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

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

Editorial Notes.

WE much regret the late appearance of this issue, particularly as we had hoped that we could now become again in fact, as well as name, a quarterly. The fuel crisis and the difficulties of the last few months have, however, caused unavoidable delays. We offer our sympathies to our printers, Messrs. Rush and Warwick, of Bedford, and take this opportunity of thanking them for their faithful and efficient service throughout the war years and the present austere aftermath.

* * * * *

The death on February 1st, in his seventy-seventh year, of Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke removes one of the best known Baptists of his generation and one who by his practical achievements engraved his name deeply and ineradicably into our modern history. When the Baptist World Alliance was founded, Newton Marshall and Rushbrooke were J. H. Shakespeare's invaluable lieutenants. They were then young men who had both studied in Germany, and who were full of enthusiasm for the cause of international peace and Christian fellowship. Newton Marshall's lamented death—a very severe blow to the denomination in more directions than one—and the breakdown in health of the gallant C. T. Byford left Rushbrooke almost alone in our ranks so far as intimate knowledge of the Continent was concerned. But when he was appointed Baptist Commissioner for Europe in 1920, few can have foreseen the place he would occupy a quarter of a century later in the regard of his fellow Baptists, of Christians of other communions, and of officials in chancelleries and foreign offices in many different lands. His standing was the result of unremitting, self-sacrificing labour and of courage, wisdom and simple friendliness. He believed in our Baptist witness, he loved his fellowmen and he was prepared for hard work. We shall hope in a future issue to publish an account of his life. We also hope that the preparation of an adequate biography will at once be put in hand. Dr. Rushbrooke was a frequent contributor to the *Quarterly*, and was also the ever ready friend and helper of those who have been its editors.

* * * * *

During the Congress at Copenhagen there is to be a meeting of those interested in Baptist history. It is high time that closer links were forged between those studying our witness and tradition

in different parts of the world. A great deal of important work has been done recently in the United States, first, by those studying Puritan and Separatist origins (among whom Professors Perry Miller, William Haller and M. M. Knappen stand supreme) secondly by Mennonite historians, and thirdly by those like Professor Stiansen, of Chicago, who belong to groups of Baptists in America who come of Continental stock. Their books are all too little known on this side of the Atlantic. But, in addition, there are now valuable contributions to Baptist history coming from Germany and the Scandinavian lands. Dr. Luckey's scholarly book on Julius Köbner was on sale at the World Congress in Atlanta. There is now available another valuable study of Köbner, this time in Swedish and by Dr. K. A. Modén (*En Baptismens Banbrytare,* Stockholm, 1946). Mention of Swedish recalls the fact that Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* has recently been translated into that language by Eric Wärenstam, a Baptist journalist with a number of useful books to his credit. It is to be hoped that the World Alliance will be able to work out adequate channels for publicity and co-operation in this field. There are a number of English books with ought to be circulated in other lands. We should not leave it to the Roman Catholics to use what they do not hesitate to call " the apostolate of the Press."

* * * * *

There have recently been a number of changes in the officers of the Baptist Historical Society. They were duly recorded on the cover of our last issue, but occured too late for comment. Dr. W. T. Whitley becomes president. He is now the honoured *doyen* of Baptist scholars, known and honoured throughout the world. Also, he was the founder of the Society We rejoice that after his long stay in hospital he is now at home again and still able to take a deep interest in our work. To the vice-presidency three College Principals have been appointed, Dr. Dakin, Dr. Evans and Dr. Underwood, all of whom have rendered important services to the Society and the cause for which it stands. Mr. Seymour J. Price has also been appointed a vice-president. His services during many years as secretary of the Baptist Historical Society and editor of the *Quarterly* are well known to our readers, and are among the most important of the many tasks he has undertaken for the denomination. It is good to know that he hopes to be able to give more time to work on Baptist history and kindred topics than has been possible during recent busy years. Dr. E. J. Tongue succeeds the Rev. F. E. Robinson as librarian. We are deeply grateful to the latter for taking responsibility during many years for the care of the Society's books housed in Bristol College. As secretary, the Rev. Graham W. Hughes has been appointed,

and we look forward with confidence to what his youth, knowledge and enthusiasm will be able to accomplish. It is now nearly forty years since the Society was formed. It has not often secured great publicity, but the discerning will be under no doubt how much is owed to the publications which it has sponsored, the research it has encouraged and the help it has been able to render to students of history in all parts of the world. We look forward in the years to come to considerable extension of its activities.

