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

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

The
Baptist Quarterly
incorporating the Transactions of the
Baptist Historical Society.

Editorial.

THE editor deeply regrets that, owing to a variety of circumstances mainly arising out of war conditions, there has been considerable delay in the publication of this double number for January and April, 1942. It is hoped to publish another double number early in the Autumn for July and October. An endeavour will be made to resume the quarterly issues in January, but their size will depend on the paper situation, which does not grow easier.

One outcome of the delay has been to reveal the affection of the members of the Baptist Historical Society for the *Baptist Quarterly,* as enquiries have come from all parts of the country, and from one or two places abroad, asking when the next issue would be published. Some even expressed their dismay lest it had been needful to suspend publication for the period of the war. The editor thanks his correspondents; he takes the blame for the delay and hopes to do better.

* * * * *

In 1941 the names of nine new members of the Baptist Historical Society were printed. The following have joined since our last issue:

Rev. Gwenyth Hubble, B.A., B.D.
Rev. S. W. Stanford, B.A.
Mr. A. E. Jones.
Mr. R. E. Pringle.

Subscriptions for 1942 are due and should be sent with the accompanying form to the Treasurer, Mr. Allan H. Calder, 90, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1. The subscriptions are in four classes: Ordinary membership, ten shillings per annum; Honorary membership, one guinea per annum; Personal Life membership, one payment of ten guineas; Permanent membership for a Church, one payment of fifteen guineas.

DR. H. WHEELER ROBINSON. Dr. Wheeler Robinson's recently celebrated seventieth birthday gives us the opportunity of expressing the grateful regards and sincere good wishes of all the members of the Baptist Historical Society to one who has been our President for twenty years, and who in this and many other ways has rendered outstanding service both to the denomination and to the whole Christian Church. Of Dr. Robinson's service to Regent's Park College and to our ministry in general we hope to speak at a later date. Here we content ourselves with expressing the hope that he will be able, during many more years, to give us the benefit of his leadership and scholarship, and also our satisfaction that a fine oil-painting of him has now been hung on the walls of Regent's Park College, Oxford. Conditions at the present time are unfortunately unfavourable to the securing of portraits of this kind, and the College and the denomination are therefore the more to be congratulated that in this case the difficulties have been overcome. The painting, which has given great satisfaction to all those who have seen it, is the work of Mr. James Gunn, already known in Oxford for his portraits of Dr. Darwell Stone and Sir David Ross. A wider public is familiar with his "Conversation Piece: Belloc, Chesterton and Baring," which was in the Academy Exhibition of 1932, and with his portrait of Delius. The picture of Dr. Robinson shows him in his doctor's robes, standing at his desk in characteristic attitude. On the wall nearby there hang an architect's drawing of the new buildings of Regent's Park and a sketch of the five-pointed star, symbolic of the main points of Baptist witness, which Dr. Robinson himself designed for the Helwys Hall of the College. The painting has been photographed by Paul Laib, and we draw the attention of our readers to the fact that copies may be obtained, price 6s., post free, from the Rev. E. A. Payne, Regent's Park College, Oxford.

* * * * *

THE REV. S. PEARCE CAREY. We understand (though it is not very easy to credit it) that our esteemed friend and occasional contributor, the Rev. S. Pearce Carey, M.A., has recently celebrated his eightieth birthday. We offer him our warm congratulations and good wishes, our almost envious good wishes, for advancing years seem to have made no difference to his enthusiasm and energy. We honour him for the name he bears, but also for his own sake. His contributions to Baptist history have made the whole Christian Church his debtor. The great life of William Carey has probably been more widely read than any contemporary work by a Baptist author, and it is a happy coincidence that in these very months so many will be re-reading

it. The biography of his other great-grandfather, Samuel Pearce, is also a glowing book which will continue for many years to kindle the hearts of its readers. Nor should *Dawn on the Kond Hills* and the more recent *Story of the Stockton Baptists* be forgotten. But Mr. Pearce Carey has also given us in *Jesus and Judas* and in *Jesus,* richly suggestive New Testament studies. Of his fruitful pastoral service in this country, in Australia and in India this is not the place to speak at length. His has indeed been a full and useful life, and he has won the regard and affection of us all. Many passages from his own beloved Browning come to mind in thinking about Mr. Carey. We do not think we are far wrong in suggesting that he would say to us with the poet:

Have you found your life distasteful?
My life did, and does, smack sweet.
Was your youth of pleasure wasteful?
Mine I saved and hold complete.
Do your joys with age diminish?
When mine fail me, I'll complain.
Must in death your daylight finish?
My sun sets to rise again.

* * * * *

PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN. A few years ago the Revs. B. Grey Griffith and C. E. Wilson were colleagues at the Mission House, as Home and Foreign Secretaries of the B.M.S. It is therefore peculiarly appropriate that in this Ter-Jubilee year they should fill the highest offices in the gift of the denomination, Mr. Griffith as President of the Baptist Union, and Mr. Wilson as Chairman of the B.M.S. Each will have a heavy programme of visits to churches and associations, but each will bring to his task a mind thoroughly equipped and richly stored with missionary knowledge. The sturdy evangelical appeal that is behind all missionary endeavour will be in the forefront of their messages—to the great enrichment of ministers and people. Our heartiest greetings and good wishes to these honoured brethren.

The Five Points of a Baptist's Faith.*

IN the Helwys Hall of Regent's Park College, Oxford, there is a large five-pointed star, designed to show the characteristic tenets of the faith and order of Baptists. At its centre are the words, "Jesus is Lord," the earliest and shortest Christian creed. The five arms of the star bear on them the words "Faith," "Baptism," "Fellowship," "Freedom," and "Evangelism." The symbol has no ancient history, but I hope that you will agree that it does sufficiently express those realities which we deem important, those realities of the common faith of Christendom which have a more or less distinctive Baptist interpretation.

The Lordship of Jesus was the essential confession of faith made by the New Testament Christian at the time of his baptism. This is apparent from Romans x. 9:—

> "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

With this we may link such a passage as the words of Ananias to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on his name" (Acts xxii. 16). One of the New Testament descriptions of Christians was "those who call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I. Cor. i. 2; cf. II. Tim. ii. 22; Acts ix. 14, 21). The high significance of the confession is shown by the claim that sincere utterance of it is due to divine inspiration:—"No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit" (I. Cor. xii. 3). This was the central assertion of apostolic preaching: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord" (II. Cor. iv. 5). This was the divine event, not far off, to which the whole creation moved, when "every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord" (Phil. ii. 11). The original Aramaic prayer, *marana tha,* "our Lord, come!" familiar in the Aramaic-speaking Church, was treasured even amongst Greek-speaking Christians (I. Cor. xvi. 22; cf. Rev. xxii. 20).

What did this title, "Lord," imply for those men and women who first used it of Jesus? We are on surest ground when we think of its contemporary use for the declaration of loyalty to the Roman emperor. A good example is afforded from the story of the martyrdom of Polycarp, who refers to Christ as "my King Who saved me." Friendly officials met the aged saint on his way to execution, and took him up into their carriage, to persuade him to

(* Address to the London Baptist Board, Oct. 1st, 1941).

recant, saying, "Why, what harm is there in saying, Cæsar is Lord, and offering incense . . . saving thyself?" That the Christian confession was in conscious antithesis to this may be seen from St. Paul's contrast of the "lords many" of the pagan world with the "one Lord, Jesus Christ" (I. Cor. viii. 5, 6). To the Roman emperor as Lord belonged not only sovereignty, but also, where Oriental influences prevailed, divinity (though the Greeks proper do not seem to have used the title of their gods). Claudius, Nero and Vespasian were acclaimed as gods on earth, as had been the Ptolemies of Egypt, and even Herod (by Gentile voices). Broadly speaking, we may say that the term "Lord," as applied to Jesus was the Gentile equivalent of the Jewish term "Messiah," i.e. "Christ" in its original sense of "the anointed one"—the vice-regent of God.

But we do not get the full significance of "Lord" for the Christian until we follow St. Paul along the lines of his great argument in the Epistle to the Philippians (II). There he looks back to the "Heavenly Man," who left his high place and "emptied himself" in the death of the Cross, after accepting the necessary conditions of Incarnation. It was for this redemptive work that God highly exalted him and gave him the title of "Lord." The whole passage is modelled on the picture of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah liii.—humiliated that he might finally be exalted—and the striking phrase, "emptied himself in death," is actually borrowed from the words there found, "poured himself out in death." The point to note is that the Lordship of Christ is no arbitrary title; it has been won by a unique achievement. This might be illustrated by the "new name," which an Indian chief wins from his conduct in his first fight, which henceforth becomes his real name. To say that Jesus is Lord means, therefore, that He has won the right to my devotion by becoming my Redeemer. Henceforth I belong to Him as a slave to the new master who has ransomed him from his captivity, and has brought him into the new service which is perfect freedom. The new relation is warm and intimate with an ever-deepening personal gratitude.

This, then, is the co-ordinating centre from which we approach each article or application of our Christian faith. Loyalty to Jesus Christ as the redeeming Lord is the principle by which all else is to be tested. Yet the test must not be so narrowly applied that we miss the larger setting of this Lordship, the setting in which Jesus lived his life in the days of His flesh and prepared for His death. He inherited the noblest faith of prophet and psalmist, and in appropriating it raised it to a new level. His own faith in the Father and in the Father's unceasing providence should prevent us from making our theology "Christocentric" rather than "theo-centric." The work of Christ is done, as St. Paul says, to the glory of God the Father. The worship of Christ is fully justified

because we have seen the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Yet we must not so think of Him as to forget the love of God behind the grace of Christ. That would be to imitate the error of those whose worship of the Virgin Mary has tended to obscure the grace of Christ—as in those pictures which represent the Virgin as mediator between man and Christ.

I. FAITH.—The direct personal relation of the believer to his Lord is signified by the term "faith." "Faith" does not mean mere acceptance of a tradition in which we have grown up, or even the opinion that the tradition is worth upholding. Faith, in the deepest New Testament meaning, is personal conviction. It is personal, not only because it is an individual act, for which no other can make himself sponsor, but because it is the response of the whole personality —thought, feeling, will—to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is conviction because it implies spiritual conquest by One mightier than self. To be convinced is actually as well as etymologically to be conquered by a larger truth. Hooker's words cannot too often be quoted:—

> "If truth do anywhere manifest itself . . . acknowledge the greatness thereof, and think it your best victory when the same doth prevail over you."

The spiritual forces by which this victory is won are concentrated in Christ, though it is His glory to have many allies from all the values of the Kingdom of God. The light of dawn irradiates the earth before we see the sun's disc, and the prevenient grace of God prepares us for the grace of Christ in many ways. Not least is it the example of the loyalty of others that first opens our eyes to the meaning of faith and to its significance for life. This light of life may come by way of some homely truth, familiar as the well-trodden path to an old church door, or by the sudden revelation of some arresting phrase, one of those

> "jewels five-words long
> That on the stretch'd forefinger of all Time
> Sparkle for ever."

Faith may begin humbly enough as a poor relation of the faith of high degree, though a faith that is really high-born will never despise the days of small things in others or in itself. Jesus did not turn away from the half-faith of him who cried, "Help Thou mine unbelief." The growth of faith may be due to what seems a series of human discoveries, whilst the deeper fact that they are also divine revelations may at first remain hidden. But, whatever the path, when the providence of God has brought us into the real presence of Christ, there comes the intuition that here is One who has authority by what He is, and by what He has done and still does.

Faith in Christ is nurtured from three principal sources. It

dwells lovingly on the story of His ministry, that it may know His mind. Every incident and every spoken word, from the Baptism and the Temptation through the Messianic declaration and warning of Cæsarea Philippi, Gethsemane and the Cross to the Resurrection, make their contribution to this. Discerning faith will recognize the mingling of the transient with the permanent in the teaching and example of Christ, since His first appeal was to a particular generation, with particular political, social and economic conditions. But, even so, the great and permanent principles for a life loyal to Jesus as Lord are easily apparent to the simple reader. The Christian life is a distinctive and characteristic life, with differences that make themselves felt even in a civilization that has absorbed far more of Christian morality into its practice and ideals than it usually realizes. The spirit of a life of Christian loyalty is always and everywhere the spirit of the Cross; by that supreme test it stands or falls.

But the Cross is more than the law of life. It is the hope of life, the ground of redemption, the sacrifice of a suffering which belongs essentially to, and therefore faithfully reveals, the sacrificial love of the invisible God. The great mystery of human suffering here finds its only adequate illumination in the revelation of the Gospel that God Himself shares in the suffering of man, and by sharing transforms His apparent defeat into victory. Since the Cross belongs to God as well as to man, we can never exhaust its meaning. But we know that to come to the Cross is to find the peace of reconciliation with God, the forgiveness of sins for the Beloved's sake, the approach to God through what God Himself has done in the actuality of our human history.

In the third place faith lifts its eyes to the Risen Lord, the Lord the Spirit. Here the earthly limitations are left behind, though the fruit of the earthly life is fully garnered. The Risen Lord, not the earthly Rabbi and wonder-worker of Jewish interpretation, not the heroic leader with which modern admiration is often content, the Risen Lord is the focus of Christian faith. The Heavenly Man returns with His laurels to His appointed place and henceforth rules for His Father. Is this to be dismissed as mythical, a splendid metaphor, a dazzling picture of something too good to be true? No, for faith here finds confirmation in experience. The cardinal doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, God who is Spirit, taking the things of Christ and making them His own, is here the essential explanation of the reality of Christian experience. The far-off figure of the heavenly places becomes a living Presence. "Through Him," says the apostle, "we have our access in one Spirit unto the Father." In the heart of every loyal Christian, and according to the measure of his loyalty, God by His Holy Spirit becomes the indwelling Christ, carrying onwards the miracle of the Incarnation. Through that divine Presence all the gifts and graces of a genuine Christian

life become possible. They have indeed their natural basis and conditions, yet these too are God's gifts, and by His spiritual activity within man He raises them to new levels. As St. Thomas Aquinas taught, grace does not take away nature, but perfects it. The limitless resources of the whole spiritual order are made ours through faith in Christ—"All things are yours . . . . and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (I. Cor. iii. 22).

II. Baptism.—The New Testament entrance into this realm of new resources is by baptism in, or into, the name of Jesus. (The Trinitarian formula of Matt. xxviii. 19 seems to be a late development of the usage of the primitive Church as described in Acts and the Pauline epistles). The "name" then implied much more than it is apt to do for us. It was felt to be a wonder-working instrument, and baptism into the name definitely meant the transition into the authority and power of a new Lord, whose ownership and authority over the baptized were thereby asserted. We remember that St. Paul was glad that he had not personally baptized at Corinth, because it might have been said that such baptism was into his own name and authority (I. Cor. i. 15). As we have already seen, the baptism was accompanied by the confession of faith, "Jesus is Lord," which interprets the more forceful expression contributed by the act of baptism.

Because the visible act of water-baptism was into the name of Jesus, it expressed and mediated the invisible baptism into the Holy Spirit, i.e. into the new powers of the heavenly kingdom. This is implied in St. Paul's words: "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body . . . and were all made to drink of one Spirit" (I. Cor. xii. 13). The context shows that he is thinking of the common act of water-baptism by which alone there was entrance into the visible Body of Christ, and with this he is closely associating the invisible experience as the normal accompaniment. The Lord's own baptism was accompanied by the descent of the Holy Spirit. In the Acts, from Pentecost onwards (ii. 38) water-baptism and spirit-baptism are intimately linked. In this two-fold sense we ought to interpret all St. Paul's references to baptism: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27); "There is one body and one Spirit . . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" (Eph. iv. 4-6). The fullest and clearest of all his associations of the outer sign and seal with the inner and invisible grace is that of Romans vi. 3-5, where the act of water-baptism is said to unite the believer with the dying, buried and risen Lord on the one hand, and on the other with the new obligations and new resources of a penitent and "risen" life in Christ. The sacramental emphasis of this spiritual realism is best understood in the light of the prophetic symbolism of the Old Testament. The act of the prophet was, as it were, a fragment, and so an effective

prophecy of the larger whole of the divine activity. The believer did, in fact, enter into the risen Lord's realm and resources by the water of baptism—always on the assumption that he was indeed a believer.

