. From the first his people loved him; towards the end of his long ministry they almost worshipped him.

A rigid and uncompromising Baptist, he was a saint of the Church Universal. Inevitably the grace of his personality overflowed the bounds of his denomination. We find him helping a young Anglican missionary enthusiast to a post under the C.M.S., and co-operating wholeheartedly with Quakers and paedo-Baptists in support of the Bible Society. A Norwich boy who remembered seeing his slender form wrote, “If anyone had told me Mr. Kinghorn had been one of the apostles I should have believed him.”

During his long pastorate Kinghorn kept no Church records other than a register of members and a register of births of their children. We have therefore little record of the corporate life of the Church. The period is lit up by Kinghorn's correspondence, lovingly preserved by his ward, Simon Wilkin. Much of this was published in *Joseph Kinghorn of Norwich*, by

Martin Hood Wilkin, and some of it later passed into the possession of St. Mary's. The letters throw a vivid light on Kinghorn's life and his relationship to his members, his many Norwich friends and the leaders of the Denomination. His first Norwich contact was with Thomas Hawkins, the Deacon and Treasurer of the Church, who met him in the inn yard as he stepped out of the Expedition coach on his arrival. Hawkins belonged to an old Norwich family which claimed to be connected with that of Archbishop Parker. He was a grocer, living over his shop in Tombland with his wife Martha and their growing family. He served the Church nearly sixty years as deacon, and more than half the time as faithful treasurer. He was mindful of his civic duties, too, and served as a Common Councilman when the offices of Mayor and Sheriff were still closed to Nonconformists. For years Kinghorn took Sunday tea with the Hawkins family, whose children learnt to frame his name before they could talk. Young William later became his student, and after entering the ministry, his lifelong correspondent. A successful man of business and a valued administrator in the Church, Thomas Hawkins was also a man of spiritual power. On one occasion, when Kinghorn was away from Norwich, Hawkins sent him an account of the unusual action of the Church in celebrating the Lord's Supper without the assistance of a minister.

"Last Lord's day I had the resolution after the morning service to desire the members to stop and all of them fill up their places as I had no less important resolution to make them than whether we should, under our present circumstances, attend to the Lord's Supper amongst ourselves. When met, I requested if anyone had any objection to make it; no objection was made. Mr. Watson proposed that I should take the first prayer and break the bread and pour the wine; I proposed Mr. Theobald should take the second prayer; also that Mr. Watson should give such reasons for our conduct as struck his mind. Each willingly took his part, and all, I trust, was done decently and in order."

Thomas Hawkins introduced Kinghorn to W. W. Wilkin, who became one of his closest friends. He was a farmer and miller, living in the village of Costessey, a man of fortune and culture. He and Kinghorn were both interested in mechanical pursuits, and spent many hours together in the workshop at Costessey, fitting up a measuring wheel and other scientific instruments with the aid of a local locksmith. Wilkin was a gentleman of the old style. He belonged to the eighteenth

century, and could scarcely have been at home in the changing world of the nineteenth. Providence cut short his life, and in 1799 he died, leaving his eight-year-old boy, Simon, in Kinghorn's charge.

Another family with which Joseph Kinghorn was on terms of intimacy was that of Theobald. John Theobald, with his wife and their eight children, had come to Norwich in 1778 from Lowestoft, where their home had been a centre of Nonconformist influence. They joined St. Mary's, but in 1786 withdrew to the Independents. Kinghorn won them back, became their close friend, and later baptized three of the children. John Theobald was a man of firm faith. His daughter recorded of him :

" My dear father, when any national troubles arose, always said, ' The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice.' "

Letters give us a picture of Kinghorn at the Theobalds' house writing to young Thomas, who is on a business visit to Germany. Sally comes in with a letter from a young lady in London asking her love to be sent to Thomas by the next letter. Kinghorn promises to do any mischief Sally sets him upon, and " dresses up " the story. Ann now comes in, and the letter is read out, to the party's mirth, and despatched to Germany. Thomas returned a month later, bringing a score of books for Kinghorn.