* * * * *

In the *Baptist Quarterly*, Volume xi, pp. 337f., we printed an important article by the late Dr. Mott Harrison on *The Portraiture of John Bunyan*. In the course of the article, Dr. Harrison referred to the oil painting of Bunyan which is in the possession of Regent's Park College, Oxford. It was presented to the College in 1863 by John Fenwick, Esq., a Newcastle solicitor. There has recently come to light a note by Dr. Angus giving the history of the picture as told to him by Mr. Fenwick. It is as follows :—

"This picture was purchased by Mr. Gee Phillips of a descendant of Bunyan. From Mr. Phillips it came into the possession of Mr. William Sharp, the celebrated engraver, who engraved it. From him it came into the possession of Messrs. Hurst, Robinson and Co., Booksellers in Cheapside, from whom it came into the possession of the late James Richardson, Esq., the Clerk of the Peace for Leeds, from whom I obtained it. Only the head of the portrait seems to be finished, and the painting is supposed to be the work of Mr. Walker, the celebrated portrait painter of the time of the Commonwealth."

This provides further important evidence in authentication of the portrait.

* * * * *

In a recent letter to the editor the Rev. C. B. Whyatt emphasizes again the importance of the proper preservation of Baptist records, and in particular, church minute books. We would again urge upon individuals who may possess old Baptist documents and books that they should get in touch either with the Baptist Historical Society or with the nearest Baptist College before either disposing of or destroying such material. We would also suggest to church officers the desirability of their depositing church books which date from the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries with Baptist College libraries. This should be done by resolution of the church, and a proper note should be made in the current church books of where the minute books are now to be

found. It is to be feared that a good deal of important historical material has been lost of recent years for want of due care.

* * * * *

What has been here said about Church records applies also to those of Associations. Dr. Thomas Richards, M.A., of University College of North Wales, Bangor, one of the outstanding Free Church historians of his generation, has recently published a very valuable and attractive booklet for the Monmouthshire Baptist Association, based upon the Circular Letters, 1832-1945. The Monmouthshire Association is not one of the oldest, but it has proved by no means easy to get together a complete set of the Letters, and we gather that even now no copy of that for 1843 has been discovered. The commissioning of Dr. Richards' brochure and its publication with portraits of eight Welsh preachers (among which there stands out the truly noble head of Robert Ellis, Cynddelw) are due to the characteristic generosity of Mr. W. Nefydd Lewis, of Aberclydach, Gilwern. Copies may be had from him for one shilling, post free, and any profits will be devoted to the Reconstruction Fund of the Baptist Union of Wales, and the New Home Work Fund of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

Stars in Still Waters, by S. P. Goodge. (Kingsgate Press, 5s.)

A lot of people in our churches, who would like to read profitably on Christian themes, find themselves without time or energy for either solid or sustained reading. This book is one such people would greatly appreciate. Ministers will find in it many suggestions for short talks of a homely nature. In his forty "Random Reflections on Things Visible and Invisible" (the subtitle) the author has brought together a good deal of sound, practical Christianity in genial and interesting fashion. His book will do a lot of good of a kind I think he would like it to do.

G. W. Rusling.

The Origins of Prophecy.

"HEBREW prophecy," says Skinner (*Prophecy and Religion*), "has roots and antecedents in widely diffused primitive ideas and customs which are found everywhere among peoples in the early stages of civilization." Although the great "writing prophets" of Israel seem far removed from primitive ideas and superstitious customs, yet there can be no doubt that, high and noble as the words of Amos and Isaiah are, they nevertheless stand in a very real sense in direct succession to primitive ideas. The unique thing about Hebrew prophecy is not the root from which it sprang, but rather in the way in which it developed. Generally speaking, the desire to find out and to foretell the future grows less respectable as civilization advances and knowledge increases. All the world knows the story of the two Roman augurs who met one another in the Forum and greeted one another with a sly wink! Their contemporaries knew what value was to be placed upon their "revelations." Among the Hebrews, however, prophecy remained a living force; this is ascribed by Skinner to its "close and permanent association with religion." In its development Hebrew prophecy was unique, but in its origins it is linked with many primitive ideas and conceptions.

The ancient world had its methods of ascertaining knowledge of future events, and these methods were practised by specialists.

Firstly, there was the magician. His task was to discover knowledge about the future by determining the course that future events would take. Working very largely on the principle that future events were undetermined, he set out, by means of his art, both black and white, to determine them. As a rule he worked on the imitative plan; *i.e.* he mimicked that which he desired to come to pass, in the sure and certain faith that his miming would actually produce the desired result. The most notable example of "white magic" is the existence in many parts of the world, of a class of rain-makers, who, by simulating the falling of rain, caused rain to fall. Examples of "black magic" abound. The "guy" was pierced with knives, in the faith that the original would feel the pain and die. The magician attempted to get a knowledge of the future by determining it.