This assumption is a safeguard in the interpretation of Pauline sacramentalism which Baptists have been slow to realize. So far as the evidence of the New Testament goes—and we have no other—all the baptized persons were actual or professed believers. The spiritual condition of faith was therefore always present in the sincere, and faith is the power-point of the Holy Spirit. Baptists, continuing the New Testament practice of baptizing believers only, are in a unique position, through being able to give a high value to water-baptism as a means of grace, without peril to the spirituality of faith. But if water-baptism is not a means of grace, why keep it up? We ought to expect it to be the occasion of a new access of spiritual power.

Whether or not baptism is this will depend on the preparation of faith to receive it, that is, on the intelligent and Scriptural instruction of the believer. I cannot but think that we have been sadly wanting here. We have interpreted believers' baptism in too retrospective a fashion. We have made it almost wholly a public profession of repentance and faith. The New Testament makes it chiefly prospective, as the entrance into a new life in the Holy Spirit. On grounds of actual value to the young convert, it is more important to underline divine grace than the strength of his own resolution to follow Christ. It is more important to believe that Christ has chosen us than that we have chosen Christ. The Christian view is that our human purpose is taken up into the divine purpose, and there guaranteed by the resources of the Holy Spirit. That, I believe, is what the New Testament baptism primarily expresses, however true it also is that such baptism requires repentance and faith. Other communions have rightly emphasized the doctrine of grace in relation to baptism, though, as we Baptists think, in a wrong and dangerous form. It should be for us, with the safeguard of personal faith, to follow the truth, avoiding the error. I believe that the future of the Baptist Church in this country does largely depend on the recovery of a lost sacramental emphasis; on our making more, not less, of believers' baptism.

III. FELLOWSHIP.—The baptism of believers is the door of entrance into the fellowship of the Church, and this "fellowship" or "communion" essentially constitutes the Church. The word translated "fellowship" (*koinonia*) occurs less than a score of times, some of them in other senses, but the idea permeates all that is said of the Church. The reason for this is that such fellowship is the direct and primary product of the Holy Spirit, and that most of the gifts and graces of the Christian life are quite obviously community-

gifts and community-graces. This is plain when we think of the gifts (I. Cor. xii. 4ff.) enabling a Christian to serve the community, or of the "fruit" of the Spirit, which is "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, humility, self-control" (Gal. v. 22, 23). It is such community-life that the familiar benediction contemplates; the communion of the Holy Spirit is not fellowship *with* the Holy Spirit, but the fellowship existing in the true Church, which is the creation of the Holy Spirit. We cannot hold too high a doctrine of the Church, if the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is a reality to us. Ideally, the Church is figured as the bride of Christ, "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle" (Eph. v. 27). The realism which our knowledge of human nature, and especially of our own hearts, forces upon is, is no ground for despondency, still less for cynicism.

The Church, however imperfect, is the crown of human fellowship, because, more than any other form of social fellowship, it is the creation of the Holy Spirit. Its actual failures are more easily apparent, just because its ideal is so high. We must still hold to John Smyth's definition of the Church as "a company of the faithful, baptized after confession of faith and of sins, which is endowed with the power of Christ."

The sacramental expression and nourishment of this fellowship is the Lord's Supper. St. Paul describes it as a communion of the body and blood of Christ, a fellowship of participation in His redemptive work (I. Cor. x. 16). That redemption is the creative centre of the fellowship and the constant fountain of its renewal. The breaking of the bread and the sharing of the cup are acts of prophetic symbolism, like the baptism of believers, and are certainly not, for St. Paul, what is sometimes called "mere" symbolism. As carried out by believers—here the Church Catholic is in virtual agreement—they both express and in a real and deep sense mediate, the grace of the Lord's redemption. If they are simply memorial acts, pictorially reviving the past, it is difficult to justify their continuance. But the common experience of the Christian Church is that the Lord's Supper, in whatever form, and with whatever explanatory doctrine of grace, does constitute the living centre of the fellowship of the Church.

There is no prescription of any particular form of organization for the Church in the New Testament. It is difficult to see how a stereotyped form could have been prescribed to a living Church. Life has always to adjust itself to new needs in new ways. Scholars recognize to-day that there are, in the New Testament, elements of all the three main types of organization familiar to us to-day—the congregational, the presbyterian, and the episcopal. The apostolic authority was a very real thing, and the elders of a local Church certainly held a ruling place, though we can see that the Church

had also its congregational side, which even the rather autocratic Paul was careful to recognize. A Baptist may well feel that a predominantly congregational type of organization is more expressive of the essential fellowship of the Church than any other type of polity, as he also feels that the New Testament *mode* of baptism provides a truer symbolism than any other. Yet in neither case ought the mode to be made essential to the spiritual reality. No type of Church government should be regarded as sacrosanct, even though some are better than others. A growing number of Baptists is willing to recognize the expediency of some modification of congregational polity. The rule here is the same as that for the worship of the Church, equally unprescribed: "Let everything be for building-up" (I. Cor. xiv. 26). It may fairly be argued that the social temples of the Spirit need not conform to one particular type of ecclesiastical architecture any more than His individual temples. But it must not be forgotten that each type has its own limitations. Baptists especially need a far richer conception of the fellowship of the whole Church as the Body of Christ. I cannot believe that the Holy Spirit is the slave of geography and of the mere accident of locality.

IV. FREEDOM.—It is characteristic of the individualism, which springs from the Baptist emphasis on personal conviction and loyalty to the Lord, that we should have been in the forefront of the demand for freedom. This applies to political and social, as well as to religious, freedom. Baptists held a prominent place in Cromwell's army, as the names of many of his leading officers show—Allen, Deane, Harrison, Hutchinson, Ludlow, Lilburne, Gough. The Baptist share in the abolition of slavery and in the general political struggle for civic liberty cannot here be reviewed. But one fact does deserve emphasis, because it is very insufficiently realized. The first demand for full religious liberty published in England came from a Baptist, Thomas Helwys, who was the lay minister of the first Baptist Church in this country. When, recently, a Jewish Passover was celebrated in the new Helwys Hall of Regent's Park College, I was proud to call attention to those words of Helwys, which cost him his liberty and eventually his life:—

> "Our lord the King is but an earthly King, and he hath no aucthority as a King but in earthly causes, and if the Kings people be obedient and true subjects, obeying all humane lawes made by the King, our lord the King can require no more: for mens religion to God is betwixt God and themselves; the King shall not answere for it, neither may the King by jugd betweene God and man. Let them be heretikes, Turcks, Jewes or whatsoever, it apperteynes not to the earthly power to punish them in the least measure."

Every Baptist minister should have a children's address on the story of John Murton, the disciple of Helwys, who wrote in prison a book on the same lines. Milk was supplied to him from outside the jail in bottles with paper stoppers. He wrote on that paper in milk—a convenient invisible ink—and the manuscript, again screwed up to make a stopper to the empty bottles, escaped from the prison unnoticed. This published book ultimately reached and influenced Roger Williams, the first American Baptist, who founded the first of the states, Rhode Island, to give full religious liberty. Thence it passed into the constitution of the United States, and has found its latest expression in President Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms"—freedom of speech and of worship, freedom from want and from fear. That remarkable sequence of Baptist witness and influence should be better known, and should be a challenge to Baptists to-day to take their hereditary place in the achievement of freedom in the future world-order.

The assertion of the right to freedom, whether political or religious, is itself an act of faith, faith in the dignity of manhood, faith that in the long run enlightened men will not abuse it. The justification for that act of faith, in contrast with all totalitarianism in politics or papalism in religion, is that God Himself has trusted man with moral freedom, and with the responsibility for its use. His providence committed even the Gospel of His Son to the frail and trembling loyalty of a handful of men and women; on their memory and devotion hung the whole future existence of the Church. We may well remember this when we are tempted to think of ourselves—in this land, though not in a wider horizon—as a negligible minority. If it be true, as I believe it is, that some essential truths of the Christian faith are committed to the charge of Baptist hands more emphatically and clearly than to any other form of the Christian Church, that charge is a challenge and ought to be an inspiration. In no merely sectarian spirit, but with a proper pride in our heritage of freedom in particular, we have an opportunity of witness and service to-day not less than any in the past generations. The Baptist faith should make us optimists, not pessimists, about the future of mankind, though with an optimism that draws its strength and justification from the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

V. Evangelism.—This brings us to the last point, that of evangelism, by which I mean personal testimony to the Gospel, whether from lips or life, whether direct or indirect, whether abroad or at home. Everything that effectively proclaims and promotes the Lordship of Jesus is evangelism. The successful evangelism of minister or missionary needs as many actively co-operating men and women behind it as does the work of the air-pilot.

In theory, at least, the place of the layman in the ministry of the Gospel is fully recognized, and there is little fear that the Baptist

layman will allow his rights to be ignored. What he sometimes needs to be told, however, is that he has no rights unless he is an evangelist, in the large sense here indicated. Both the professional minister and the ordinary Church member do well to remind themselves that the urge to personal evangelism is the measure of personal conviction. Truth is by its very character universal; to be convinced by the truth is to be pledged to extend it. We do not really believe in the Lordship of Christ if we are not eager to see His universal sovereignty.

The aims of such personal evangelism have been nobly set forth by John Clifford, in words that deserve to be recalled:—

> "To get men to Jesus Himself—to His mind, with its illuminating discoveries; to His heart, with its boundless love; to His will, with its quickening and uplifting strength; to His character, with its deathless charm and infinite beauty; to His story, with its inexhaustible suggestiveness; to His Cross, with its message of pardon and grace; to His throne, from which He rules the ages; to His indwelling spirit, by which He is with us even to the end of the world."

("Life," by J. Marchant, p. 214; spoken at Liverpool in 1922).

On the missionary record of Baptists, and on their long line of distinguished evangelical preachers, it is not possible or necessary to dwell. But it is necessary to urge the new opportunity for evangelism in the present generation. We have often lamented the lost sense of sin, without which there can be no genuine repentance and no evangelical faith. But to-day, in terrible but unmistakable fashion, the actuality of moral evil is exhibited as never before. Public events have spoken more eloquently and convincingly than any preacher, and have claimed for their auditorium the whole world. Nor is the interpretation of these things wanting, though from "secular" lips, and with a new vocabulary. The voices of statesmen and journalists to-day proclaim as new discoveries that which evangelical preachers have been saying for many generations. As in the days of the Old Testament, it is only the stern teaching of events that wins a response to the prophet's voice. There is hope for this generation just because, in however confused a fashion, it is learning what sin is and does. That is the necessary prelude to the sense of personal need and to the discovery of the Gospel of God's forgiving love. Let Baptists, in what may prove the beginning of a second "evangelical revival," not be as backward as they were in that of the eighteenth century

I have been trying to give a comprehensive view of a Baptist's faith, even at the cost of covering far too much ground to deal adequately with any of the points raised. My chief aim has been, not to secure your assent to every proposition, but to stir you to

make a similar review for yourselves, each for himself and in his own way. The final test of its validity is that it should become a pathway into the Catholic faith. Here intensity is of more value than extensity. It gets us further to press on in one path than to wander about over many. Whatever be the value and prospects of any of the schemes of federal union with other Churches, of which we are likely to hear a good deal in the coming years, I am sure that the worthwhileness of any of them will depend on the vigour and not on the flabbiness of the convictions of each consenting party. To that end I urge the need for clearer conceptions and more systematic teaching of these convictions by Baptist ministers, both in the pulpit and in the catechumen's class. We stand or fall by the clarity of our convictions, for there is often little enough to attract in our architecture or worship or social status—what Bunyan called "Religion in his silver slippers." As an institution we cannot claim the long tradition that seems to reach into the mists of antiquity. It is not altogether surprising that from time to time we have instances of the drift of Baptists to other Churches. A Baptist minister of the last century, after thirty years of work amongst us, went over to the Roman Church, saying that all his life he had been haunted by a question to which he found no answer: "By what authority doest thou these things?" The Baptist who has learnt to think clearly ought to be able to give a direct and convinced answer to that question. The authority lies in the intrinsic worth of truth, to which all the mediation of institutions and books and men is secondary. When we know the intrinsic truth we come nearest to God, and act by His sufficient authority. To follow that authority is to follow the star—whether you make its points five or not—to follow the star which will still lead wise men of the West to Bethlehem.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

Books that Remain from 1904-09.

THIS article arises from a suggestion made by the Editor, who asked for something on books which had been a help to me in the ministry. I soon found that this would lead to an article of far greater length than is possible in this *Quarterly,* so I have confined myself to the books of the first five years of my ministry (1904-09) which are still read.

Those who started their ministry at that time had two great advantages. One was the emergence of the New Theology, leading to a controversy which became popular : daily newspapers found it good copy; the editors of religious journals called for declarations from all ministers. A man had to decide and announce where he stood. This meant that theology was in the air, and theological sermons were expected and listened to. The other advantage was the Welsh Revival which broke out in the early autumn of 1904. I had been reading Benjamin Jowett's *Dissertations on Paul's Conversion,* where he seemed to suggest that conversion on a large scale of a sudden character was no longer to be expected, that education was doing the work. When I read it I thought it all so sane. Then came the Revival, with its evidence contrary to Jowett's statement. The Revival claimed us all for evangelism, and probably its effects in this direction were permanent.

It was a flowering period in religious and theological literature. *The Dictionary of the Bible,* issued by Hastings, was being completed. It was being followed by *The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,* to be followed by *The Dictionary of Christ and the Apostles. The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* was starting its magnificent way. *The Expositor's Greek Testament* was available (with the exception of the last volume), with its notable contributions, especially by Denney on the *Romans,* and Moffatt and Dods. *The International Critical Commentary* was establishing itself, being led greatly by Sanday and Headlam on the *Romans,* and a notable contribution by Harper on *Amos* and *Hosea. The Expositor's Bible* was also completed, but we were all reading the remarkable volumes by George Adam Smith on *Isaiah* and the *Minor Prophets.* Ramsay was bringing out his volumes on *Paul* and on *The Letters to the Seven Churches;* and the International Theological Library (T. and T. Clark) had already issued some volumes.

The above are mentioned because they still remain fresh and powerful to-day, while the Dictionaries have not yet been superseded.

I make no reference to devotional literature, although it

was at that time that a good friend put me into touch with Dora Greenwell, whom I still find inspiring. Nor do I mention the biographies procured at that time.

When I came to make my choice of books I found there were ten or a dozen that retain their places on my shelves, and which I read constantly. These I reduced to six or seven. I would have liked to have said something of the thrill that came to me when it was made so clear by Deissmann that the language of the New Testament was that of the common folk; and I wish I could say a word about Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity,* especially the two chapters on "The advance of our faith through unknown witnesses," and "Social work undertaken in the first three centuries." Considerations of space, however, permit of four books. They are:

1. *Christ in Modern Theology,* by Fairbairn. It was published in 1893, and I had some contact with it in college days, but had not read it with any closeness until I had settled in the ministry. Some object to its terseness; they cannot see how a movement can be summed up in a sentence, or a man's place in theological thought, if it is worth anything at all, determined by a phrase. They have a suspicion that truth is being sacrificed to an epigram. But Fairbairn never played with words, and made no attempt to be clever. He always writes with clearness, and always gives the impression of vast learning. Nothing seems to be gathered at second-hand: the footnotes show that he had gone to the original sources. What he did for me was to establish my feet in History, and to show that the most effective way of learning Doctrine was through Church History. In these later years I have found it necessary to emphasise the need of a thorough course and good grounding in Church History for all our missionaries. Perils and dangers arise from heresies, and heresies are within the Church. They vary in form, with change of place and generation, but really they are substantially the same, and repeat themselves. So missionaries, who have to guide the ways of a Church in its second or third generation, are greatly helped by their knowledge of what happened under similar conditions in other days. In any case, Fairbairn retains, after all these years, a freshness and a fascination.