With the coming of a new century many new names began to be added to the Church roll. Some of them are notable. James Cozens was transferred from Yarmouth in 1804. He became a deacon, succeeded Thomas Hawkins as treasurer, and for many years gave out the hymns from the box under the pulpit. One of his great-nephews became the first Lord Cozens-Hardy. In 1805 John Culley joined the Church, a grandson of the first pastor and benefactor of Worstead Baptist Church, and the first of a family which has probably contributed more members to the Church at St. Mary's over a long period than any other, and has rendered notable service. In 1806, Thomas Theobald and Jeremiah Colman, who had married one another's sisters, were baptized together. Jeremiah Colman belonged to a family with Baptist traditions. He and his nephew James, who later joined the Church, were founders of the famous flour and mustard milling business. Both were deacons and devoted servants of the Church throughout their lives. All these families represented new ideas which were to become dominant in agriculture or industry. They were leaders in secular affairs as in the Church.

Rigid Baptist and strict Communionist as he was, Kinghorn always advised paedo-Baptist friends to join a Congregational church where they could enjoy full communion. Nevertheless the success of his ministry and the enlargement of the membership



of his Church made it inevitable that his congregation was increased by paedo-Baptists who, attracted by his ministry or by family ties, found their spiritual home among the Baptists. Among these were Thomas Brightwell, solicitor, who married Mary Snell Wilkin, the sister of Kinghorn's ward, and later was the first Nonconformist to hold the Mayoralty of Norwich when that office was opened to dissenters by the Municipal Corporations Act, and John Crome, the great landscape artist.

Twenty years of Kinghorn's ministry had resulted in the Meeting House at St. Mary's becoming overcrowded, and it was resolved to rebuild it. Simon Wilkin, who, with Kinghorn's other pupil William, son of deacon Hawkins, had been baptized in 1808, was chosen treasurer; and on a memorable Thursday he and Thomas Hawkins went round and collected more than £900 in cash from members and friends, and banked it in Gurney's. Simon gave £800, his brother-in-law £350. Nearly £900 came from members of the Culley family. Thomas Hawkins, James Cozens, Thomas Bignold, Thomas Theobald and the Colmans were also large subscribers. John Crome gave £15, and many small gifts made up a final total of £3,650. During the period of the demolition and rebuilding, St. Mary's enjoyed the hospitality of the mother church at the Old Meeting, Kinghorn preaching alternate Sundays with the Rev. William Hull, the minister of that church. Communion services were held separately by the two churches in accordance with Kinghorn's strict views. In March, 1811, Kinghorn laid the foundation stone of the new building. A crowd assembled on the mound of bricks and earth which occupied the site. The minister stood in a space excavated for the foundation. As he concluded the ceremony with his arms uplifted in prayer, William Taylor happened to be passing, who afterwards said the scene strongly reminded him of the benediction of the people by the Pope, which he had witnessed at Rome.

The new building was opened in June, 1812, Kinghorn preaching in the afternoon and Hull in the evening. Wilkin proudly described the chapel:

“ . . . with handsome iron palisades and gates; its imposing front of white bricks, with Grecian portico and an ample flight of stone steps—altogether, both within and without, one of the handsomest Baptist Meeting-houses in the kingdom: free, however, from all popery and popish adornments of Gothic within and Gothic without, as well as from all vestiges of popish canonicals.”

The outside plan of the building was almost square. Within, the pulpit, approached from a vestry behind, stood against a

flat wall, while the gallery opposite and the interior wall behind it were semicircular. The ceiling was of plaster in the form of a ribless vault, elegant in appearance and of considerable accoustical value. The chapel has been several times enlarged, and the interior was destroyed by fire in 1939. The street front, with its palisades and portico remains, and the plaster vaulting has been restored.