Secondly, there was the diviner. He apparently worked on the principle that the future was determined, and he set out to read

the signs and interpret them correctly. Among the Babylonians, the diviner read the marks on the liver of the sacred animal, and by means of a system of "clues" was able to foretell the future. Among the Arabs, there were people who were able to foretell the future from almost any object upon which the eye might rest. Divination does not seem to be totally inconsistent with theism. Trial by ordeal is really a form of divination in which it would be possible for the participants to believe that God would see that the innocent escaped. In exactly the same way the early Hebrew was convinced that Yahweh controlled the sacred lot. This persists even into the New Testament. The account of the appointment of Matthias as one of the Twelve in Acts. i. 15-26 is instructive on the point. The diviner, in short, proceeded from the known to the unknown; in the known he read the signs that pointed him to the unknown, and there seems to be no reason to regard this method as incompatible with theism.

Thirdly, there was the ecstatic. He was a man who saw visions and dreamed dreams. He gave himself up to his god, and in a passive state of god-possession, the deity spoke through him. He was characterised by wild dances and frenzies, by fits of stupor, by trances, and often by periods when his speech forsook him. Being literally "inspired" by his god, his god could give knowledge of the future through his passivity. This type of prophecy is certainly not incompatible with a theistic faith. We find many instances of it in the OT, *e.g.*, "The spirit of Yahweh rushed upon Saul . . ." (I. Sam. x. 10.)

From these observations on the nature of prophecy generally, can we learn anything of the origins of Hebrew prophecy?

Without discussing for the moment the question of method, it seems clear enough that the Old Testament prophets had this in common with these three groups, that they claimed to be able to foretell the future. While it is perfectly true that the word "prophet" will bear the meaning "forth-teller" as well as "fore-teller," it is also true that the Old Testament prophets were more than mere preachers. Most certainly this is true of the prophets of the early kingdom, and it is also true of the later "writing prophets." Jeremiah, who in many ways stands at the summit of Hebrew prophecy, is prepared to accept the test of his time—that a true prophet can be discerned by whether or not his predictions of the future come to pass.

Of these fore-telling prophets we have two classes specifically mentioned in the Old Testament. (i) The *ro'eh* or Seer, such as Samuel is represented to be in I. Sam. ix. I-x. 16. He seems to be very like the diviner whom we meet in primitive society, but with this important difference, that his predictions come direct from his association with Yahweh. He is spoken of as *'ish*

Yahwĕh and is in direct contact with Him. All through the narrative we are conscious that Samuel is in a very real sense dependent upon Yahweh for his decisions. That there also existed the more "automatic" kind of diviner whose activities were scorned by later editors of the Old Testament, appears from the way in which glossators have confused the references to the Urim and Thummim. But even in this connection, the LXX text of I. Sam. xiv. 41[1] is interesting as showing that the person in control of the sacred lot was also conscious that the lot was under control of Yahweh. (ii) The *n^{e}bhî'îm* usually rendered "prophets" in the English A. V. These were the ecstatics, but again, their ecstasies were directly inspired by Yahweh; they were possessed by Him. Sometimes, as in the case of Elisha before Jehoshaphat (ii. Ki. iii. 15), the ecstasy was artificially produced, here by music, but usually no such means are recorded. The characteristics of the true ecstatic are to be seen however, in the wild dances and a-rational actions of many of these prophets.

In I. Sam. ix. 9 we have an important note about these two classes of prophet, which was apparently inserted from the margin: "He that is now called a prophet *(nabhî)* was beforetime called a Seer (*rō'ĕh*)." This must mean that at the time of this marginal comment, the seer properly so called, had ceased to function, and that the fore-telling of the future which had been his proper duty was now performed by the ecstatic. It is of interest to note that where the ecstatics are spoken of in the early kingdom when the seer was also operating, there seems to be no reference to the *nabhî* as foretelling the future; that comes later, only when the Seer has disappeared.

We may now pass on to examine whether we may find any clue to the origins of Hebrew prophecy in magic, divination and ecstasy.