Take a typical passage concerning Calvinism: "Calvinism was thus the conscious and consistent antithesis to Rome. For one thing, a rigorous and authoritative system was met by a system no less rigorous and authoritative. The Roman infallibility was confronted by the infallibility of the *Verbum Dei;* the authority of tradition by the authority of reasoned, yet Scriptural, doctrine; salvation through the Church by salvation through

Christ; the efficacy of the Sacraments by the efficacy of the Spirit; the power of the priesthood by the power of the ever-present Christ. The strength of Calvinism lay in the place and pre-eminence it gave to God: it magnified Him; humbled man before His awful majesty, yet lifted man in the very degree that it humbled him. Catholicism is essentially a doctrine of the Church; Calvinism is essentially a doctrine of God. In days when men have little faith in the supernatural and transcendental, Catholicism is an enormous power; its appeal to history is an appeal to experience, and men will cling to its traditions in the very degree that they have lost faith in God; but in days when men are possessed by faith in an all-sufficient Reason that knows all and never can be deceived, in an all-sufficient Will that guides all and never can be defeated or surprised, then the theology that holds them will be the theology that makes God real to the intellect and most authoritative to the conscience. And it was at this point and by this means that Calvinism so seized and so commanded men, faith in God being ever a less earthly and a sublimer thing than faith in a Church. Then, for the second thing, Geneva served in an equal degree the cause of freedom and of order. Calvinism was the very genius of system in theology and of order in polity. These two stood together; the one was a logical corollary from the other, yet appeared also as a copy of the ancient Scriptural model. But while order was as necessary to Geneva as to Rome, it was for reasons so different that the order did not remain the same. The order Rome maintained was autocratic, personalised in the Pope, incorporated in the Church, realised by its authority; the order Geneva created was democratic, personalised in God, incorporated in the Apostolic Society, realised by the authority of conscience. Roman order was external, imposed from without; Genevan order internal, evoked from within. Hence, while Rome could, in alliance with an absolute monarch, realise its order, the Genevan could be realised only by and through the people. It might be tyrannical in exercise; it must be popular in basis, and the basis was determinative; in it lay all the possibilities of freedom and progress."

2. *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* by Forsyth, published 1906. The period 1900 onward had as one of its features the interpretation of the Gospel in social relationships. Rauschenbusch and Peabody were writing their books, within the Anglican Church men were giving themselves to special forms of social service, and this was true both of the school which emanated from Maurice and Kingsley, and also of the Tractarians. The Brotherhood movement was laying hold of large sections of the Free Churches, social legislation,

especially in the way of health and insurance, was being promulgated, and all this was to the good.

Moreover, there was a general optimism coming over from the Victorian period that nothing could hinder progress, and while we had come through the Boer War, nobody really believed that there would be another "great" war. The Socialist movement was gaining strength, and it had in it a religious note. Hymns, like "These things shall be," and "When wilt Thou save the people?" were sung at political meetings. In theology the "liberal school" was gaining ground. Against these three tendencies Forsyth gave a warning. Concerning "liberal" theology he said: "It is fatal to the old faith. For all its varieties in common, it does not take either the measure of holiness or the weight of sin. It makes the Cross not necessary but valuable; not central but supplemental; not creative but exhibitive; a demonstration, but not a revelation; a reconciliation but not a redemption. It makes the Church a company of workers and not believers, the brethren of Christ rather than His flock and His property, a genial body rather than a regenerate, a band of lovers rather than of penitents."

He also showed how the disease that held mankind was a deeper thing than was being imagined, and that the cure had to be more drastic than was being offered.

The charge is sometimes laid against Forsyth that he is obscure, that he adds picture to picture in a bewildering way, and that sometimes the last picture used is a contradiction of the first. But he wrote for "those who do not resent an unfamiliar word, who are attracted rather than impatient towards a dark saying, who find the hard texts the mighty ones, and who do not grudge stopping the carriage to examine a mysterious cave, or to consider a great prospect."

He wrote concerning the Bible, the Church, the Ministry, and claimed that everything had to be interpreted by the Gospel; and by the Gospel he meant that which was set forth in the Cross of Christ. Here was one who had faced all the questions of criticism, and yet his faith seemed securer than that of many. Here was one who was well acquainted with Art, for had he not written an understanding book on it, and yet declared that Art and all related to it in all forms of culture, could not save, "that there is no reconciliation possible between the Cross and culture, when each knows its own mind, except as culture itself submits to be redeemed. As if Christ did not come to redeem us not from sin only, nor from worldliness, but from the world. I once addressed a meeting of ministers on the necessity of the evangelical consciousness, by which I meant the central or even daily life of forgiveness, repentance, humiliation, and their fruits,

in contrast with what is vaguely known as the Christian spirit. And I created a good deal of bewilderment. For one of them came to me afterwards, and asked me if he had understood me right, as, to his knowledge, the experience was one that few ministers possessed. If that was so I need not say another word to account for the loss of pulpit power and authority. It is not more religion we need so much as a better order of religion, and a more serious idea of the soul, its sin and its salvation. For an ill like this there is but one cure. It is a deeper, daily, though perhaps reserved sense, not only of our unworthiness, but of our perdition except for the Grace of Christ, the mercy of the Cross."

And is not this a relevant passage for to-day? "Christianity comes to-day, as it came in the first centuries, to a paganism which is disillusioned about itself and is sinking into pessimism. In those first days Christianity took the world at its own estimate, and brought the message that the situation required. Even Stoicism then despaired of the mass of mankind in spite of its high conception of Humanity. It could not make a religion of that idea. It had the dream but not the power. It had not the Redemption, the secret of a new creation. This was the one thing the age craved, and it was the one thing Christianity brought. And it was to this outworn world Christianity came. It was not to the northern world of the fresh Teutonic races. Its method was not to save an old civilisation by the infusion of a new and hopeful race. Or do you think that what saved antiquity was not the Christian redemption but the incursion of the Northern peoples? Well, Europe to-day is rapidly moving to where antiquity had come, to moral exhaustion, and to the pessimism into which natural optimism swings when the stress and burden are extreme. Do you think that that situation is to be saved by the spontaneous resources of human nature, or the entrance upon the *Weltpolitik* of a mighty young people like America? Is there no paganism threatening America? [The words were addressed to Americans.] What is to save America from her own colossal power, energy, self-confidence and pre-occupation with the world? Her Christianity, no doubt. But a Christianity which places in the centre not merely Christ but the Cross and its redemption, in a far more ethical way than America is doing; a Christianity which is not only set in the presence of Christ's person, but caught into the motion of Christ's work, which is not only with Christ, but in Him by a total moral and social salvation."

When Barth broke upon Europe, and many rallied to his call, it seemed surprising that it came as if a new thing were being declared. For what of value Barth emphasised was already found in Forsyth. To those who knew and accepted the teaching

of Forsyth there was no necessity for Barth, and, moreover, such were delivered from those limitations which seemed to hold Barth. It is remembered that both Barth and Forsyth owed much to Kierkegaard.

3. *Vision and Authority,* by Oman. The continued value of this book is evidenced by the fact that a new edition has come out in these last years, and has had a great sale. It has its own interest, because it reveals the seed from which other great books written by Oman have sprung: in particular, *Grace and Personality; Nature and the Supernatural,* and, last of all, *Honest Religion.* When *Vision and Authority* appeared it burst upon the Christian-thinking people in this country with a glad surprise, for here was one uttering the fundamental things in a great fashion, being persuaded of two great realities, namely, that God will not storm the soul of man, but will deal with him by the way of persuasion and with patience, and that on the other hand the final worth in man lies in his individuality. It is not surprising that the articles on *Individual* and *Individualism* in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,* were written by John Oman, where he says: "The only influences our Lord used were the appeals of wisdom and love. In every case He respected the individuality of another, and sought to make men realise how much they were to themselves as well as to God. When any influence appeared as a substitute for personal choice He sternly repressed it. He trusted no general movement, and appealed to nothing occult. He was always willing to leave a crowd for an individual. The only miracle He ever wrought for the multitude He used for sifting them and for gathering individuals from among them. And when a crowd did gather to hear Him preach He gave them most individual teaching. He never departed from the method of being an individual dealing with individuals, and requiring of them the most individual of actions—repentance and obedience to one's own call." To Oman, "the central fact of experience and the central fact of revelation are found to be one. God's tolerance is the key to experience and history. The central fact of human life is God's patience. He will not force His mystery on us. He will lead us up to it. Force is the destruction, the contradiction, the absolute opposite of this mystery. Force belong to the things seen, God's mystery to the things unseen. . . . God's tolerance is not like man's. It is not mere endurance of what we ourselves think right or not very far wrong. It is real tolerance—the recognition of the freedom of the possessor of a mind and conscience to err, the determination not to replace man's own dim search for light and man's own vacillating discipline of a wayward will even by omniscient wisdom and omnipotent righteousness."

To this patience of God the answer of man is to be found in discipline and duty. "Those who have made discovery of them are the meek who inherit the earth. They alone discover their true and complete inheritance. . . . They can accept all experience with the assurance of meekness, being those whom trial cannot daunt or opposition dismay, the absolute opposite of the timorous whom trial easily daunts and opposition easily dismays. They are meek, not because they are feeble, but from a sense so overwhelming of the all-pervading operation of God's wise love, that conflict dies out of trust and fear out of obedience. Submission for them is strength and obedience is peace."

Hence his warning against the acceptance of a creed which is merely the conclusion of others: "Mere acceptance of the conclusions of others, mere uniformity of creed or conduct with those who have gone before us, mere unity through suppression of difference, is not the way by which we profit from the labours of the saints, or lay broad and deep our foundations on the whole experiences and discoveries and victories of mankind." So also arises his fear that the Church may use to achieve her ends means totally unworthy. "Under the delusion that success must be hers, that her failure is God's failure, that, because a cause deserves to win, she must find means to make it win, the Church has too frequently been mixed up in matters outside her province, and has used means God would hate. She must learn that God has made in every heart a sanctuary into which only the persuasion of love has a right to enter, a sanctuary into which He Himself will not, with any other means, force an entrance; and she must be taught how to fail, how to make failure her last and greatest appeal, how to fail, not in discouragement, much less in indifference, but in faith and hope and love."

Similarly, concerning the movement towards unity, he says: "Too frequently the impression is conveyed that in spiritual matters agreement alone is the supreme necessity, whether it is agreement in the truth or not being of quite subsidiary importance. The feeling has thereby been created that religion is not an affair of truth, but merely of certain helpful ideas to be accepted and certain profitable things to be done. . . . The insistent demand for immediate and outward unity arises partly from a certain distrust of truth, and partly from a right understanding of the evidence which should accompany truth." All this is urged with clear conviction, with a piquancy not afraid occasionally of irony or satire, but never descending to scorn or contempt; and sometimes arising to great heights of eloquence. Here is an eloquent passage, when he speaks of the Hebrew Prophets and Christian Apostles: "They are the royal race who have grasped firmly the kingdom which others have aimed at dimly. Moreover

they are, in a special sense, our own spiritual ancestry, of whom we should have a better right to be proud did we bear them more resemblance. In comparison with them, the influence of kings and conquerors has been superficial and fleeting. They were weak, but out of weakness were made strong. They were often destroyed, but their destruction was their victory. Though humble and poor, lacking all the advantages of possession and of place, uncrowned by any dignity except the glory of their own faithfulness, they were yet set over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant. Vast armies marched up and down with noise and tumult. Mankind were used in masses as mere pawns to play with in the game of might and dread. The prophets stood alone, assured only of God's aid, but speaking to men as souls conscious of right and capable of high resolve. While the thunder of the armies has passed like the roar of the billows that waste their strength on a rock-bound coast, their word still echoes through the fruitful earth like the murmur of the brooks." Surely a prophet for this very day is Oman, and more than a prophet!

4. *Studies in Mystical Religion,* by Rufus M. Jones, published in 1909. I shall ever be thankful to the good deacon who presented me with a copy of this book as soon as it appeared. It opened to me an entirely new world, for consideration of the mystical element in our religion had never been dealt with in college days. A name here and there was known, but no more. This book of Rufus Jones' brought to mind again and again the saying of Jesus: "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth." It certainly gave a continual reminder that there are religious folk outside all religious bodies, that there are believers in Christ outside the organised churches. I recalled a word of Thoreau, "that if we find any one out of step we must not be in a hurry to condemn him, for it may well be he has heard the sound of another drum." On the other hand it showed clearly the worthlessness of any creed, or absence of creed, that did not reveal itself in true character; and, further, that there was always a danger of that "excess" which contradicts the good initial movement. For example, he says concerning Montanism: "Montanism, as a movement, 'failed'; its books were destroyed, its prophets were thrown to the beasts. Both the world and the 'Church' arrayed themselves against it, and finally stamped it out. It would have 'failed,' however, without the stern methods which were used against it, for it had not within itself the inherent power of ministering to the condition of the world and the soul of man." Similarly, concerning the Ranter movement, he says: "It brings forcibly to light the dangers involved in

extreme mystical doctrines, that is, doctrines by which the individual is assumed to be an infallible embodiment of God, to be superior to all previous revelation, and to be able to arrive at final truth without the help of the Church of the social environment."

The chapters on "John the Scot," under the title, "A Great Light in the Dark Ages," and on "The Waldenses," is most illuminating reading. So is also that on "The Pre-Reformation in England," and, particularly for us, the two chapters on "The Anabaptists." If it were not for the wholesome rule that this *Quarterly* does not reprint that which has been issued elsewhere, I wish that, over a space of one year, say, the two chapters on the Anabaptists could find a place in these pages. As that is not possible, I wonder whether they could be issued in a separate document?

Here is given the story of Menno Simons. "He became the leader and organiser of a new stage of Anabaptism, and the prophet of the type out of which the modern Baptist sects sprang —a type of Christianity which profoundly affected the religious life of Holland, the inner life of the religious societies of the English Commonwealth and the spiritual destinies of America."

John Smyth and Thomas Helwys have their place in the record, and the inevitable quotation from Masson concerning Leonard Busher and his reference to "the most extreme and despised sect of the Puritans." "The despised Independents," he continues, "and the still more despised Baptists, or thorough Separatists of the school of Smyth and Helwisse, were groping for the pearl between them; and, what is strangest at first sight, it was the more intensely Separatist of these two sects that was groping with most success. How is this to be explained? Partly, it may have been, that the Baptists were the sect that had been most persecuted—that they were the ultimate sect, in the English world, in respect of the necessary qualification of pain and suffering, accumulated in their own experiences."

A final word of Rufus Jones: "They (i.e. the Baptists) insisted, however, that Christ Himself is Head and Governor of the Church, and they made it a principle of the first importance that in order to '*restore the primitive way,*' there must be 'men professing and practising the order and form of Christ's doctrine who shall beautify the same with a holy and wise conversation in all godliness and honesty.' They were the ringing champions of a free conscience, a free ministry, a spiritual Church and a pure daily life. They were the beginners of a new order, which did much to prevent old customs from 'corrupting the world.'"

So these books remain. Others have come, some to take their place along with these, and others have passed on.

Theologically, Fairbairn proclaims the unique and unexhausted revelation of God in Christ given to generation after generation: Forsyth the centralising of the redemptive act of God in the Cross: Oman the persistent patience of God: Rufus Jones the freedom of His spirit. On the human side, Fairbairn makes clear how each generation has found Christ sufficient: Forsyth has emphasised the holiness of Christian character: Oman the supreme worth of the individual, and Rufus Jones the variety of the religious experience.

It may be that they are being read. If so, then the readers will not demur to what I have said, except that there may be something lacking in appreciation. If they are not being read, then those who will read them for the first time will find in them far more than I have been able to set forth.

B. GREY GRIFFITH.

GERMAN BAPTISTS in America owe much to Mueller of Bristol. In 1883 they organised a missionary society which has sent help to every continent, and workers to the Cameroons and to Canada, many of them trained at Rochester. Immigrants from Poland, Mennonites from Holland, have been evangelised and organised. Look at F. A. Mueller of Konigsberg, converted by reading a sermon of Spurgeon's in 1874, he at once preached, till on Whit-Sunday in the next year eighty-four converts were baptised. Seven years in the army saw great success among his comrades till Koebner persuaded him to give himself wholly to missionary work. Trained in his native city, he refused a call to Australia, and went to superintend twenty colonies in Russia. In eight years he baptised a thousand, so that Lutherans and Russians combined to secure his expulsion. He decided on Canada, with only a promise of a hundred dollars a year. Retiring at the age of seventy-two, he wrote that in the new land he had baptised 1,237 persons, organised ten churches, and built thirteen chapels. When a chapel was dedicated at Onoway, people of six nations were present; a German preached in English, a Pole in German, and C. Martin in Russian.

The Message of John Oman.

THE posthumous publication of *Honest Religion,* Dr. John Oman's last book, suggests a suitable occasion for attempting an account of that distinguished religious thinker's signal contribution to Theology. Oman achieved, in his lifetime, a foremost place among British theologians, and exerted a deep and far-reaching influence on contemporary religious life and thought. Though it may be safely said that his influence will be slow to abate, the time has not yet come for determining his final place in modern theological thought. No judgment at present can be other than provisional, and we shall do well to confine ourselves to considering his essential message.