During Kinghorn's ministry a development of vital importance in the life of the Church took place—the beginning of a Sunday School. It cannot be said for certain that the room over the vestry at the pulpit end of the chapel was erected in 1812 for this purpose, but this seems probable. Kinghorn was on terms of close friendship and co-operation in religious activities with Joseph John Gurney, who was instrumental in founding the Norwich Sunday School Union in 1815.

There was no Baptist Union in the modern sense in Kinghorn's day, but the Baptist Missionary Society had begun to provide a centre of denominational co-operation. From its early days Kinghorn played a part in promoting the interests of the Society. In 1793, he and a few friends sent a small subscription, and from that date the Church at St. Mary's made increasing contributions. He served on the Committee of the B.M.S., and made two notable journeys to Scotland on its behalf, preaching in kirks and meeting houses and collecting funds.

In 1816 Joseph Kinghorn entered upon the controversy which made him the recognized leader of the Strict Communion party in the Denomination by publishing *Baptism a Term of Communion at the Lord's Supper* in reply to Hall's *Terms of Communion*, Hall, of course, advocating the admission of paedobaptists to the Lord's Table in Baptist churches. The controversy covered a period of twelve years, during which time Kinghorn issued four books, distinguished by cool and unruffled logic as against the warm and impetuous advocacy of his opponent. While Kinghorn's logic was correct, the peculiar circumstances of the Baptist denomination in its relationship to other evangelical bodies in England made his position impracticable, as his own Church later proved. It may, however, be noted that in America, where Baptists are predominantly strong, and on the continent of Europe, where there are few others with whom Communion would be possible, strict Communion is the common practice.

In 1822 David Kinghorn, who had lived with his son during the twenty-two years of his retirement, passed away. Kinghorn told his Church :

"I am now loosened from every earthly tie, and have no other care but you. Henceforth you, the members of this

Church, shall be my brother and my sister, my father and my mother."

From this time his relationship to his members was even closer, resembling that of a benevolent patriarch to his family. He had been an untiring worker, and his body was always frail. His members were quick to detect a declension in health which could not be attributed to advancing years alone. In 1828 Thomas Theobald wrote beseeching him to recruit his strength by doing less work.

"To communicate and enforce Christian truth is really all that you ought to attempt. I strongly recommend you to select sermons from your extensive and valuable hoard instead of incurring the unnecessary labour in writing others: to allow a proposal for the discontinuance of the Afternoon Service on the Lord's Day during the summer months and of the Lecture on Wednesday evenings till you shall have recruited your strength."

Needless to say, this advice was not heeded. On Sunday morning, August 26th, 1832, the congregation gathered at St. Mary's for worship as usual. When the baize door behind the pulpit opened, a strange figure entered—it was William Knibb, of Jamaica, then in the height of his anti-slavery campaign. Kinghorn had come down to breakfast that morning with the shorthand notes of his sermon, but fever forced him to return to bed. He died on the following Saturday evening at his house in Pottergate.

It was a fitting tribute to the catholic spirit of one whose adherence to Baptist convictions had always been so uncompromising, that when his people looked for the most suitable man to conduct his funeral they chose no Baptist but his friend, the Rev. John Alexander of Prince's Street Congregational Church. Quaker J. J. Gurney also addressed the mourning congregation. His remains were laid to rest in the vestibule of the chapel which he had built.

Such is the influence of a saintly character that, though Kinghorn had never taken any part in public life except in matters directly concerning evangelical religion, it could be said by a Norfolk clergyman on hearing of his passing, "If half Norwich had died the loss would not have been so much felt."

CHARLES B. JEWSON.

*(To be concluded.)*

# Financial Statement

(For the year ended 31st December, 1940.)