As far as the magician is concerned, there seem to be none of his characteristics left in the great Hebrew prophets. What we understand, indeed, as the rise of prophecy was coincidental with a revolt against witchcraft and necromancy. The superstitions which alone can give magic power were to the eyes, even of the people of the early kingdom, both futile and in opposition to the will of Yahweh. Yahweh could not be controlled by such rites which were therefore futile, and to attempt to practise them was a form of idolatry.

Among the later prophets there appear traces of what has been called mimetic magic, as for instance, when Jeremiah sank

[1] "And Saul said, O Yahweh, God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If the iniquity be in me or in my son Jonathan Yahweh, God of Israel, give Urim; but if thou sayest thus: the iniquity is in thy people Israel, give Thummim."

a curse against Babylon in the river Euphrates. There are many similar actions recorded of the great prophets. The explanation of these actions, however, does not lie in the magical These prophets had a great sense of the power of Yahweh, and the actions which they performed were performed at His express will. They had a profound sense of the Word of Yahweh and believed that His word was creative. Thus their actions were, in a sense, symbolical of that which was to come to pass. The distinction from magic may be seen here: whilst the magician believed that his action would cause the effect, the prophet believed that his action was an illustration of what Yahweh would bring to pass. His actions reinforced the spoken word.

The question of the diviner is not so simple. Professor A. Guillaume in his *Prophecy and Divination* contends that the activity of the prophets of Israel is in many respects of the same order and character of that of many of the Beduin diviners. That there were great differences between the Israelite prophets and the Beduin diviners is not in question. Some of those differences have already been mentioned above, but the point of contact lies in the attempt which was common to both of them to divine the unseen from the seen and the unknown from the known. Dr. Guillaume has described the Beduin technique in great detail, and has shown the similarities between the methods of the two. Many illustrations of similar technique could be given from the Old Testament, but two will suffice.

The first is the story of Baalam (Numbers xxiii.) Here we have a man who, although not an Israelite, is prepared to submit his judgements to the will of Yahweh, and whose predictions came, in the manner of the diviners, from the things which he saw. From the summit of the mountain he was to curse Israel, and in his third oracle we read how he saw spread out before him the tents of Israel. The sight of the tents suggested to him the idea of lign-aloes (RV). The text is important—Num. xxiv. 5-6:

How goodly are thy tents *(oh^{a}lîm)*, O Jacob,
Like lign-aloes *(^{a}h^{a}lîm)* which Yahweh hath planted.

The one word suggested the other. This kind of assonance was a common feature of Beduin divination. Further, each of Baalam's oracles is introduced by the word *mashal*, which here seems to bear the meaning of "similitude." Thus both sight and sound played their part in Baalam's prediction of Israel's future. It is important to notice, however, that Baalam also had some of the characteristics of the ecstatic. Of this very vision we have the words "and the spirit of God (*'elohîm*) came upon him." In the person of Baalam we seem to have a combination of divination and ecstasy.

The second illustration is that of Amos in chapter viii. 1-2. Again it is a question of assonance; the sight of the basket of summer fruits (*qaiç*) suggested to him the idea of the end (*qéç*) which is to come upon Israel. Once again, and this time much later in the development of Hebrew prophecy, we have a relic of that method of foretelling the future which had its origin in divination—divining from sight and sound.

Thus it seems that the methods of Arab and Jew in this matter of prophecy were not wholly opposed, and that there may have been some element of a primitive divination, even in the noblest Hebrew prophecy.

The question of the ecstatic has received considerable attention in modern times. Some have maintained that the ecstasy of the prophets of Israel was due to contact with Canaanite religion. Whether this be true or not we cannot be sure. As Adam Welch has pointed out *(Religion under the Kingdom)* so little is known about Canaanite religion that we cannot usefully make comparisons. That bands of ecstatics existed in the time of the kingdom is clear, however, and they may have perpetuated Canaanite ideas. What we must say is that whatever the ecstatics may have been and done, their activity in the early days was not usually connected with prediction of the future; the ecstatic seems to have been rather the mystic of the ancient world whose aim was to apprehend his god and to know communion with him, and this was done through abnormal psychological states. It is worthy of note that the ecstatic was often despised by the ordinary man, and even Elijah on Carmel repudiates the ecstatic antics of the priests of Baal.

By the time we come to the "writing prophets" however, we find that some forms of ecstasy are accepted and used by them. They were careful to separate themselves from the bands of professional ecstatic prophets, while being subject to the same kind of abnormal states and were still accompanied by the same pneumatic phenomena. This is especially true of Ezekiel. Yet these prophets were saved from the extravagancies and crudities of their predecessors. This is because they are dominated by Yahweh, and for them all Yahweh was a moral Being, and in His revelations to them it was His moral commands to them and their nation that were always emphasised. It is perhaps worth noting too, that as the conception of the nature of Yahweh developed, so those who served Him gradually withdrew from these bands of ecstatic prophets whose actions were at least a moral. Beginning with Micaiah-ben-imlah we have a succession of men who, although subject to ecstasies were receiving individual rather than communal findings about the will of Yahweh, and about the events that were to come in the future.