It is peculiarly appropriate to speak of Oman's message, for his writing was deeply permeated by the prophetic spirit. Though his scholarship and learning were of first-rate quality, his work was never purely academic. He had a lively interest in the human scene, and even in his most specialised studies he never forgot life's common problems. Thus *Grace and Personality,* though generally judged to be far from easy reading, found warm acceptance with general readers. And his most philosophic work, *The Natural and the Supernatural,* is pervaded throughout by a homiletical flavour remarkable in a book of that type. His wise and penetrating *obiter dicta* on men and things are not the least rewarding part of his writing. One of the marks of Oman's distinction was that he could deal with theology in this way without falling into the obvious pitfalls that lie in the path of the attempt to combine the treatise and the homily. But in Oman it bears impressive witness to his conviction that no theology can justify itself that does not serve the highest interests of ordinary living. If the test of a theology is its power to widen vision and aspiration and to elucidate life's deepest meaning in the light of the Gospel, Oman spared no pains to pass it. He was much more than the strictly scientific theologian, and employed the great resources of his knowledge and insight to edify the Church and to commend the supreme importance of religion to all who would take the trouble to reason together with him. In this high sense he was a man with a message, and must be regarded as in the true apostolic succession.

There can be no doubt that Oman's place in theology will be determined by his two books, *Grace and Personality* (first published in 1917), and *The Natural and the Supernatural* (1931), although none of his writings should be overlooked by those who wish to take full measure of his teaching. Competent opinion is divided as to which of these works will prove to be

his *magnum opus*. Both have high claims in their respective fields, but time will probably show that *Grace and Personality* is the more creative. To know it is really to know what is most original in Oman's thinking. It is the key to all he wrote, and best sets forth that characteristic standpoint which gives unity to his various books. The other book, which is more academic, is closely related to it, as it deals with the philosophic basis of Oman's interpretation of religion. For our present purpose it will suffice to confine our attention to *Grace and Personality*.

It is significant that this book was written during the last war, and that its aim was to fortify faith in face of calamity and catastrophe. Fundamental questions were being raised, which "forced upon me," the author wrote in the original preface, "the reconsideration of my whole religious position." The outcome was not the adoption of a new standpoint, but the re-affirmation, with new emphasis, of the position already taken. Oman saw that the fundamental issue concerned the doctrine of grace, but the book is much more than a treatise on a single aspect of Christian Theology. In keeping with his principle that Theology is a whole, whose parts it is dangerous to treat in isolation (cf. *Honest Religion*, p. 155), the book sets forth a complete theology which touches on every basic Christian doctrine. From another point of view it may be regarded as a theodicy, for it seeks to justify the ways of God to men in face of the dark mystery of life's manifold evil and suffering. Nor would it be out of place to count it a book of devotion, for it possesses a singular power of bracing the soul to high aspiration and noble endeavour in the service of the highest. It is not surprising that Dr. Tennant has described it as "one of the major treasures of theological literature." It offers an instructive example of how a theological book ought to be written. Theology should not be a mere academic exercise of the intellect, but religious thinking undertaken by a religious person who is seeking to face the fulness of reality religiously, and to live the religious life strenuously and sincerely.

The fundamental question to which *Grace and Personality* addresses itself is the nature of the relationship between God and man. This, Oman maintains, has been misconceived within Christianity even as outside it. What it ought to be is defined as "a gracious personal relation." This is what is meant in the teaching of Jesus that God is our Heavenly Father. The relation is gracious because religiously, as in all else, man is utterly dependent on God, and needs His succour in the whole range of his varied experience. But it is also personal, because man is a moral personality and must be so dealt with that his utter moral independence is always respected. Without grace man is

a moral failure, yet he cannot achieve moral success apart from his own seeing and choosing. The essence of the Gospel, therefore, is the good news that God deals with men as His children, sparing nothing that grace can provide, yet doing nothing that would over-ride their independence as moral personalities. Truth must not be accepted on authority even though it be God's, nor must deeds be done on authority even though at God's command. Grace is not compulsion, which is always impersonal power even though personally operated, but is God offering Himself by the manifestation of the truth and by the constraint of love. This, Oman claims, is the New Testament conception of grace, which must be the foundation of any truly Christian theology, for no theology can be true, which is wrong about grace.

Our traditional theologies, however, have never accepted this conception of grace as their foundation. They divide themselves into those that make grace omnipotent power directed by omniscience and those that exalt man's self-sufficiency by reducing the necessity of grace to the minimum. Augustinianism and Pelagianism furnish the classical types. The former was right in ascribing all things to God, but wrong in setting forth grace as His irresistible power. The latter, in endeavouring to make room for man's moral independence, made the mistake of practically deeming all things possible to him, and so was led to make grace little more than Divine illumination. If the one undermined man's moral independence, the other undermined his religious dependence. Oman points out that though the Church remained Augustinian in doctrine, in spite of the Pelagian controversy, in practice it adopted a compromise. Within the Church grace was held to operate as irresistible might, whose manifestation was infallible beliefs and mechanically effective means of grace. But though the faithful were thus kept in leading strings within the Church, outside it they were allowed a measure of freedom. This meant, as Oman puts it, that while the Church was Augustinian, its members were Pelagian. The Church thus safeguarded its authority and preserved its members from the dangers of unlimited freedom. And average human nature did not object to having its thinking done for it so long as in the sphere of common life the reins were not too tightly held. It was able to cherish the illusion of freedom with none of the responsibility that freedom, in the true sense, carries with it. But such a solution, being a compromise, could be no more than a temporary adjustment of rival claims. The time was bound to come, and did at last come, when men could no longer endure the bonds of pupilage. Growing up, they demanded the freedom of their manhood, and the crisis came, Oman maintains, not at the Reformation, but at the *Aufklärung*. The former,

with all its significant achievements, failed to get to the root of the matter. It did not effect a real emancipation of the human spirit, for in casting off ecclesiastical bondage, it adopted the fetters of Biblical infallibility. The debate between Calvinism and Arminianism turned partly on the question of grace and freedom, but the discussion did not go deep enough. It was left to the *Aufklärung* to raise the naked issue by confronting authoritarianism with rationalism.

The *Aufklärung* is thus the watershed of the modern period. Oman describes it as the discovery of the individual, and from it has flowed that vast and many-sided movement which is often vaguely summed up as Liberalism. The underlying issue is the question of freedom, which was raised in so thorough-going a fashion that it is no longer possible either to suppress the problems raised or honestly to evade them. The movement was of supreme importance to the Church. What was demanded, in short, was a new conception of the meaning of grace, a conception at once broader and deeper. The fresh insight into the nature and significance of moral personality required a radical reconstruction of the doctrine of grace and freedom, such as would bring together, without reduction on either side, man's utter dependence on God and his utter moral independence. Such a harmony may be beyond our powers in the way of exact scientific expression, but no doctrine will any longer serve that fails adequately to recognise both these aspects. Freedom is nothing less than a gracious gift of God, and to seek to over-ride it in the supposed interests of grace involves an intolerable contradiction. The supreme religious requirement remains submission and surrender to God, but man may not yield himself even to his Maker except on the ground of his own insight and personal choice. Yet there is no exercise of freedom apart from grace, nor can freedom's responsibilities and obligations be discharged without the Divine succour. Unless God bless him, man cannot enter into his inheritance. Thus grace and freedom must be regarded as interacting elements in the fellowship which God offers His children through Jesus Christ. All this may well seem to some minds nothing short of a deplorable surrender to human pride. But to Oman's mind it is simply a return to the gospel. Consult the life and teaching of Jesus, consult the writings of those who first interpreted Him, and you will find no other doctrine of grace. "Our Father" means that God deals with us as His children. This implies "a gracious personal relation," in which both adjectives must be given their full value.

How, then, are we to explain the persistent distortions of the truth? There can be no other explanation than the sense that the consequences of unmeasured freedom are apt to involve

too much peril. In practice men may be better than their creed, but in theory they hesitate to be as adventurous. What tragedy, they reflect, may follow in the wake of letting man go his own way with naught to hold him save your appeal to the highest in him! Are not all the devastating evils of the human story due to this dangerous principle of freedom? Grant it free exercise, do you not open the door to sheer chaos? So many have thought and so many still think. Much strenuous labour, even now, is devoted to building up afresh the old safeguards. Terror of liberalism was not the least of the reasons that persuaded John Henry Newman to enter the Roman Church, even as it explains, on the part of many Protestants, whole-hearted acceptance of Fundamentalism. And does it not go far to explain the rise of the modern revolt against democracy and the development of our contemporary totalitarianisms? The way of freedom, it is felt, is too hazardous; it leads to consequences that will not bear contemplation. Are not the bulk of mankind but children in another sense than that of the Gospel? Surely the only sensible policy is to ensure their good behaviour by exercising over them the schoolmaster's discipline.

It is not the least of Oman's merits that he faces the alarming consequences of his doctrine as candidly as any far-seeing authoritarian. But he steadily maintains that his doctrine is grounded in the very nature of things, as any one may see who seeks to interpret honestly all life and experience. If it is God's way to work by irresistible grace, why is there no evidence of it in history? We ought to see a well-ordered pattern of events, in which nothing is, nor can be, out of place, whereas what we actually see is a spectacle of every kind of imperfection. Either God's providential ordering is within a framework of freedom or there is no order at all. It is futile, therefore, to attempt to work against the principle of freedom, for it is to strive to work against God. Moreover, it is to distrust God's wisdom and to doubt the sufficiency of His succouring grace. Did not God know what He was about when He made man as he is, and did He not know the consequences of His doing? To attempt to force life into other channels than those divinely ordained is to judge oneself wiser than God, and to assume that He cannot safely be entrusted with the guidance of His own world. God speaks through life and experience, pointing to the lesson that true living calls for moral adventure and involves taking all risks and hazards. Such a vocation requires childlike trust in the sufficiency of the Divine grace. We must see the world as God's world, and live in it as the children of the Heavenly Father, accepting life's stern discipline as the discipline which His love appoints for us. All is of His grace, and we must believe that

in following the highest we know, whatever the cost, we shall be abundantly blessed and sustained. We cannot tell all that lies before us, nor how long our journey will be, yet we may be assured that we shall not falter nor fail if we believe that to them that love God all things work together for good. Without the sense that there is a gracious purpose of good manifesting itself in all things, freedom would indeed be dangerous folly. It is grace that provides this assurance of succour. If we are to be confident that the way of freedom leads to the Promised Land, we must believe that underneath us always are the Everlasting Arms.

This doctrine, Oman maintains, merely interprets aright the whole course of prophetic religion through its long development till it found its consummation in the life and work of Jesus Christ. The authority of the Bible rests in the fact that it gives meaning to experience, the truth of which we can test for ourselves by living the life of faith. Hence the traditional doctrines are not only unscriptural, they are also contrary to the plain facts of life. The Bible is thus never out of date, but remains our best guide to right living. By its light Oman found the answer to the acute religious problems raised by the last war. He saw that the problems had always been with us, but it was not until that great catastrophe overtook us that the pressure of them was fully felt. Obviously no such calamity could have taken place if God's working is by way of grace interpreted as irresistible might. Such evil plainly could not flourish to bring disaster and sorrow to the children of men if it is God's plan to direct our steps unerringly in the paths of righteousness. The only answer to the problem, therefore, is that which lies open in the Bible when its message is rightly interpreted. Grace works within the framework of freedom, and its function is to appeal and persuade, to succour and sustain, whilst in freedom man faces the high adventure of life in obedience to his highest insight and judgment of right. The practical bearing of this relation of grace and freedom has never been summed up better than in the Apostolic exhortation: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, according to His good pleasure."

The message of the Bible may then be set forth as the word of reconciliation. Being reconciled to God means being reconciled to God's purpose for us, which is that we should live according to His will by His grace in the order of freedom. We must not shrink from life's hazards and distresses, for they are by the Father's permission; nor must we seek to evade its claims and responsibilities, for they are the Father's appointed discipline. Though we may seldom be able to discern it clearly, we must

believe that we have been set within the present order according to God's gracious purpose of good for our own profit and for the Divine ends. Being reconciled to God, therefore, is being reconciled to life, with which we are called to do our best, shirking no claim it makes upon us and evading no responsibility it imposes upon us. Because the order of grace is also the order of freedom it must needs be that offences come. There cannot be but folly and failure, sin and sorrow. But since all is within the Providence of God there cannot but be victory over even the worst if we rely upon God's sufficient grace. Rightly exercising our freedom and rightly using the world and its opportunities, we shall not only make our souls, but share also in the realisation of that Divine purpose for which God created all things. What the ultimate goal may be we can only dimly discern, but those who are reconciled to God know that they have light and strength enough for each step of the way. Only beyond, in the blessed life, shall we know even as we are known.

Of the company of heroic souls who have discerned that grace and freedom are but aspects of the same order, and have lived in accordance with that insight, Jesus Christ stands in a place apart. He is much more than the supreme example of how life should be lived in freedom yet in utter dependence on the Heavenly Father. He is the Mediator of Divine grace in a unique sense. The grace that pardons and reconciles and succours was made manifest in Him as in no other. In Him is revealed for all time what God has done, and is doing, and will do, for the children of men. The victory that overcometh the world shines forth supremely from His life and death and resurrection. How Oman works all this out we cannot now stay even to summarise. It must suffice to say that the foundation of it all is the conviction that no one cometh unto the Father save by the Son.

This broad outline of Oman's message will perhaps serve to show how great is the debt that many feel they owe to this great prophetic thinker. That debt is not to be measured merely by the intellectual stimulus he has given to those who have studied his contributions to Theology. The final test of the worth of a prophetic ministry is the results in the lives of those who have profited by it. It is Oman's distinction that he has enabled those who have come under his influence to live the Christian life more strenuously and more courageously. In an age distracted by doubt and perplexity and fear he has encouraged believing men and women of all grades, and not least his brethren in the ministry, to persevere in all high tasks with faith and hope. And his bracing message will continue to be fruitful, for it was Oman's way not to be content to speak to immediate and par-

ticular situations, but to deal with the fundamentals that are involved in all situations. He passed from us before the present catastrophe overtook us, but the book, whose occasion was the last war, is as relevant at the present time as it was then. When the highest prerogatives of the human soul are once more imperilled, we need to hear his clarion call to hold sacred the rights of human personality. Yet to respond to that call we need such a conception of Reality as will enable us to gird up our loins for the high adventure of living in the assurance that to follow the highest we know is no illusion but the pathway to a good that surpasses all our dreams. We need no less, therefore, Oman's other call to find our succour in the sufficient grace of the Father of our spirits as it is made supremely manifest in Jesus Christ. In personal fellowship with God, and with the sense of His pervading Providence in all things we may be assured that not even the worst calamities of our time will avail to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus. And in this confidence we shall have no doubt that the business of the Kingdom, however much it may be delayed by human pride and folly, will finally prosper till it reaches its consummation. Though we must pray for the Kingdom to come on earth, and direct our energies to that end, we may well believe that the final goal will be beyond history. But somewhere, somehow, the goal will be reached, and we shall arrive at that blessed destination whose glory and delight will more than justify the long, toilsome journey which, as we have travelled along it so painfully and haltingly, has so often seemed but the pursuit of an empty dream. Such hopeful assurance comes of the grace of God, but the way to its fulfilment can be no other than the way of freedom.

W. E. Hough.

Two Dutch Translations by Carey.

AN ANGUS LIBRARY FIND.

I

THE linguistic achievements of Carey have always caused great astonishment, and sometimes a little incredulity. That a young man, with the slenderest resources and much else to occupy him, should have taught himself Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and also a working knowledge of Dutch, French and Italian, has seemed almost beyond the bounds of possibility. Just as later there was questioning of the reliability and accuracy of certain of the translations of the Bible which came from Serampore—questioning which has resulted in the complete vindication of Carey's name—so, even in Carey's lifetime, there were some who refused to believe that a village shoemaker-pastor could have gained such mastery over ancient and modern tongues.

In the main, for the earlier period of Carey's life, we have to rely on the testimony of his contemporaries, and in particular that of his closest friends. To substantiate their claims, however, there is still preserved, happily, in the vestry of the College Street Church, Northampton, a translation of a Dutch pamphlet made by Carey for John Ryland in 1789, and there has just come to light in the Angus Library of Regent's Park College, Oxford, some further evidence of his knowledge of the Dutch language. The papers are important as confirmation of Carey's ability, and they have also considerable interest on account of their contents.