					£	s.	d.
INCOME.							
Balance from 1939	...	...	...	...	6	8	7
Subscriptions	...	...	...	...	103	18	4
Sale of Publications	...	...	...	...	4	3	4
					<hr/>		
Deficit carried to 1941	...	...	...	...	114	10	3
					5	3	1
					<hr/>		
					£119	13	4
					<hr/>		

EXPENDITURE.							
<i>Baptist Quarterly</i> , four issues	...	...	...	...	112	9	4
Stationery, postages, insurance, etc.	...	...	...	...	6	14	0
Friends Historical Society: Subscription	...	...	...	...	10	0	0
					<hr/>		
					£119	13	4
					<hr/>		

RESERVE FUND.							
Life Subscriptions	...	...	...	...	60	10	0
General Reserve	...	...	...	...	50	0	0
					<hr/>		
					£110	10	0
					<hr/>		

A. H. CALDER, *Treasurer.*

## JEWISH PROSELYTE BAPTISM.

This issue contains a review by Dr. Williamson of Dr. Rowley's *The Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule*. Dr. Rowley has also just published an article on *Jewish Proselyte Baptism*. It is an off-print from the *Hebrew Union College Annual of Cincinnati*, and Dr. Rowley discusses the four issues: (1) What early evidence is there for the practice of baptizing proselytes in Judaism? (2) What was the nature of this baptism? (3) What was its nature to the ritual lustrations of the law? (4) How is it to be distinguished from the baptism of John?

## Reviews.

*The Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule*, by H. H. Rowley, M.A., D.D., B.Litt. (The Rylands Library, 1s. 6d. net.)

Dr. Rowley, who is now Professor of Semitic Languages in the University College of North Wales, spent eight years in China as a missionary of the Baptist Missionary Society. It is evident from this fascinating little study that Dr. Rowley has by no means lost his interest in things Chinese, nor his grip of them. He has given us in compact and readable form a valuable comparative study of The Golden Rule as enunciated by Christ, and so-called parallels of the great Chinese sages, Laotzu, Confucius and Motzu.

The discussion of the relative superiority of the positive to the negative forms of The Golden Rule is first dismissed as somewhat academic, as it is thought futile to confine comparison chiefly to the terminology of the precepts.

Laotzu's familiar precept: "Recompense injury with kindness", and Confucius' criticism: "With what, then, will you recompense kindness?" are fully discussed, and the conclusion reached that, because the general teaching of Laotzu is grounded on a calculated indifference to, rather than concern for, the affairs of others, and possesses no truly religious basis, his maxim means less than it seems to mean.

Dr. Rowley then outlines Confucius' doctrine of "reciprocity" and "faithfulness" to one's better nature. It is observed that the scope to which Confucius' teaching applies has definite limitations; that he is over-optimistic as to the influence of personal example; and that he is lacking in conscious religious faith. Dr. Rowley draws the inference that, in such a context, the Golden Rule of Confucius "becomes quite other than that of Jesus".

Motzu, with his doctrine of universal love, and exemplification of this teaching in his person and work, is next discussed. There is much in the character and range of Motzu's philosophy which approaches very near to the Christian ideal. It is considered, however, that in over-emphasising the utilitarian motive so as to make it akin to self-seeking, and by applying religious sanctions in a subordinate rather than in a primary capacity, Motzu is definitely inferior to Christ.

Dr. Rowley rightly argues that each great maxim should be related to the general content of the teaching in which it is found; to the circumstances which led to its being propounded; to the character and purpose of the teacher who enunciated it; and to the motive power on which each depended for the fulfil-

ment of his teaching. When this has been done, the conclusion is reached that Christ is "Lord" in this, as in all other spheres.

Those who are interested in the study of comparative ethics and religion will find in this lecture a well-balanced, logical and fully documented study, based on wide research and literary resources, and yet compressed into thirty-four pages of clear and attractive type.