It seems sufficiently clear that in the case of the great prophets, psychical experiences came to them which caused their more normal mental and physical states to be subordinated so that they could receive communications direct from Yahweh, who could mediate His word through them. So far we may say that prophecy in Israel owed something to the method of the ecstatic.

In conclusion one would emphasise again that the worth of Hebrew prophecy is not to be measured by the nature of its origin. Its value and its uniqueness lies in its development and in the ends which it subserved. That it sprang out of the universal desire to know the future may not be denied. As the idea of God developed, however, it became more than a desire to know the future. For the Hebrew, all events were at the command of Yahweh; He was in control. Consequently the attempt among the Hebrews became one to discover the will of God and then to announce that will to the people. In this way we get the combination of prophet and preacher that is so familiar to all readers of the Old Testament. The method perhaps does not matter very much. They, at all events, would have acknowledged only one method. "And the Lord God shewed me . . ." That was the source of their revelations. And such it was; but we may trace the "shewing" through the methods of foretelling the future which the Hebrews developed in their own way; through divination and ecstasy at least. That was the human element in their revelations.

J. C. WHITNEY.

Some Recent Contributions to the Study of the Fourth Gospel.

II.

INTERPRETATION.

IN passing from critical questions to problems of interpretation, we are entering upon a more inviting and fruitful field. It seems to be the common judgment in recent times that the discussion of critical issues in connection with the Fourth Gospel has not brought many assured results, and that study is most profitably focused upon the interpretation of the work. Thus C. H. Dodd ventured to say (in a statement greatly beloved of examiners!) "If the solution of the Synoptic problem was the most spectacular success of the nineteenth century critics, the Johannine problem represents their most signal failure." (*The Present Task In New Testament Studies*, 1936.)

I cannot claim to have any original contribution to make toward this very difficult task of interpretation, to which so many distinguished scholars have addressed their energies. All that I seek to do here is to direct others to recent work which I have found illuminating. Discussion will be limited, rather arbitrarily perhaps, to Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' Commentary, a brief monograph by C. H. Dodd, and W. F. Howard's book *Christianity According to St. John.*

I begin with Sir Edwyn Hoskyn's two-volume Commentary (ed. F. N. Davey, 1940). This notable work contains a fascinating account of the interpretation of this Gospel in recent times, and some interesting observations on the right approach to it. The opening sentence of the section on "The Problem of the Fourth Gospel," is a key to the author's consistent attitude:—"The Gospel according to Saint John is a strictly theological work." He goes on to specify what he means both positively, and negatively, by ruling out other methods. "The two themes which form the ground-bass of the whole book—the Word of God and Eternal Life—refuse to be simply dissolved in the ideas of the author or merely identified with his peculiar spiritual experience."

Hoskyns insists strongly upon the fact that any true interpretation must be such as to account for the great place which this

Gospel has always occupied in the devotion of the ordinary Christian. "Whatever the Fourth Gospel may be, it is not a text-book of metaphysics. Primarily it is the text-book of the parish priest and the inspiration of the straight-forward layman."

There is obvious force in this point, though one would expect Hoskyns to give more consideration to the fact that there is a deceptive simplicity of direction in the Fourth Gospel, which frequently reveals the difficulty of its conceptions while rendering it very accessible to popular devotional use. As has already been suggested, Hoskyns considers that we have relied far too much on historical criticism in the attempt to expound John, and that we must return to the more theological outlook. Criticism has proceeded on the supposition that somewhere or other in human experience, the Fourth Gospel could come to rest, and its obscurities would vanish before the progressive march of critical knowledge. The Fourth Gospel has, however, not come to rest, because the theme of the book is beyond human knowledge, and because, if it did come to rest, it would have "denied the theme which in fact it never denies." It should be borne in mind that not every "liberal" scholar believes in the all-sufficiency of historical and literary criticism to the extent that Hoskyns suggests. E. F. Scott's significant essay "The Limitations of the Historical Method" (in *Studies In Early Christianity,*" ed. S. J. Case, 1928) is evidence of this. Scott says: "The historical method has its well-marked limitations. No one can dispute its value, but the exclusive use of it has led, in almost every instance, to a false emphasis or a concealment of the very fact that needs to be examined. Its worth is at best preliminary . . . It still remains true that the final word in New Testament research belongs to the theologian."