What we know of Carey's acquaintance with Dutch comes almost entirely from John Ryland. In his life of Fuller, published in 1816 (that is, while Carey was in the midst of his work in India) this passage occurs:

> "I never formally examined the proficiency he had then made in learning Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Dutch, Italian, etc., but one anecdote will illustrate what, indeed, his subsequent attainments render unnecessary to be proved. I one day had occasion thus to address him: 'Well, Mr. Carey, you remember I laughed at you when I heard of your learning Dutch, for I thought you would never have any use for that language; but now I have the first opportunity of profiting by it. I have received a parcel from Dr. Erskine, of Edinburgh, who has long been used to send me any interesting publications which he receives from America, or which have been printed in Scotland; and this parcel contains several of those sorts: but he says I shall wonder that he has inclosed a Dutch book. This, he informs me, is a volume of Sermons written by a Divine now living in Holland; at the end of which is a Dissertation on the

Call of the Gospel, which, if any friend of mine or Mr. Fuller's understands the language sufficiently to translate it for us, we should be glad to see. 'Now (said I to Mr. Carey) if you will translate this Dissertation for me, I will give you the whole book.' He soon brought me a good Dissertation on the subject, and afterwards an extraordinary sermon, on Hosea, chapter iii, which I doubt not were translated from this book. I once also, in an accidental way, made a trial of his skill in French; and hence, at that early period, I inferred that, as his motives to learn Latin, Greek and Hebrew must have been stronger than those that excited him to acquire French and Dutch, his proficiency in them could not be less. His present eminence in Oriental literature every one acknowledges. But it is pleasant to trace the rise of the oak from an acorn."[1]

This passage was substantially reproduced by Cox in his *History of the Baptist Mission,*[2] and has also found its way in various forms into the biographies of Carey. Only one small addition can be made to it from another source. When, in 1834, Christopher Anderson printed his memorial sermon, preached in Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh, after the news of Carey's death reached this country, he added a footnote to his quotation of the passage from Ryland given above:

"And I am now able to give additional interest to this anecdote, from the best authority, owing to my residence with Mr. Sutcliff, whose conversation used so delightfully to beguile every evening. Dr. Carey actually acquired the knowledge of this tongue without the intervention of one elementary book, through some Dutch quarto, obtained, I think, from an old woman either in the village or its neighbourhood."[3]

Anderson spent some months in Olney in 1805, and remained in close touch with Sutcliff and Fuller for the rest of their lives. On a number of points besides this one, his testimony is of great value.

Pearce Carey has examined the College Street translation, which runs to forty-five pages of neat, small writing. He calls it a "creditable rendering."[4] It was made apparently in 1789.[5]

The Angus Library find is in a small parcel of faded papers which belonged once to John Rippon, well-known for his selection of hymns and as editor of the *Baptist Register.* The parcel contains, among other things:

(1) A translation of a letter to Rippon from Daniel Hovens, of Rotterdam, dated 26th November, 1791. It runs to seven closely written sheets, and at the end there is this note:

1. *Life and Death of Andrew Fuller,* 1816, p. 239n.
2. *Op. cit.,* 1842, I, p. 9.
3. *A Discourse occasioned by the death, etc.,* 1834, p. 31n.
4. *William Carey,* 8th ed., p. 52.
5. Smith, *Life,* Everyman ed., p. 17.

> " Some few words in the Letter were obscurely written but the sense is given. I shall translate the Pamphlet in the course of the week if nothing very unexpectedly prevents. All except the Names must be translated. But Oh! how fall'n is Religion in Holland. I am, etc.
> W. Carey."

This is addressed on the outside to Mr. Thos. Rippon, Drawing Office, Bank of England, for the Revd. J. Rippon, and the postmark is Leicester, January, 1792.

(2) A Dutch MS. of twenty-four pages, consisting of a copy by D. Hovens of an account of the Baptist congregations in Haarlem, written in April, 1740, by his grandfather, Enoch Hovens.

(3) A translation of the above, quite clearly in Carey's writing.

The deciphering of the Dutch script can have been no small feat, and though there are evidences that Carey was occasionally somewhat baffled as to the sense, there is no doubt at all from the translation both of the letter and the so-called pamphlet that he had a very competent knowledge of the language. These are not laborious schoolboy exercises. Pearce Carey's word " creditable " is, on the whole, an understatement.

II

Both the letter and the other document are of interest in themselves. Rippon, says Dr. Whitley, " was an indefatigable antiquary, and gathered much material; unfortunately he did not publish much that he gathered, nor did he return it to its owners, and many early records have been lost ever since, though some manuscripts have found their way to safe keeping."[6] In the parcel in the Angus Library there are other documents that will repay careful examination. The letter from Hovens, of Rotterdam, throws light on Rippon's methods, and also indicates that there were not a few contacts between English and Dutch Baptists in the late eighteenth century.

Hovens is replying to a communication he had had from Rippon seven months earlier, inviting his collaboration in the *Baptist Register*. He has only recently learned that he need not attempt to send an answer in English. A colleague in Leyden has assured him that " though you neither understand High or Low Dutch, yet you can get it interpreted without much trouble." Hovens then tells an interesting story. In 1783 he had had a letter from the Rev. Job David, of Frome, who had seen a contribution of his to Teyler's *Divine Fellowship*. David invited his help with the plan for a " History of the Baptists in Europe and America," which was occupying the attention of Robert Robinson, of Cambridge. In particular,

6. *History of British Baptists*, p. 272.

Robinson was wanting a copy of T. J. Van Braght's *Looking-Glass of Martyrs.*[7] Hovens reports that in May, 1784, he sent a copy, care of a Holborn bookseller, for forwarding to David, and also information about the historical papers of a Mr. Cuperus, a deceased Baptist minister of Utrecht, who had had in mind an undertaking similar to Robinson's. David had replied asking for the papers, but after considerable correspondence and delay, the executors of Cuperus had refused, though they were willing that Hovens send to England some extracts from them. This he reported to David in 1787, receiving in reply full details of Robinson's scheme, and a further request for help. But Hovens's wife died shortly afterwards, and for some time he was too overwhelmed to undertake any additional work.

In May, 1791, however, having married again, he felt able to pursue the matter further, and he sent over to the Holborn bookseller:

(1) H. Costenbaan, *Epistola de Mennonitis Amstelodami.*
(2) An account of the Baptists of Haarlem written by his grandfather, Enoch Hovens.
(3) Two catalogues of Baptist churches and their ministers, which he had made up some years earlier from the papers of Cuperus.

When he wrote to Rippon in November of the same year, these had not been acknowledged. He gathered from references in the copies of the *Baptist Register* sent him, that Robinson was dead, and he thought that perhaps David also was deceased. Accordingly he appeals to Rippon to try to discover the papers. "What concerns the state of the Baptists here you will in some sense perceive from the two catalogues which I have sent to Mr. David, if you can obtain them. The greatest part of the churches, however, are since that time become very much reduced, and a few remain much as they were with little increase."

Hovens tells Rippon that he has been in touch with Dr. Stennett, translating into Dutch one of his pamphlets on baptism. He asks for a copy of Rippon's hymnbook, and says he is sending him:

(1) Printed catalogue of Baptist writers and writings, 1639-1725 (perhaps).
(2) Last printed catalogue of Baptist churches and teachers with notes.
(3) List of Bachelors of Divinity who have come out of the seminary in Amsterdam since its foundation.

7. See Whitley, *Baptist Bibliography,* I, p. 119, etc. An Anabaptist martyrology, which appeared in its final form in 1685, but incorporated documents from as early as 1524.

(4) Some details of the peculiarities of one or two special congregations.
(5) Copy of a 1672 discussion between a Baptist minister and a doctor of the Sorbonne.
(6) Copy of an abstract of the latest Church Acts relating to the Mennonites.

A few points may be added to this summary of Hovens's letter. Robert Robinson had died in 1790, with only a part of his plan completed. After his death, his friend George Dyer[8] edited his *History of Baptism* and the unfinished *Ecclesiastical Researches.* Job David did not die till 1813; but he shared Robinson's unorthodox views and became minister of a Unitarian church in Taunton, which probably accounts for Hovens's failure to hear again from him. The list of Dutch churches which Hovens sent to Rippon must be that printed in the *Baptist Register,* Vol. I, pp. 303-320. I cannot find that Rippon ever used the other material, but it is significant that he had heard of Carey's knowledge of Dutch and that he turned to him for help.

III

Finally, as to the document translated by Carey, the Dutch original of which we possess. It seems without doubt to be that sent by Hovens in May, 1791, to the Holborn bookseller, which means that Rippon acted at once on Hovens's suggestion that he should try to get hold of it.

It is a copy by Daniel Hovens of an account of the Baptist churches in Haarlem, prepared in 1740 by Enoch Hovens for a friend in Utrecht, with a few notes which show that it was written out in 1787. It makes clear that by "Baptists" the Mennonites were really meant, though the divisions and varieties among them were so many that certain groups might perhaps be better described as Baptists. The interest and importance of the document come from several considerations. Enoch Hovens was eighty years old when he wrote it; he was himself a Mennonite "teacher," that is, a preacher called out by the church, but receiving no stipend or salary; he was related to, or could recollect, not a few of the seventeenth century Mennonite leaders, including his great-grandfather, Herman Zeger, of Utrecht, born about 1577, that is, only sixteen years after the death of Menno Simons, and whom he heard preach when over ninety years of age.

Professor Kühler, of Amsterdam, a distinguished Mennonite scholar, says of the Mennonites:

> "In the 18th century their number declined for many reasons. The lay-preachers elected from among the brethren

8. See *Baptist Quarterly,* Vol. X, No. 5 (Jan., 1941).

no longer satisfied the congregations; consequently, a great number of families passed into the State Church. The foundation of a theological seminary in Amsterdam (1735) did not produce any lasting improvement. At many places, fortunately, the piety of the forefathers continued, and the spiritual well-being of the people and the spreading of a higher civilization were objects of great care."[9]

All these points might be illustrated from Enoch Hovens's account of affairs, which is full of names of persons, parties and meeting-places. Not the least interesting passage is an allusion to the Moravians—" a troop from Germany called Herrnhutters, full of inward imaginations, and assertions of an indolent waiting for divine illuminations, which draw to themselves some of light faith and desirous of new things." The aged Enoch Hovens, who remembers the great days of the past, thinks they will come to nothing, but he has to confess: " For the hundred years that are past in Haarlem very little less than 5,000 members have been in the Baptist churches, which now can by no means make up the third part." As one reads the whole account through one does not wonder at Carey's comment: " But Oh! how fall'n is Religion in Holland."

One day, perhaps, when the present grim European ordeal is over, and happier days come for Rotterdam and Haarlem, the Historical Society might reprint in full this 1740 account of conditions in Holland, and might renew English contacts with the Mennonites —contacts that were clearly prized on both sides of the North Sea at the end of the eighteenth century, and that gave occasion for this welcome evidence of the early linguistic skill of young William Carey.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

9. *E.R.E.*, VIII, pp. 553-4.

General Ludlow's Baptist Comrades.

EDMUND LUDLOW was of good Wiltshire family, his father being a knight of the shire in 1640. Trained at Oxford and the Inner Temple, he responded to Charles waging war, by enlisting in the hundred Life-Guards of the Earl of Essex, along with Thomas Harrison and six others who rose to high rank. After Edge Hill, he was detached to defend Wardour Castle, then was commissioned to raise a regiment to serve under Waller in the West, which was disbanded when the New Model was created.

Meanwhile he had been chosen Sheriff of Wilts before he was thirty; then in 1646 succeeded his father as M.P. and owner of Maiden Bradley, seven miles south of Frome, on the borders of Wilts. The governing principle of his life henceforth was loyalty to this Parliament; first as he found it without any Royalist members, then to the Rump after it was purged by Colonel Pride. When he wrote his memoirs, they closed with its disappearance in March, 1660.

The interest of his two volumes is twofold, apart from occasional glances at public events in which he had no share. First, his campaigns in Ireland and his subsequent administration; for he rose to be Commander-in-Chief there, and after the death of Deputy Ireton, succceeded to his civil powers. Second, his efforts from 1658 till 1660 to uphold Parliament against the violence and intrigues of the troops near London.

While these are the real themes on which he dwells, it seems strange that no study has ever been made of the great part played by his Baptist friends. He was not primarily a Baptist; indeed, only one page ever mentions religious matters. Perhaps it is all the more important to see how Baptists did take a very full share in the matters under his own eyes; whence it may be argued that in other parts also they were by no means negligible in these years. At least we can read their doings in both military operations and civil affairs; (and a few notes may be interpolated).

During the first war, Ludlow left Lieutenant-Colonel Read at Salisbury to hold the belfry, whence he was burnt out and had to surrender. (This man afterwards distinguished himself in Scotland, retired to his home at Idmiston, and was a mainstay of Baptists near for many years.) After the second war, Ludlow and two others were sent by Parliament to Windsor with orders to the Army to discharge the "Levellers," but he does not mention Cornet Denne. When he sat, with Harrison, Hutchinson, etc., to judge Charles, one of the Counsel appointed to prosecute was Serjeant Steel, whom he met later as Lord-Chancellor of Ireland, "a Man of great Prudence and uncorrupted Integrity," upholding the Parliament just as Ludlow did. When Charles was sentenced, Adjutant-General

Allen was sent to tell Bishop Juxon that the King desired his ministrations. Ludlow knew about Allen's rise from the ranks, as Adjutator for his regiment at Saffron Walden; and he was glad to have his help in Ireland. Colonel Richard Deane, who had been in charge of Charles, was now promoted General-at-Sea, to guard the English and Irish Channels. After being commissioned to bring about the Union of Scotland with England for one Parliament, he and his regiment of horse fought at Lochaber. Then in 1653 he was Admiral, and defeated Van Tromp, Lawson being Rear-Admiral; he was killed in action off Solebay (and was given a State funeral in Henry VII's chapel). Captain Richard Deane was Treasurer-of-War in Ireland under Ludlow, handling over a million in seven years. (He is known in later life as paying bail for Ewins at Bristol, as visiting Collier at Trowbridge in 1676, and as writing a letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, used by Crosby).

Ludlow came into the front rank with January, 1650-1, when he sailed from Milford to Waterford, as Lieutenant-General of the Horse in Ireland, with large civil powers. To regulate taxes, customs, excise, commissioners were appointed in the Precincts, including Colonels Axtell for Kilkenny, Zanchey for Clonmel, Lawrence for Waterford.

Axtell, "than whom no man was better acquainted with the country of Ireland," had commanded the soldiers at the trial of Charles, was soon captured by pirates at Scilley, was on a small committee to draw all smiths, armourers and saddlers into the Parliamentary garrisons. (Deane had paid his regiment £51,712, and abundant information as to his governing Kilkenny is in Dunlop's *Ireland Under the Commonwealth,* which also has many more details as to Baptists in Ireland then. Deane was executed for his share in the trial of Charles.)

Hierome Zanchey, or Jerome Sankey, waxed more and more important. After vigorous campaigns, he, with Lawrence and Axtell, received the surrender of Colonel Odowyer in Waterford, of Colonel Grace in Galway, and so really ended the war. We shall meet him again in the troubles of 1659.

(Richard Lawrence, whose regiment drew £81,041, was greatly concerned in executing the last Act to which Charles assented, by the transplantation of the Irish west of the Shannon—an exact precedent for modern transportation of Poles and Jews! He valued properties in Galway, and after the Restoration was a member of the Council of Trades. His brother Henry Lawrence, as President of the Council in England, was constantly writing to Ludlow; after the Restoration he published on baptism. Ludlow hardly mentions him yet.)

The ejectment of the Rump of the Long Parliament in 1653 greatly hurt Ludlow, who records that Overton proposed to lead the Army in Scotland to restore it; he does not mention that Harrison

was foremost in the actual handing the Speaker from the chair. An Army petition in its favour was sent over to Ludlow, who employed Walcot to circulate it for signatures; but Auditor-General Roberts opposed. Overton was seized, and when it was proposed to sue out Habeas Corpus for him, he was sent to Jersey. Ludlow's own regiment was paid off in full, and settled on lands in Wexford. Henry Cromwell was sent over to be his father's personal agent; he failed to win Zanchey, Adjutant-General Allen or Quartermaster-General Vernon, who openly opposed.