Dr. Rowley modestly disclaims any title to being a Sinologue, or that he has written for Sinologues. He has, nevertheless, made a very valuable contribution to the study of this most important theme. It occurs to one to suggest that a slightly more generous estimate of the Chinese teaching, especially that of Motzu, might have been made. On that point, however, there is strong divergence of view amongst the authorities, and most readers will find themselves in general agreement with the main conclusion reached by Dr. Rowley.

H. R. WILLIAMSON.

*The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism*, by H. G. Marsh. (Manchester University Press, 7s. 6d. net.)

This scholarly book by a Paedobaptist can be welcomed and profitably read by any Baptist who desires a larger view of the subject which so intimately concerns him. There is very little in the book to which an informed Baptist could object, for the support given to infant baptism is so slight as to be contained within six pages (174-180), beginning with the significant admission, "The New Testament contains no mention of the baptism of children." The familiar argument from the holiness of believers' children (1 Cor. vii. 14) is rightly dismissed as irrelevant, though there is a plea that the admonition of children to obey their parents (Col. iii. 20; Eph. vi. 1) implies (in an epistle to the Church) that these children must have been Church members, and therefore baptized—a very dubious plea when we remember that St. Paul contemplated the presence even of unbelievers in some gatherings of Christians (1 Cor. xiv. 23). The cited analogy of pagan cults is of little value in regard to those who were consciously striving to lift men out of paganism to personal repentance and faith. The reference to Jewish circumcision (which was an accompaniment of Jewish baptism, not a substitute for it) is no more convincing. The appeal to the solidarity of the family in ancient times is a much stronger argument (notwithstanding the quite inconclusive reference to the baptism of households) and does suggest a probable line of tendency towards infant baptism—but only for those of a later generation who had lost sight of the initial emphasis on personal

faith. The slightness of such arguments is fitly matched by the small space given to them in a book of over 200 pages. The author is obviously not a Paedobaptist on the grounds of the New Testament teaching.

With these few pages out of the way, the book may be warmly commended. It is clearly written, with no unnecessary words or homiletical expansions. It faces the many difficulties of the subject frankly. It shows a wide knowledge of the very extensive literature, English and foreign (of which there is a useful bibliography), and is fully documented.

The baptism of John (regarded as the link between Jewish proselyte baptism<sup>1</sup> and Christian baptism) is treated at considerable, if not disproportionate, length. Five characteristics are found in the Johannine rite. (1) It was "eschatological," pointing onwards to the coming Messianic Age. (2) It was a baptism by water, in contrast with the baptism by Holy Spirit which was yet to come. (3) It was demanded of all, since all had sinned. (4) It was a baptism administered once only, and not to be repeated, as were the Essene baptisms. All this is a useful and, broadly speaking, adequate characterisation.

The baptism received by Jesus (very briefly discussed) is regarded as unique in character, marking neither His call nor the discovery of His vocation, but the inauguration of His Messianic ministry. The attitude of Jesus towards baptism during "the days of His flesh" is regarded as one of tacit approval, rather than of explicit command. (The formula of baptism in Matt. xxviii. 19 is not accepted as a command of Jesus, partly because the baptisms of Acts "into the name of the Lord Jesus" seem to rule it out.) The general view here taken is that, prior to Pentecost, baptism was virtually a continuation of the Johannine rite; after Pentecost, it was accompanied by new phenomena associated with the gift of the Holy Spirit.

St. Paul's teaching about baptism is taken as implying cleansing from sin, the gift of the Spirit and union with Christ (owing nothing in substance to Hellenistic religions). The emphasis falls on the third of these. "The Pauline doctrine of faith is a sufficient guarantee that the Apostle accepted no ritual act as the sole means of cleansing from sin, or of obtaining any other of the benefits associated with salvation." With this, all Baptists will agree. The Pauline figure of "burial with Christ" in baptism obviously implies "that immersion was probably the customary form of baptism" (as in the case of Jewish proselyte baptism), but the author thinks that perhaps "from the beginning

<sup>1</sup> On this, see Professor H. H. Rowley's valuable contribution to the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. XV. (1940).

some less difficult form of baptism than total immersion was accepted in certain circumstances."