I have limited discussion above to Hoskyns' general approach to the Gospel, as it is obviously impossible to give many instances of his actual exposition of the text. It many be helpful, however, if I seek to sum up the main merits and weaknesses of his treatment.

(1.) He always treats the Gospel as a very serious theological writing on an inexpressibly great theme. In his own terms, he regards it as demanding a sustained "energy of understanding," and he offers us a rare theological concentration and sensitiveness in his exposition. There is never anything trivial or superficial in his treatment.

It is here perhaps, that his work most obviously excels that of "liberal" writers at their worst. It his attacks on some of the modernists, Hoskyns probably has in mind scholars like Streeter, who make too facile a recourse to psychological and mystical data, and too immediate an analogy with modern situations. Streeter's

approach in *The Four Gospels,* while it has some justification in the well-known hesitations of the Church regarding John, completely obscures the fact that though the author used a new terminology, the *content* of his teaching was profoundly unaccommodating to the syncretistic tendencies of his day, and more in accord with later "orthodoxy" than almost any New Testament writing. It would be truer to say that the incipient Gnostic movement rather than the Gospel of John was "modernism" in its own day.

(2.) Yet it seems to me that Hoskyns' theological concentration too has its dangers. For instance, I do not feel that he sufficiently conveys the sense of release and confidence which the New Testament writers had attained in Christ, because of his deep concern with theological problems as such. He deals admirably with the theological issues facing the writer of John's Gospel and the 1st. Epistle of John, but he does not seem to me to emphasize adequately that this was a man whose problems were *solved* because he had found complete rest in Christ. The strain and burden of the mystery seem to be more obvious in Hoskyns' pages than the serene joy which the Johannine Christ bequeaths to His disciples.

(3) Again, the theological approach sometimes overreaches itself in the discovery of over-subtle parallels and allusions. This appears to be the case in Hoskyns' treatment of John ix. 7. ("Siloam" applied to Christ), of xiii. 21. (the reclining position of the Beloved Disciple marks the verity that the true disciples are in Jesus as Jesus is in the Father), of xviii. 1. ("The garden is important to him . . . The Passion and Resurrection which effected the salvation of the world are contrasted with the Fall in the Garden of Eden"), of xix. 28-30. ("If it be assumed that the author intends his readers to suppose that the Beloved Disciple and Mary the Mother of Jesus remain standing beneath the Cross, the words 'He bowed His head' suggest that He bowed His head toward them, and the words: 'He handed over the Spirit' are also directed to the faithful believers who stand below. This is no fantastic exegesis, since verses 28-30 record the solemn fulfilment of vii. 37-39.")

These examples are a few random cases of over-curious and strained exegesis, when all due allowance has been made for the subtlety and allusiveness of the evangelist's mind. In the interpretation of the texts just cited, and of others like them, Hoskyns gives too uncritical a hearing to patristic exegesis, which he quotes freely. It should be remembered, too, that he has exerted a great influence (Canon Charles Smyth ventures to say that for many of his generation "the two outstanding names in the history of Christian thought in England in the present century are those

of G. K. Chesterton and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns,"—see the memoir introducing Hoskyns' *Cambridge Sermons*) and that his disciples are apt to be more extreme than their master. I once heard a quite fantastic exposition of part of the Passion narrative in the Fourth Gospel by a disciple of Hoskyns, in which a plethora of astonishing parallels with Genesis was produced. (e.g. Jesus bowing His head on the Cross, probably in sleep(?), reminds us of the Sabbath rest of God in Genesis!) This kind of exegesis can discover anything anywhere, and would be more aptly called "eisegesis"!

In spite of these criticisms, one cannot but pay tribute to Hoskyns' work as a whole. Any reader who turns to his discussion of the Prologue, or of the discourse to Nicodemus, or his careful examination of such words as "Paraclétos" (p. 549) or "Hagiazein" (p. 590) will surely be impressed by the mingling of exact scholarship and theological insight.

Much briefer notice must be given to C. H. Dodd's monograph *The Background of The Fourth Gospel* (originally published as an article in *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, and reprinted).