Ludlow refused to support Cromwell, so after some hesitation he was superseded in 1656. Colonel Lawrence came asking him to stay in Ireland, and he found that an order to that effect had been issued. On the ground of the illness of his father-in-law, he sailed, but was arrested at Beaumaris by an order from " the Usurper, whose jealousies increased with his Guilt "; then was released to go on parole to Cromwell. At an interview, he spoke plainly: " If Providence open a way and gives an Opportunity of appearing on behalf of the People, I cannot consent to tie my own Hand beforehand." He saw Harrison at Highgate, newly released, and they had a discussion on Harrison supporting the Fifth Monarchy against usurpers. Cromwell then decided on a Parliament, and summoned Ludlow with others to see where they stood. He taxed Cromwell with breaking the law as to Habeas Corpus; so in the end, President Henry Lawrence signed an order for his arrest. It was compromised that he might go to his father-in-law in Essex, but must keep out of Wilts. Yet in his absence he was elected again, but was excluded from sitting.

Plans were laid for declaring Cromwell King, against which Lieutenant-Colonel John Mason (a Baptist worshipping at the Chequer without Aldgate) presented a petition by most of the officers near London, which caused him to decline. He was therefore installed as Protector (the title used in the minority of Edward VI). At the first opportunity he dismissed his Parliament, then purged the neighbouring troops of many officers, including his own Major Packer and Captain Gladman.

In 1657 there was a rising of the Fifth-Monarchists, among whom was Cornet Wentworth Day (who was perhaps a Baptist). At this stage Harrison and Carew were baptized. As the Western Association was due to meet at Dorchester with Deane, Carew, Vernon, Allen, spies were sent, who reported that while there was some speech against Cromwell, yet Kiffin exerted himself to prevent any declaration in favour of the Fifth Monarchy. Family affairs about this time brought Ludlow to London, when Cromwell was alarmed and sent to ask whether he had come " with a Design to raise some disturbance in the Army." The reply was, " I should be glad of the Prolongation of his Life, if he would employ it to the Publick Good, which ought to be more dear to us than Life itself."

But Cromwell's death within a few days completely altered the situation; and the Memoirs henceforth are most valuable for following the complicated intrigues, as Ludlow presented them afterwards, having been intimately concerned at the time.

Richard Cromwell was proclaimed Protector, and it was agreed to call a Parliament on the ancient lines. Ludlow, however, took his place as duly elected in 1646, that Parliament never having ceased constitutionally; his action was challenged, but was never brought to a decision, and he continued to sit. On the question about admitting members for Scotland and Ireland, which was desired by most, but clearly novel, he argued successfully that the words " By the Law of the Land " could not possibly be used. Then he argued that the " Assembly," including members for Scotland and Ireland, was not a legal Parliament, by its own confession. The House shirked the question, which was the more awkward as there was the " Other House " as constituted by Cromwell, and when the Assembly thought of recognizing it, Ludlow showed the absurdity of the position; yet " the Cavaleerish Party who were very numerous " voted for it, hoping soon to recall the ancient House of Lords.

By this time the officers of the regiments near London were divided into three parties, nearly equal. Those well-affected towards the Commonwealth included Lieutenant-Colonel Mason; the Wallingford House group under Fleetwood had no Baptist; Richard Cromwell's party included Colonel Gough. Fleetwood approached Ludlow, who tried to fuse the second with the first. Gough's regiment mutinied and joined Fleetwood; the House restored Packer and Gladman. Fleetwood thought of recalling the Long Parliament, and Ludlow gave him a list of 160 men who had sat since 1648 (that is, The Rump); a conference took place between four officers and four Parliament men, including Ludlow; Richard Cromwell being quite ignored. Overton and Alured were with difficulty received into the service, while Ludlow accepted command of Gough's regiment. Parliament appointed a Council of State, Ludlow being the only Baptist on it; but the Wallingford House officers were loath to admit its authority; Ludlow accepted a commission signed by the Speaker, as did others. As to military appointments, Zanchey, Lawrence, Roberts and others recommended men for Ireland, including that Ludlow be Commander-in-Chief there; all this was done. But the Presbyterian party thereupon passed over Gough's regiment to another, while Alured was put in charge of the Guards to the House.

As Ludlow went through Holyhead to Ireland, he heard of a rising threatened under Sir George Booth; he sent Deane to secure Ulster, and strengthened the garrisons of North Wales. As the London Council asked for troops, he sent 1,500 in an Irish Brigade, Zanchey as chief, Axtell next in command. The rising was, however, put down by Lambert (no Baptist), who then took the lead for a new revolution, in favour of which Zanchey sent over papers. Ludlow

opposed this, and felt his place was really at Westminster, as Lawrence wrote to urge; while his confidence in Zanchey was shaken. So appointing a substitute in command within Ireland, he sailed back.

At Beaumaris he heard that the Army had again offered violence to Parliament, and decided to try for a reconciliation. At Conway he was met by Colonel Robert Barrow (a Baptist who had done good service under him, and was now a Commissioner for Irish appointments) with letters for him from Fleetwood and his party. At Chester the Irish Brigade professed fidelity to Parliament, and he had news that the London regiments had set up a Council of twenty-one, including himself and Serjeant Steel (no other Baptists). Further on, he heard that the Army in Scotland under Monk opposed this revolution.

In Town he found the Parliament sitting; it voided all the proceedings of Wallingford House, and appointed a Board of Seven as Commander-in-Chief (much as the modern Board of Admiralty), which Board included Overton and Ludlow; the London regiments were hopelessly divided. Fleetwood's party sent Barrow to Ireland to win the forces there, and dismissed Alured. Monk was highly indignant (dismissed most of the Baptists in his forces as he) remodelled his forces and marched for London. Ludlow's deputy in Dublin was greatly confused, and yielded to threats from Wallingford House that if the Irish troops would not support them their pay would be stopped; whereupon Lord-Chancellor Steel thought he could do more good in London supporting Ludlow, and sailed. The Irish Brigade under Zanchey was ordered to occupy Newcastle and resist the march of Monk; Zanchey failed to get from Monk any explanation of his intentions. Meantime the Fleet, under Vice-Admiral Lawson, grew very angry at the Wallingford House proceedings, and Barrow, "A Man of Probity," failed to conciliate him, for he demanded "the absolute Submission of the Army to the Authority of the Parliament." Ludlow went to a Council of Officers "and was much surprised to find them debating whether a New Parliament should be called, and ready to go to the Question." He told them "That at least one third part of the Officers present were against their Design; and that it seemed to me an unaccountable Presumption for two thirds of about a fourth part of the Army to undertake to put a Period to the Civil Authority." And he was strengthened by a message from the Irish Brigade that he and three others were to speak for them at such meetings. He continued efforts to bring both officers and Parliament to reason, but presently felt that with a Cavalier rising in the city, and the obstinacy of all parties, his duty lay "in Ireland, which was my peculiar Province."

Though worse news overtook him on the journey, it was still worse to find that he could not land at Dublin. He went to Duncannon, and found that Colonel Leigh, Governor of Waterford, "though being an Anabaptist"—(the only time he ever alluded to

such a topic) was beginning to side with the Grandees at Dublin. Here he was overtaken by order of Parliament to return to London; on the way he heard that he was formally accused of High Treason. He found that Fleetwood was deserted by most, that Alured was in practical control and had restored Parliament, that Monk had written asking that Parliament would send all soldiers away from London to make room for his troops to come and guard them; they reluctantly did so. Ludlow took his seat in Parliament, ignoring the presentment for treason, and with Lawson visited Monk, who so far satisfied them that Lawson said, "Since the Levite and the Priest had passed by and would not help us, he hoped we had found a Samaritan that would do it."

Ludlow was surprised at the attitude of Hutchinson, who wanted Sir Henry Vane sent into the country; and he found that the members secluded in December, 1648, by Pride's Purge, were considering resuming their seats (much as he had done in a Protectorate Parliament). The Rump then appointed five commissioners to govern the Army; and the trial of strength came over the fifth; Alured was put in, against Sir Ashley Cooper. Ludlow had no satisfaction from a call on Monk, who soon took advantage of a temporary absence of Alured and admitted all the Secluded Members. From that moment Ludlow refused to sit with men who in his opinion had been constitutionally expelled; and ostentatiously walked about Westminster Hall while the full Long Parliament was sitting. He soon heard that Walcot had been prevented reaching the Irish Brigade, though Monk gave him a passport to his estates in Ireland. A new Council showed how complete was the revolution; Ludlow refused to garrison the Tower with three regiments loyal to the Good Old Cause; Lawson gave his adhesion to the new Council and full Parliament. The last three weeks were hectic.

Alured was sent by Parliament to try and persuade Overton, Governor of Hull, to quit that place; both saw that his garrison was divided, and the Cavaliers had increased, so he resigned and left Alured in charge. An Act was passed for ordering the militia, Monk was made sole Commander-in-Chief, then the Long Parliament dissolved itself, after ordering a new election on the ancient lines.

Ludlow was chosen by the electors of the borough of Hindon, whom he had never approached. This he heard as he was travelling to his home in Wilts, which he had not seen for years. He refused an invitation to join Lambert in raising forces against Monk, but never took his seat in the "Convention calling themselves a Parliament." Monk asked such Lords as had sat till 1648 to assemble, added those who had gone with Charles to Oxford, and those whom Charles II had recently ennobled. Ludlow closed his Memoirs with the result: "The Nominal House of Commons" voted "that Charles Stuart should be proclaimed King of England."

It may be added that when the judges of Charles I were called

on to surrender, he did so, then gave sureties to stand trial; but when he found that no pardon was possible for those who justified their action, like Harrison, he withdrew to Switzerland. He took up his residence at Vevay, in a house identified by Professor Firth with 49 Rue du Lac, though a plaque is placed elsewhere to his memory by the town. He died in 1692, and the Latin inscription on the tablet erected in the church by his widow may be seen in the works of Addison. A monument more lasting than bronze is his *Memoirs,* whose first edition appeared six years later, in a form shortened by an anonymous editor. The next trip of the British and Continental Touring Club in happier times ought to arrange for a stroll from Montreux to the home of this constitutional stalwart.

Since his *Memoirs* show what a great part was played by Baptists for nine years, it may be said afresh that they were all displaced promptly from every position; persecution rapidly set in; the Test Act shut them out of Parliament, except on terms that few would accept, while the Corporation Act similarly excluded them from local administration. This narrowing of life endured till last century, and greatly dulled the very idea of public service or citizenship. Overseas, indeed, there were opportunities, as when Sir Ashley Cooper considered Captain Walcot a fit Governor for the Carolinas (how very ironical that would have been!), and Joseph Collet did prove a fine Governor at Madras. The positions attained by Baptists in America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, have shown Britons this century where some duty lies, and can now be discharged.

W. T. WHITLEY.

CAPTAIN VANCOUVER in 1792 dropped anchor in the Pacific, twenty miles west of the site where a city now bears his name. To the island close by he gave the name of his admiral, Keats. That end of the island was bought in 1926 by a company of Baptists, who presented fifteen acres to their Convention. A fine summer camp was built, where glaciers, mountains, land and sea mingle their charms. Within ten years, it was housing five hundred people for two months, and now such camps are popular in other provinces.

Spurgeon and Gladstone.

"WERE not C. H. Spurgeon in his youth, and W. E. Gladstone in his old age, the two most wonderful phenomena of the nineteenth century. Both are gone; but I shall always count it a great privilege, as well as high honour, to have lived under the influence of these good and noble men." That is an extract from an anonymous letter received by Mrs. Spurgeon soon after the death of her husband in 1892 (*Autobiography* ii, page 238). The claim which it makes for these great contemporaries is a strong one, and it would be difficult to demonstrate it to complete satisfaction. The nineteenth century was prolific in outstanding figures, and we are still too near it to form a trustworthy opinion as to the relative influence and distinction of the brilliant band whose careers adorned its annals. Thus some might be prepared to argue that William Booth was a more significant contributor to English piety than even Spurgeon. But such comparisons are as odious as they are futile. "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another in glory" (I Cor. xv. 41). It is better to content oneself by saying that the youthful Spurgeon and the aged Gladstone offered pictures of excellence so remarkable that it would not be easy to find many parallels for them in any century, let alone the nineteenth.

That can be easily substantiated by a brief reference to the facts on which it is based. Spurgeon began his ministry in London at the age of nineteen. He was already pastor of the Baptist Church at Waterbeach, near Cambridge, where his ministry had always attracted a good deal of attention. Having accepted a call to the New Park Street Chapel, Southwark, he began work in a somewhat inaccessible building seating twelve hundred people. When he first preached in it, the morning congregation totalled about two hundred. Within six months the building was full so that the famous Exeter Hall in the Strand had to be taken for one service. That too proved to be inadequate, and the bold step of holding services in the Surrey Gardens Music Hall was taken. That edifice held seven thousand, and it was at once filled and kept full. It has been stated that on some Sunday mornings Spurgeon preached to as many as ten thousand people. These figures seem almost incredible in the light of modern conditions, especially when we realise that they are associated with events which happened less than a century ago. When Spurgeon was about twenty-seven, still a young man, the Metropolitan Tabernacle was opened with accommodation for a total of between six and seven thousand. Such record would be difficult to surpass in the history of Christianity.

As for Gladstone in his old age it must suffice to say that he

was not only a national institution but an international institution. Morley's tribute may be quoted in support of that observation. "Truly was it said of Fenelon that half of him would be a great man, and would stand out more clearly as a great man than does the whole, because it would be simpler. So of Mr. Gladstone. We are dazzled by the endless versatility of his mind and interests as man of action, scholar, and controversial athlete; as legislator, administrator, leader of the people; as the strongest of his time in the main branches of executive force, strongest in persuasive force; supreme in the exacting details of national finance; master of the Parliamentary arts; yet always living in the noble visions of the moral and spiritual idealist" (*Life of Gladstone,* vol. 1, page 184). These words had reference to the statesman's impression on his contemporaries, and they will never need to be revised.

It would have been strange indeed if these two public men, both citizens of London, should not have made contact with each other. That was destined to come in the latter part of Mr. Gladstone's career, and it must have been peculiarly acceptable to Spurgeon, for he never ceased to cherish the deepest admiration and affection for one from whom he differed in so many respects. It may be suggested with all due respect that Gladstone was honoured by winning the allegiance of Spurgeon. The latter was a pulpit genius, and these are none too common, especially in view of the fact that his gifts of eloquence were linked with rare wisdom and shrewdness. Spurgeon was a judge of men, whose verdict cannot be lightly dismissed, and his affectionate reverence for Gladstone is a tribute to the national leader in which the latter took pride and pleasure as the following selections from their correspondence will show.

Strong Liberal and Gladstonian though he was, Spurgeon was no blind or uncritical follower of his political leader. A letter which he wrote to an old Cambridge friend, Mr. J. S. Watts, will serve to illustrate that (*Autobiography,* vol. 4, page 126). It was sent from his house in Nightingale Lane, Clapham, which he occupied before he removed to his famous residence in Beulah Hill, Upper Norwood.

> Nightingale Lane, June 19, '80.
>
> My Dear Friend,
>
> Like yourself I go in for religious equality, but I like things done legally, and not in Mr. Gladstone's occasional despotic way —by Royal Warrant, or by his own will. Alter the Act of Settlement if the nation chooses, but do not contravene it. Moreover, I should not allow a Mormonite to be Judge in the Divorce Court, nor a Quaker to be Commissioner of Oaths, nor an atheist to be Chaplain to the House of Commons; and for the same reason I would not have a Roman Catholic (Lord Ripon), sworn to allegiance to the Pope, to be Viceroy of India.

Mr. Gladstone said this himself when writing about the Vatican; but the way in which he eats his words, and puts on a new form as soon as he is in power, does not increase my esteem for him.

I belong to the party which knows no party. To cheapen beer, to confirm the opium curse, to keep in office the shedders of blood, and to put Papists to the front are things I never expected from Mr. Gladstone; but "cursed be the man that trusteth in man." Yet I am a Gladstonian despite all this.

The best comment is surely that saying in the Book of Proverbs: "Faithful are the wounds of a friend" (27 : 6).