There are, of course, many other interesting and important matters concerning the New Testament baptism with which this competent book deals. But the main position held is that "it was the spiritual experience, not the act, which was of supreme importance." Perhaps the author unduly stresses the antithesis between an "intensely magical" and an "intensely spiritual" act. It seems more in harmony with St. Paul's teaching to regard baptism as resembling the acts of "prophetic symbolism" in the Old Testament, where they are conceived as part of the effective obedience of the prophet, an initial part of the thing to be done. Such an interpretation of baptismal symbolism, which has the high endorsement of Professor C. H. Dodd, does more justice to the striking terms of Rom. vi. 1-5, Col. ii. 11, 12, and would allow us to regard the baptism of *believers* as a means of grace, through the Holy Spirit.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

*The Forward March*, by Sir Richard Acland. (George Allen & Unwin, paper 2s. 6d. net, cloth 3s. 6d. net.)

*Why Another World War?* How we missed Collective Security, by George Gilbert Armstrong. (George Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d. net.)

*The German Mentality*, by Verrina. (George Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d. net.)

There is a questioning spirit in our land to-day. Some of the questions are merely superficial, others lie much deeper. For example, behind the warring of the nations, or rather, in the midst of their warring, are we witnessing the struggle of humanity to emerge from an order which is played out, and to discover a new basis on which human life can be built up?

Here are three thought-provoking works arising out of such questioning. Sir Richard Acland thinks that what has happened in Europe has been the breakdown of hope. Freedom for each man to pursue his own economic self-interest in his own way has failed to produce equality, not even equality of opportunity. Liberals have correctly insisted that the highest value of statesmanship is the well-being of the individual citizen; while socialism was bound to fail for the one supreme reason that it assumed the *economic* motive to be supreme. Nazism established the Service Community *for* the Reich *in* war. Sir Richard proposes to establish the Service Community *for* humanity *in* peace, or, putting it in another way, to transfer to the tasks of



peace the communal enthusiasm which is so readily called forth for the tasks of war.

Lord Baldwin, Sir John Simon, Sir Samuel Hoare and Mr. Neville Chamberlain have a bad time at the hands of the author of *Why Another World War?* They are indicted for not foreseeing that the policy for which they were responsible was making war certain, and for cutting away the precautions against war which better men than they had skilfully built up. Perhaps we are too near the events for such a sweeping judgment; yet it is becoming increasingly clear that these four—Ramsay MacDonald should be added to them—are the statesmen of this country who were mainly responsible for the breakdown of the League of Nations. The book is more than an indictment of individuals: it is a well-documented record of the international discussions of the last twenty years. The author's conclusion is that the redemption of all the countries engulfed in Hitler's Europe can be permanently achieved only by a return to Collective Security, through their federation with the British Commonwealth in a union with pooled resources, from which all that Nazism stands for shall be excluded.

For a whole generation "Verrina" has been in close touch with the German population, and in the course of twenty chapters he deals with the range of ideas of leading circles and of the man in the street, both before and under the Nazi regime. Many books have described the rise of Hitlerism, but there is something new and bigger in this volume. The morbid mentality of the average German, and the brutal outlook of the young Nazi present Europe with a very sinister problem, and on its successful solution depends the future of Europe. Methods for the cure and re-moulding of the depraved mentality of the Germans are discussed, and the time anticipated when they will have found again their religion, their good qualities, their diligence, their sense of order.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

*A Christian Year Book*, 1941. Edited by Hugh Martin and Ernest A. Payne. (Student Christian Movement Press, 2s. 6d. net.)

Three hundred pages concerning places, people and events, societies and churches—including those connected with the Ecumenical Christian Movement. A veritable Baedeker for church workers. Buy it and use it.