Dodd suggests that the interpreter who keeps the *readers* of the Gospel in mind rather than seeking to penetrate directly into the secrets of the author's mind, will find his task more compassable. The Fourth Gospel seems to have been composed in such a way that readers who had no more than a most superficial acquaintance with Christianity could follow it with understanding. The Prologue, and the teaching of this Gospel on Re-birth and the Living Bread, for example, could well be appreciated by religiously minded people as yet outside Christianity, but aware of their own needs, and sensitive to certain strains of current religious thinking. It may be that some of the silences as well as some of the characteristic features of the work may be one to the fact that the author is writing for such people in addition to his Christian readers.

Dodd goes on to consider the main forms of religious thought which were influential in the world to which the Fourth Gospel belonged, and discusses in a very illuminating way its relation to Rabbinic Judaism, Greek Philosophy and the Higher Paganism, Hellenistic Judaism and Gnosticism. Interesting examples are given of cases where our exposition ought to be determined by these various strata of thought.

In conclusion, it is suggested that the approach to the Gospel from the point of view of its readers and their background is preferable to an approach by way of the Synoptic Gospels. The latter method makes us unduly aware of the Hellenistic elements in "John," whereas to approach it as it might have been received

by its first readers, to whom these Hellenistic ideas were part of the axiomatic structure of any religious philosophy, is to realize the radically Christian substance of the teaching. Here is something quite new to Hellenistic thought and destined to transform it. "From the standpoint of the history of religion it is not the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel that is its new and original contribution to religious thought, and not its speculative philosophy at all: it is the announcement that the revelation of Godhead is to be sought in the words and deeds, life and death of a Person who taught in Palestine and was crucified under Pontius Pilate."

In this brief but stimulating monograph, Dodd seems to me to hold the right balance between, let us say, Streeter and Hoskyns. He is as aware of the Hellenistic milieu as the one, but as aware also of the distinctively Christian emphasis as the other. There is much in this brief work, of which I have given such slight extracts, which makes it, as W. F. Howard has observed, indispensable for the student of the Fourth Gospel

A contribution of more questionable value to Johannine studies was Dodd's article "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel" *(Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, April* 1937*)*. In this he sought to strengthen the view held by some scholars that the Epistle is not from the same hand as the Gospel. In spite of a painstaking comparison of grammar, idiom and style, and an instructive examination of the theology of the two writings, the main thesis of the paper does not appear to have been established. There are a number of artificialities in the argument (e.g. the statement that the teaching of I. John i. 4 that "God is light" is not paralleled in the Gospel) and it is not surprising that this piece of criticism has failed to win as much general assent as most of Dodd's work, in spite of the valuable material which it presents.

(Incidentally, most of Dodd's points in his last-named study may now be found in his Commentary on the Epistle of John in the Moffatt Series).

W. F. Howard's book *Christianity According to St. John,* deserves much fuller treatment than I can give. It supplements on the theological side what the author had already given, with more attention to critical matters, in his book, *The Fourth Gospel In Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (now brought up to date in a third Edition). It is difficult to select from such a rich and suggestive work, but it seems to me that the following are the most significant contributions which it makes:

(1) It lays strong emphasis on the Jewish character of the language and thought of the Gospel. Howard speaks of the "overwhelmingly Jewish tone and setting of the Gospel," in a more pronounced way than he did in his earlier book, where he

was more sympathetic to the idea that the evangelist had laid under tribute "all the best thought in the contemporary world."

Recent criticism seems to be thrusting the "Greeks" further and further away from the centre of the Fourth Gospel. Hoskyns, Temple and Howard, for instance, agree in regarding them as purely peripheral. Their case seems to be a sound one, but there is some danger of excessive vehemence in asserting the Jewish background. After all, John's distinctive message was more offensive to Jews than to the Hellenistic world, and readers of the kind described by Dodd in *The Background of the Fourth Gospel*, would be most likely to profit by it (cf. also W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*.)

(2.) Howard deals very suggestively with "three methods of theological emphasis" in the Fourth Gospel, which he calls "explicative emphasis," "mandatory emphasis," and "proleptic emphasis."

The first is that of "unfolding to the eye of the reader some feature in the ministry of our Lord which was known to the primitive tradition; where, however, it was not conspicuous, but was indicated by some shadowy saying or vague allusion." (E.g. the conception of Jesus' ministry as a sifting, critical, event, which lies behind the difficult words of Mark iv 10-14, is much more fully developed in John. In view of the well-known difficulties of the passage in Mark iv, this is a somewhat unhappy illustration, though admittedly Dr. Howard is dealing with explications by John of the *earlier tradition*, and not necessarily with explications of the original words of Jesus.