It is true that there can be no profound love and respect without the possibility of enjoying a harmless joke at the expense of the object. Spurgeon overflowed with racy humour, and he relished greatly the following *jeu-d'esprit*. On one of his visits to Mentone, a certain lady who resembled him in her admiration for Mr. Gladstone, asked him to guess a word which would solve this riddle: (1) What Mr. Gladstone likes; (2) What he does not like; (3) What he would like to do; and (4) Where his enemies would like to put him. Spurgeon was unable to think of an appropriate word, and he was greatly pleased with the answers to the four questions which ran thus: (1) Reform; (2) A Tory; (3) To reform a Tory; (4) In a reformatory. He often used to repeat that witticism, and always with renewed enjoyment. In the same strain reference might be made to a snatch from Spurgeon's table talk which was always with grace, seasoned with salt. He once remarked that he had received a letter from a gentleman who had made a special study of the symbolic significance of Biblical numerals. He stated that he had succeeded in equating the number 666, the designations of the Beast in Rev. xiii. 18 (six hundred, three score and six) with the letters in the names of Mr. Gladstone and Napoleon III, but he had failed to achieve the same result with Mr. Spurgeon's name. He had written to enquire as to the reason. "Why," Spurgeon observed, "I suppose it must be because I am not a beast, and that, therefore, 666 is not the number of my name" (Ibid 3, page 359). It was no easy task to score off Spurgeon. Out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword.

Spurgeon differed wholeheartedly from Gladstone on the question of Home Rule for Ireland. Thus we find him writing in this strain from Mentone shortly after Parnell's fall. "That Irish stew! The last dose was well peppered, and served up hot! Perhaps now they are separated they will get together, they seem to have been greatly divided while they were united (Gladstone and Parnell). Poor G.O.M.! How he must feel the insults of those for whom he has forfeited everything! Yet he seems to hold on to their scheme, though he knows that it is not only dangerous, but

unattainable. I am glad I am neither of Gladstone nor of Parnell. He that wades not up to the ankles will not go in up to the loins." Spurgeon was ever a man of rare common-sense, or uncommon-sense as Coleridge called it. The last sentence is the proof.

Many of his friends were Home Rulers, and enthusiastic supporters of that policy. One of them, Rev. T. W. Medhurst, of Portsmouth, was reported in the local Press as having spoken very unkindly of Spurgeon in the course of a speech on this burning question. He wrote to Spurgeon on the subject and received this characteristic reply, full of truth and grace (Ibid iv, page 126).

> DEAR FRIEND,
>
> I did not think your language, as reported, to be disrespectful, nor even dreamed that you would be unkind. Speak as strongly as ever you like and I shall not be aggrieved. You are as free as I am, and I am free and mean to be. If others think the bill to be wise and good, I hope that they will do their best to carry it. I believe it to be a fatal stab to our common country, and I am bound to oppose it. I am as good a Liberal as any man living, and my loving admiration of Mr. Gladstone is the same as ever, hearty and deep; but this bill I conceive to be a very serious error. I claim to be under no man's dictation, and to dictate to no man. Do not fear to speak through any shrinking on my account. Both sides ought to be heard. I shall love you none the less, but all the more, for being plain-spoken.
>
> Yours very heartily,
> S. H. SPURGEON.

As far as Gladstone was concerned, there is ample evidence that he entertained the kindliest feelings towards Spurgeon. "The two prime ministers," as they were called, exchanged quite a number of letters. Mr. Gladstone invited Spurgeon to stay with him at Hawarden Castle. Unfortunately it could not be accepted, and the same must be said of repeated invitations to breakfast at Downing Street. On one occasion Spurgeon requested an interview from the Premier, and he was informed that ten minutes could be spared for him. Spurgeon arrived promptly, and made ready to go with equal precision, but Mr. Gladstone pressed him to remain, remarking that he would wish that all his visitors were as anxious to keep to time. During this conversation Spurgeon suggested to Gladstone that all servants of the State, whether in the Church, the Army, the Navy, or the Civil Service should be excluded from Parliament by law on the analogy of family life in which household servants are not invited to participate in conclaves concerned with the welfare of their employers. Spurgeon often referred to this plan which he believed to be productive of great benefit for the nation. He was

sure that, if it were championed by some leader of public opinion like Mr. Gladstone, the nation would welcome it.

Such friendly relations with a leading Dissenter represent a great change in Mr. Gladstone's attitude. He was ever a loyal and enthusiastic member of the Church of England, and in his early days his devotion seems to have outrun discretion. There is evidence of his in his first book, *The Church Considered in its Relations with the State.* It was published in 1838, the year after Queen Victoria's accession, and had such a vogue that it went through three editions. Macaulay immortalised it in his essay where he described Gladstone as the " rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories." For our present purpose it is only necessary to say that there is some foundation for Macaulay's caricature of its arguments in the famous sentence, " Why not roast Dissenters in front of slow fires? " In justice to Gladstone let it be said that anything which he may have written, capable of being so construed even in jest, was inspired only by the passionate conviction that the maintenance of pure and undefiled religion was the supreme business of the State. In his next book, *Church Principles Considered in their Results,* published in 1840, he modifies considerably the more extreme positions which he had defended in the earlier work. Twenty years after there are signs of a new appreciation of nonconformity. " Always the devoted friend of Dr. Pusey and his school, he was gradually welcomed as ally and political leader by men like Dale and Allon, the independents, and Spurgeon, the baptist (sic), on the broad ground that it was possible for all good men to hold, amid their differences about Church government, the more vital sympathies and charities of their common profession (Morley 2, page 135). These cordial relations grew from more to more. Thus we find him lecturing from the platform of the City Temple on " Preaching " at the invitation of Dr. Joseph Parker during 1877. Dr. Parker described this effort as " an anthem in prose." This cordial friendship with Spurgeon was thus one of the results of this altered attitude to Dissent.

Gladstone only heard Spurgeon preach once. He attended the evening service at the Metropolitan Tabernacle on January 8th, 1882, acompanied by his oldest son, Mr. W. H. Gladstone. A very interesting series of letters led up to that incident. Mr. Gladstone had long wished to hear Spurgeon preach, and he refers to it in this note (Ibid iv, page 183).

10 Downing Street,
Whitehall,
24 August, 1881.

My Dear Sir,

I thank you very much for your kind note and for your good words. My years make it a great object of desire to be

relieved from my present work; but I must be patient yet a little while, and must hope that I may not be utterly spoiled by the undeserved kindness heaped on me from so many quarters, and by commendations entirely beyond my deserts.

I hope the autumn will afford me an opportunity of profiting by your kind offer to meet my wishes respecting the service at the Tabernacle.

I remain, my dear sir,
Faithfully yours,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

Rev. C. H. Spurgeon.

In passing, it may be remarked that Spurgeon disliked the title "Reverend." He never used it himself. In that connection one recalls that "The Times Literary Supplement" devoted a review which occupied an entire column to the last weekly sermon by Spurgeon which was published several years ago, the conclusion of a unique series to which Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, who was then Prime Minister, referred in his address at the centenary celebrations in the Albert Hall in 1932. The review, which was very appreciative, was entitled "Mr. C. H. Spurgeon's Sermons."

A few days before Mr. Gladstone attended the Tabernacle service he wrote to Mr. Spurgeon as follows (Ibid iv, page 183):

Hawarden Castle,
Chester,
January 3, '82.

MY DEAR SIR,

Some time ago you were good enough to promise me a safe seat at one of your services; and if it consist with your convenience to do me this favour on Sunday evening next, when I expect to be in London, I shall hope to present myself at the exact time and place which you may kindly name. Should you desire to postpone your compliance with my request I shall hope for another opportunity of preferring it three or four Sundays hence.

I remain,
My dear sir,
Faithfully yours,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

That letter by itself would prove that there was some foundation for Disraeli's famous gibe at his great rival to the effect that he was "intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity."

It elicited a reply from Spurgeon which will give some indication of his intellectual greatness. It is quoted with Morley's

comment exactly as it is printed in the Life. The exact day is not mentioned, the date being given as January, 1882.

"'I feel like a boy who is to preach with his father to listen to him. I shall try not to know that you are there at all, but just preach to my poor people the simple word which has held them by their thousands these twenty-eight years. You do not know how those of us regard you, who feel it a joy to live when a premier believes in righteousness. We believe in no man's infallibility, but *it is restful to be sure of one man's integrity.*'"

"That admirable sentence marks the secret" (Morley ii, page 531).

As has already been stated, Mr. Gladstone attended the evening service in the Tabernacle on January 8th. Spurgeon preached from Mark v. 30, 31. (And Jesus, immediately knowing in Himself that virtue had gone out of Him turned Him about in the press, and said, Who touched My clothes? And His disciples said unto Him, Thou seest the multitude thronging Thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?) Gladstone visited him in his vestry both before and after the service. There was some unfavourable comment in the Press on this event, and Spurgeon wrote to Gladstone on the subject, enclosing a book of views of Westwood, his Norwood home, with its magnificent prospect of Surrey scenery. Gladstone replied in these terms (Ibid iv, page 183):

Hawarden Castle,
Chester,
January 16, '82.

DEAR MR. SPURGEON,

I was not at all surprised at what had happened, and had not the smallest disposition or cause to suspect you. My life is passed in a glass bee-hive; with this particularity, that I fear many see in it what is not there, by which I am unjustly a gainer.

I thank you very much for the interesting book of photographs which you have been so good as to send, with an inscription I am very far from deserving. I wish I had a better return to make than the enclosed, but these are the best I can lay my hands on.

When you were so good as to see me before and after your service I felt ashamed of speaking to you lest I should increase your fatigue, but before long I hope to find a better opportunity. In the meantime I remain,

With sincere respect,
Faithfully yours,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

Spurgeon's sympathy for Gladstone in the attacks to which he

was subjected, as well as in his labours more abundant, also appear in these two extracts from Morley (ii, page 272). Under date July 15th, 1869, Gladstone writes in his diary: " 15—This day I received from a Roman Catholic bishop the assurance that he offered mass, and that many pray for me; and from Mr. Spurgeon (as often from others) an assurance of the prayers of the nonconformists. I think in these and other prayers lies the secret of the strength of body which has been given me in unusual measure during this very trying year." The other passage runs as follows: " Here is Mr. Spurgeon, the most popular and effective of the nonconforming preachers and workers of the time, writing:

" I feel ready to weep when you are treated with so much contumely by your opponent in your former struggle; and yet I rejoice that you were educating this nation to believe in conscience and truth . . . I wish I could brush away the gadflies, but I suppose by this time you have been stung so often that the system has become invulnerable . . . You are loved by hosts of us as intensely as you are hated by certain of this savage party " (ii, page 530).

Spurgeon's last illness evoked an exchange of letters which prove that these cordial relations increased rather than lessened with the passing years. Gladstone wrote to Mrs. Spurgeon, expressing his deep sympathy in these terms. The letter was sent from the house of Mr. Colman, Gladstone's friend, at Lowestoft.

Corton,
Lowestoft,
July 16, 1891.

MY DEAR MADAM,

In my own house, darkened at the present time, I have read with sad interest the daily accounts of Mr. Spurgeon's illness; and I cannot help conveying to you the earnest assurance of my sympathy with you and with him, and of my cordial admiration, not only of his splendid powers, but still more of his devoted and unfailing character. May I humbly commend you and him, in all contingencies, to the infinite stores of the Divine love and mercy, and subscribe myself,

My dear madam,
Faithfully yours,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

The bereavement to which this letter refers was the death of his oldest son, W. H. Gladstone, which had taken place suddenly on July 8th.

This letter reached Mrs. Spurgeon during one of the brief intervals between long periods of delirium which were such a distressing feature of his illness. It was read to Spurgeon, and he was greatly pleased. To Mrs. Spurgeon's reply, which may be quoted

in full as savouring so strongly and sweetly of the great preacher's spirit, he added a postscript. (Barnes and Ray, *Spurgeon, The People's Preacher,* page 307).

Westwood,
Upper Norwood,
July 18th, 1891.

DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,

Your words of sympathy have a special significance and tenderness, coming from one who has just passed through the deep waters which seem now to threaten me. I thank you warmly for your expression of regard for my beloved husband, and with all my heart I pray that the consolations of God may abound towards you even as they do to me. Although we cannot yet consider the patient out of danger, the doctors have to-day issued a somewhat more hopeful bulletin. I feel it an honour to say that I shall evermore be your grateful friend.

S. SPURGEON.

P.S.—Yours is a word of love such as those only write who have been into the King's country, and have seen much of His face. My heart's love to you.

C. H. S.

It is worthy of mention as illustrating the exalted character of the place which Spurgeon had obtained in the national life that, amongst those who made enquiries for him in his closing days, there were the Prince of Wales, who afterwards became Edward VII, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Chief Rabbi. The prince of Victorian preachers died at Mentone on January 31st, 1892, at the age of fifty-seven. Gladstone survived him until 1898, when he passed away on May 19th in his eighty-eighth year. The tribute paid by Dr. Thomas Guthrie, the famous Edinburgh preacher and philanthropist, to another distinguished Presbyterian, Dr. Thomas Chalmers, applies with equal force and felicity to both Spurgeon and Gladstone. Of Chalmers Dr. Guthrie wrote that he was like a forest giant, whose height and dimensions are only appreciated when it has been felled. Surely the same can be said of Spurgeon and Gladstone, these mighty trees planted by rivers of water, and bringing forth their fruit in their season. They were great men in every sense of the word, and pre-eminently, great men of God. It is pleasant to recall the fact that, though there was a great gulf fixed between them, it was not found to be impassable by any manner of means.

H. S. CURR.

Colchester and the Missionary Movement.

IN the records of the launching of the Baptist Missionary Society attention has been mainly concentrated on the churches of the Midlands and the North and West of England, but East Anglia ought not to be left out of the picture. The fact that Andrew Fuller began his ministry in East Anglia would naturally suggest that, when he threw his influence into the missionary enterprise, his appeals would not be lacking in response in that part of the country. During his Soham pastorate he made many contacts with neighbouring churches and their ministers. In Pearce Carey's *Life of William Carey* there is an extract from a letter written by Fuller to "his friend Steevens of Colchester." Thomas Steevens was pastor of the Colchester church from 1774 to 1802 and, during his ministry, he not only formed an Essex Baptist Association but extended the activities of the Colchester Baptists into the adjoining county of Suffolk. There is ample evidence of the zeal of Colchester Baptists for Home Missions, and three years after starting work at Langham, on the Essex-Suffolk border, a church at Stoke Green, Ipswich, was formed and became the mother church of the Baptist churches in that town. All these three churches contributed to the B.M.S. in the first year of the Society's existence. The Colchester church gave £9 1s. 0d. Langham £8 8s. 0d. and Ipswich £2 12s. 6d. The books of the Ipswich church were searched by the present secretary at my request, but they contain no reference to missionary activity. The Langham church is no longer in existence, but the minute books, now in my possession, make no mention of work for the Society in the earliest days. Even the Colchester church books contain very little information on the subject. It appears rather strange, as one peruses the pages of these old Minute books, that so much is recorded regarding what now seem trivial events, while the really big things receive so little notice. There are, however, two entries in the Colchester book which can be quoted. The first is as follows: "Lord's Day, May 17, 1795. In the afternoon we made a collection on behalf of the Baptist Mission to the Heathen, this was the second collection made for the same purpose." How much that second collection amounted to is not recorded. The second note is fuller and of greater importance: "Monday evening, December 7, 1795. Our first meeting for prayer was held for the success of the Missionaries who are gone or going to preach the gospel among the Heathen. A like service had been attended to at Mr. Hobbs' Meeting House [i.e. the Lion Walk Congregational Church], the first Monday in November. It is to be carried on alternatively here and there on the first Monday in

the calendar month." This entry is followed by a Note: "N.B. The Baptist Missionary Society (to which we may be said to belong) have now two missionaries in the East Indies and two are now on their voyage to Africa. The other, much larger Society [i.e. the L.M.S. founded in 1795], composed of Christians of almost all names in our Island, is about to send several to the South Sea Islands. This Society has raised a very great sum of money for the support of their undertakings. Mr. Hobbs carried to London more than £225 from Colchester—one gentleman gave £100 of it himself. We have had two collections for the Baptist Society and some of our friends did what they could, but the enlargement of our Meeting House prevented our doing great things."

It is interesting to learn that the united missionary prayer meeting in which the Baptists and Congregationalists united was carried on without a break for forty-three years. The two churches have been near neighbours since the seventeenth century, and a very friendly spirit has always prevailed between them. The Congregationalists celebrate their 300th anniversary this year and have a slightly longer history than the present Baptist church, which dates from 1689. But there were Baptists in the town some fifty years earlier, though unfortunately the records are extremely scanty.

It is a matter for regret that after 1795 there is no further record of missionary activity in the Eld Lane books until 1812 when a separate book reveals how calamity became the inspiration of renewed enthusiasm. This book bears the following inscription on the first page, beautifully penned with artistic flourishes, "An account of the Formation, together with the transactions of the Colchester Auxiliary Baptist Missionary Society, established 20th December, 1812." The next page relates the circumstances which prompted the action of the church: "When intelligence relative to the destruction of the Printing Office, etc. by fire belonging to the Baptist Missionaries at Serampore arrived, the Ministers of that connection laboured very assiduously to repair the loss, and this they did by soliciting the liberality of all Christians, and the Friends of Christianity residing at Colchester were not backward in giving their assistance and support. The propriety of forming an Auxiliary Society at that time was suggested, and after some deliberation several friends convened in the vestry of the Baptist Meeting House on 20th December, 1812, for the purpose of forming such a Society, when the following Resolutions and Rules were unanimously passed and adopted—1. That we do heartily approve of the objects and conduct of the Baptist Missionary Society. 2. That this Society be called 'The Colchester Auxiliary Baptist Missionary Society.' 3 and 4 deal with appoint-

ment of Officers and Committee. 5. That a subscription of one shilling per quarter constitute a member. 6. Refers to meetings of Committee. 7. That a list of subscribers be kept by the Secretary who shall report at the different meetings the names of those subscribers who may be in arrear."

The first meeting of the Society was held on "Ladyday, 1813," when it was reported that seventy-five subscribers had been enrolled and the first quarter's contributions were £5 4s. 1d. For some reason not recorded there was soon a deplorable falling off of subscribers, and by 1816 only twenty-three names remained on the books. Under July 14th of that year an entry reads, "In consequence of many subscribers having declined continuing members of this Society and its being feared that a greater falling off would take place unless some immediate measures were adopted to prevent it, Miss Sarah Patmore, Miss Eliz. Francis and Miss Hester Francis generously offered their services to raise penney per week subscriptions and upwards in order to assist the Society, which proposal was received with many thanks." As a result of this new effort the number of subscribers rose to 124. But the Society still had its ups and downs, and by 1821 there had been a further decline. For eight years there is a gap in the record which may indicate that during that period there was nothing done. But in 1829 there was a revival of interest, and subscriptions for that year totalled £30 15s. 3d. In 1832 a fresh start was made with a rise to £77 14s. 9d. in subscriptions. The Auxiliary was again remodelled in 1839, and on the 3rd of March in that year Anniversary sermons were preached by the Rev. Eustace Carey. That is the final entry in the book, but there has been preserved a receipt signed by Joseph Angus dated July 5th, 1849, from which it may be assumed the Society continued to flourish.

A fact which may partially account for the difficulty in maintaining the interest of the Colchester Auxiliary is that about the time of its formation a split occurred in the Eld Lane Church which resulted in the founding of a Strict and Particular Baptist Church which still meets at St. John's Green. This church does not come into the story of the B.M.S., but it is interesting to note that the missionary spirit was carried into the new cause. This is seen in an event which took place early in 1835. A son of the pastor, Dowling by name, had gone on a business trip to Van Dieman's Land and, writing home to his father, he depicted the awful conditions prevailing in the convict settlements on the Island. As a result of that letter the minister resigned the pastorate at St. John's Green, went to Van Dieman's Land, and founded churches in Hobart and Launceston from which the nineteen Baptist churches in Tasmania had their origin.

J. E. Compton.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(For the year ended 31st December, 1941).

INCOME.	£	s.	d.
Subscriptions	114	1	8
Sale of Publications	2	8	0
Post Office Interest	4	12	6
	£121	2	2

EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
Deficit from 1940	5	3	1
Baptist Quarterly, four issues	110	17	9
Stationery, Postages, etc.	1	18	0
Friends' Historical Society		10	0
Balance in hand	2	13	4
	£121	2	2

RESERVE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Life Subscriptions	60	10	0
General Reserve	50	0	0
	£110	10	0

A. H. CALDER, *Treasurer.*

Reviews.

A Plain Man's Life of Christ, by A. D. Martin. (George Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Martin was a Congregational Minister, who died recently, and the present book is a posthumous publication. It is introduced and commended by Professor Sydney Cave, and deservedly so. For the book is attractively and suggestively written, and many " a plain man " should find it both interesting and instructive.

The book does not, of course, profess to deal with everything recorded about Jesus in the Gospels. Mr. Martin takes as his ruling principle some words by F. S. Oliver. " The aim of the historian is to write a narrative which shall reduce a complicated confusion to its simplest elements, and he wisely discards all that is not essential for his purpose." The difficulty in this case is that the events of the Saviour's life are so well known that the process of omission must inevitably raise questions in the mind—Why is this or that left out, and why, as against the things left out, are some things kept in? Probably the size of the book has something to say in the selection of the material, and one must either write something on a very big scale, or make up his mind to leave out much he would like to discuss.

Mr. Martin does not profess to write for scholars, though it is quite evident that he knows his way about. One of the interesting points he makes in this connection is that he has got little help from Form-Criticism, the reason being that he distrusts the merely conjectural where it is unsupported by adequate evidence. It is rather surprising, therefore, that he commits himself to some rather loose statements. He thinks, for instance, that Jesus was older than thirty, and, while he does not entirely endorse it, he seems to favour the view expressed in the Fourth Gospel (ix. 57) that He passed for something under fifty. He suggests that Jesus was more than a carpenter by trade; in one place he says He was " a stonemason," and, at some time after His Baptism, Jesus, he declares, " built a home for His mother at Capernaum." He is greatly attracted by Burney's theory of poetic forms behind the discourses of Jesus, and he makes much of the poetry in the soul of Jesus. We know what this means, but Mr. Martin quotes passages from Havelock Ellis and Alice Meynell about the Rhythm of Life that make one ask whether the prose fact of the Gospel is not capable of being dissolved into spiritual beauty. The parable of the Sheep and the Goats he definitely calls a " poem," of " the same class of writings as the Myths of Plato." Symbolic it certainly is, but surely there is definite fact in it too. Of the Last Supper he says surprisingly, " there is no indication that Jesus intended His followers to repeat His symbolic acts." Apart from definite statements in the New

Testament, the practice of the early Church, one would have thought, gave unmistakable "indication."

Points like these need to be watched in any life of Jesus, but it would be wrong to overstress them in Mr. Martin's case. The book as a whole is both interesting and helpful, and even in retelling a familiar Gospel incident Mr. Martin reveals a power of his own. For instance, he makes the Synagogue a real place by describing a typical service (which, curiously enough, is not often done in a life of Jesus) and his account of the anointing of the feet of Jesus by the woman that was a sinner makes the scene live before us. The style is quiet and Wordsworthian in flavour, and Mr. Martin was obviously a man of beautiful spirit. His book makes the reader feel not only wiser but better, and that in a life of Jesus is perhaps the thing that matters most.

HENRY COOK.

The Historic Mission of Jesus, by C. J. Cadoux. (Lutterworth Press, 21s. net.)

In this substantial and important book Dr. Cadoux marshals the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels on the subject of the eschatological teaching of Jesus, i.e. His teaching on the Kingdom of God and its consummation, and His own relation to it. Each chapter is preceded by a series of propositions, which the evidence that follows seeks to establish, and the four main sections of the work are each concluded with a brief summary of the results to which they have led.

In his introduction the author reviews briefly some modern trends in the study of the Gospels. Dr. Cadoux is himself an unrepentant liberal, but he is sadly conscious that in our day the tide is running against liberalism. He recalls how Schweitzer was hailed by those who disliked liberalism, and who did not realise that the deluded visionary whom Schweitzer offered was farther from the Christ of tradition than is the Jesus of liberalism. He recalls how Form-Criticism, despite its effort to get behind the Gospels, does not lead to the Jesus of history, and in the hands of the more extreme of its devotees reaches completely negative positions. He recalls how Barthianism, with its emphasis on the divine transcendence, has discounted reason, and in the hands of some of its sympathisers has combined a transcendental Christology with a sceptical Form-Criticism, and thus cut the thread that links the Jesus of history to the Christ of faith.

Dr. Cadoux confesses that the liberalism to which he once subscribed was inadequate, since it sought to father its own ideas on Jesus. "I found the Master's word free from all admixture of human error," he says, "and fully consonant at every point with modern scientific and historical knowledge" (page 19). To-day, however, he finds it unreasonable to expect that Jesus should attain

to our level. "I am more prepared than I was to find that we cannot to-day just take over for ourselves as it stands the whole of the teaching He is recorded and may be believed to have given" (page 19). Nor will he exclude the spiritual from the sphere in which we may surpass Christ. "Of those Christians who see that the intellectual infallibility of Jesus cannot be maintained, many try to guard themselves by urging that the limitations of his knowledge affected only those matters which are of no moral or religious importance. The supposition is arbitrary" (page 343). Nevertheless, Dr. Cadoux recognises that "Jesus knows Himself"—and the choice of words implies that Dr. Cadoux allows the claim—"to be in closest filial intimacy with God as His Father, so that, while all righteous men are sons of God, He occupies a special place of His own as 'the Son' over against 'the Father' . . . He assumed an authority over men superior to that of any other authority they knew" (page 103).

Critically the author adopts an attitude towards the Gospel text which is "conservative and trustful" compared with that of the Form-Critics. He does not draw on the Fourth Gospel, which he places on a wholly different level of historical reliability. For the sources of the Synoptic Gospels he follows the hypothesis of Streeter. He appends to his introduction a list of these sources, and throughout the body of the work indicates by symbols to which of the sources the important passages he cites belong. On eschatology, he rejects alike the exaggerated views of the place of eschatology in the thought of Jesus, held by Schweitzer, and the complete rejection of the eschatological element as an accretion, as some liberals have held. He holds that "in the case of Jesus, eschatological beliefs were strictly secondary to the practical situations He had to face and the personal human realities with which He had to deal" (page 17).

That the work is based on the most thorough and exact scholarship is guaranteed by the name of the author. In his introduction he apologises for the incompleteness of his documentation, and for his failure to attain the impossible goal of omniscience in the vast field of the literature of the subject. The reader will only be aware of the amazing range of Dr. Cadoux' reading, and grateful for the fullness of the documentation. Few can have come nearer to a complete acquaintance with significant writing on the subject. Occasionally he lapses into pedantry, as when he writes Kapharnaum and Arimathaia, but his reason for writing Khorazin is not obvious. Happily we are spared similar forms in other cases, and find the familiar Galilee and Tyre.

Occasionally the author falls somewhat below his usual standard of logic. Thus, on page 35, he says that "the reference to Joseph and Mary as Jesus' 'parents' (Luke ii. 27, 41; cf. 33), if not Mary's allusion to Joseph as 'thy father' (ii. 48), indicate that it (i.e. the story of Jesus in the Temple at the age of twelve) ante-dated Luke's acceptance of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth." If it is admitted

that Joseph had married Mary, then it would be natural to refer to them as the parents, whether Mary's child was his or not; and if Mary did not speak of Joseph to her twelve-year old son as 'thy father,' it is hard to suppose how she might have spoken of him. For there is no dispute that Jesus was brought up as the child of Joseph. These passages can hardly be used for this purpose, therefore.

Dr. Cadoux lays much stress on the earlier expectation of Jesus that He would be accepted by his fellow-countrymen, and on His effort to avoid a clash with Rome. He believed Himself to be the Messiah, but His conception of the Messiahship was not that of the common expectation, and so He made no public claim to it until the end of His life. In the eschatological passages Dr. Cadoux finds the term "Son of Man" to stand primarily for the saved and saving Remnant of Israel, with Jesus Himself as its head. As so frequently in the Old Testament, the thought can pass freely from the community to the individual that represents it, and in this use the term "Son of Man" is enriched by elements drawn from the Suffering Servant passages. Dr. Cadoux thinks that at the Temptation Jesus repudiated force as the means of establishing the Kingdom, but he thinks that He still cherished the hope of ruling a political kingdom on earth.

That the eschatological element had a real place in His thinking is sufficiently attested by His use of the concepts of the Messiah and the Son of Man, both of which had eschatological associations, though different ones. But the linking of these with one another, and both with the concept of the Suffering Servant, brought mutual modification, so that just as He thought of the office of the Messiah differently from others, so His thought of the significance of the other terms may have differed from the common expectation. We are told that His disciples did not always understand Him, but were sometimes blinded by their pre-conceptions. May this not be true? May not their admitted expectation of a political kingdom be as untrue to His purpose as the common reliance on the instrument of force was alien to His method? May not He who so profoundly modified the thought of the Messiah have also modified the concept of the Kingdom, so that He was not thinking of a political kingdom, in the sense of the apocalyptic expectations? May it not be that when the Fourth Gospel represents our Lord as saying "My kingdom is not of this world" it was not going beyond Him, but growing into His thought. This is not to affirm, of course, that His Kingdom is not political, in the sense that it has no interest in the corporate affairs of men. It is but to affirm that He aimed to transform, rather than to overthrow, existing kingdoms, and that He never cherished the deluded hope that He would replace Cæsar on a comparable throne.

Dr. Cadoux does not suppose that he will always carry his

readers with him. Many will go much of the way with him, and all may learn much from him. To the reviewer it would seem that he reduces the stature of Jesus to such a point that His consciousness of His relation with God involves a measure of delusion that threatens its validity. Yet he is grateful for the frank sincerity of this book, and its clear presentation of a systematic account of the teaching of Jesus, to which he will often turn with profit.

H. H. ROWLEY.

The Relevance of the Bible, by H. H. Rowley, M.A., D.D., B.Litt. (James Clarke, 6s.)

Dr. Rowley, Professor of Semitic Languages and Vice-Principal at the Bangor University College, is a scholar of wide reputation of whom Baptists may well be proud. He has written an interesting and valuable handbook to the Bible which is commendable for many reasons, not least because its aim is to stress "the importance of an attitude of mind to the Bible that is both scholarly and spiritual." In that aim Dr. Rowley succeeds, not merely by expounding but by demonstrating. On the one hand he demolishes the position of verbal inspirationists, who leave their intelligence in the cupboard when they take out the Scriptures, and that of the "students of prophecy," who regard the Bible as a kind of horoscope while, on the other hand, he shows the profitless inadequacy of mere barren scientific study. Dr. Rowley leads the reader along the sane and spiritually enriching path that lies well between credulity and scepticism.

Although the author states that his purpose is not to write a text-book of Biblical Theology, the "plain man" for whom the book is written will learn substantially from these pages about the Biblical teaching concerning God, Christ, Revelation, Sin and other kindred themes. The plain man would doubtless, however, have appreciated some explanation as to who Hegel, Marcion and others were and what they taught.

It is not unnatural, and it by no means lessens the value of the Book, that Dr. Rowley's main emphasis falls on the Old Testament, and the reader will be grateful to him for having brought out the Gospel which that part of the Bible contains. About "experience" the author has much to say, and he regards the experience of individuals as the key to understanding the Old Testament and, in preference to theological speculation, as the best approach to the Cross.

Well-written as this book is on the whole, there are occasionally some very awkwardly phrased sentences, while one need not be pedantic to be offended by Dr. Rowley's annoying habit of beginning so many sentences with "and," "for" and "nor," and

overworking the word "indeed." We find it hard to forgive him for the terrible pun on p. 54.

This book will be welcomed not only for its own excellence, but because Dr. Rowley emphasises that the Bible is not a scientific, historical or literary work, but in truth the vehicle of the Word of God to our souls.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Achievement, A Short History of the Baptist Missionary Society, 1792-1942, by F. Townley Lord. (The Carey Press, 2s. 6d.)

This book is well named for it records great achievements. It has been specially written by Dr. Lord at the request of the Society, and he has given himself to the task with thoroughness. It is in popular style and enriched with illustrations, but it is more than a popular account of 150 years. Here are the facts: dates and names abound, and the various fields and aspects of the Society's work all receive consideration. Historically reliable; every minister and deacon and missionary worker should possess a copy—and read and re-read this thrilling story.

An Enquiry into Meaning and Truth, by Bertrand Russell. (George Allen and Unwin, 12s. 6d. net.)

A book like this—The William James Lectures for 1940, delivered at Harvard University—must inevitably be "caviare to the general", since it deals with the theory of knowledge, one of the most difficult of philosophical subjects. In parts, even the expert must feel that he gropes his way. But the book provides a useful mental discipline, even when one dissents from the "behaviourist" view on which it largely rests. Written with Bertrand Russell's brilliance, it can be commended to those who want to stretch the muscles of their mind.