The second method, that of *mandatory emphasis*, crystallizes in a phrase a conception of Jesus which is found in solution in the earlier tradition. (i.e. the conception of Jesus as being "sent by God"). The phase "Ho pempsas me" occurs in the Gospel twenty-six times and "apostello" occurs eighteen times for the Son's mission from the Father.

It is tempting to think, in view of Howard's point here, that if the Fourth Gospel had used the expression "the Apostle of God" (as Hebrews iii. 1. does) this designation of Christ might have become much more dominant in Christian theology.

The third method, that of *proleptic emphasis*, is "that Johannine characteristic by which the end is seen from the beginning, so that instead of a gradual self-disclosure, the revelation in its fulness is proclaimed by anticipation from the opening of the ministry." Illustrations are given from the Marcan and Johannine treatment respectively of (1) the Messianic Secret, and (2) the Transfiguration.

This description of John's treatment of the earlier tradition in terms of a three-fold emphasis and elaboration, is a useful way of

summing up the familiar facts. We may compare Hoskyns' suggestive comments on the treatment of the Synoptics in the Fourth Gospel.

(3.) Howard's discussion of "Eschatology and Mysticism" is important. He challenges the common antithesis made between the two, and argues convincingly, I think, that there is a Johannine eschatology which is an integral part of the Gospel. This is not by any means the only New Testament writing where eschatology and mysticism occur together, in spite of apparent contradictions. The evidence is so skilfully marshalled and discussed that one feels grave doubt as to the view of C. H. Dood in his book *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, that "in this Gospel, even more fully than in Paul, eschatology is sublimated into a distinctive kind of mysticism"—a view which Howard explicitly questions. An interesting appendix cites a modern parallel (for the passage from mysticism to eschatology) in the hymns of Charles Wesley. This evaluation of eschatology as a positive and integral part of John's theology may be compared with the similar approach by Hoskyns and R. H. Strachan (*The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment*, 1941, p. 12-14). This goes beyond treating the eschatological elements as "concessions to an earlier point of view" (as E. F. Scott and G. H. C. Macgregor regard them).

Other parts of this book are equally masterly and stimulating. It is doubtful if we have in English a more admirably alanced treatment of Johannine thought, accompanied by complete understanding of critical issues, than we find in W. F. Howard's books. Incidentally, *Christianity According to St. John*, should be of particular interest to Baptists, as the lectures of which it is composed were delivered at Regent's Park College, and the author acknowledges special indebtedness to the late Dr. Wheeler Robinson.

In this study I am much aware of the many qualifications that have been made, and of the attempts to strike a delicate balance between the views of our leading scholars, following one here and another there. The Fourth Gospel is so curiously fashioned and so many sided, that it is difficult to come to clear-cut decisions on some of the most important issues.

But if it demands much of us, it has a correspondingly rich reward to offer, if we will enter into its world. Dr. Newton Flew in *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*, quotes from Heitmuller on apt characterisation of that world as contrasted with that of the first three Gospels. It is the contrast between "the bright crowded streets of a city and the stillness of a lofty cathedral, where the light is only poured through windows of stained glass. There is some gain and some loss. The cathedral

calm of the Fourth Gospel is not so tense with life as the open-air preaching of the first three." But on the other hand, the Fourth Gospel is nearer to the attitude of the modern preacher, in that it is able to present the life and death of Jesus in the light of what they have already meant, after a considerable interval, to the world. His life is the ladder by means of which there is a holy trafficking between heaven and earth, His death a "stairway of glory" by which He enters upon His universal reign.

DAVID R. GRIFFITHS.

(The name "John" is used of the Gospel or its author, without implying any particular theory of authorship.)

Nervous Disorders and Character, by J. G. McKenzie. (Allen and Unwin, 5s.)

This would be a most useful little book for ministers who have not the time to master the standard works on psychology, yet feel the want of some reliable help in the psychological understanding of problems that crop up in pastoral work. The book is competent, clear and Christian. It recognises the value of the work of Freud and other great pioneers without slavish adherence to their theories or blindness to their limitations. In particular Professor McKenzie challenges the assumption that the psychotherapist has only to discover to the patient the origins of mental conflict for that conflict to disappear. He holds that the root origin is always in some defect of character structure, and that there can be no cure that does not integrate a man's personality. He is not, therefore, merely concerned with the removal of distressing neurotic symptoms, but with the unification of the self, which requires a right adjustment to spiritual things, which in its turn involves faith in God. "Pathological trends of character cannot really be cured unless the patient comes consciously under the influence of religious ideals." That is why psychologists need to be pastors, and pastors need to have some knowledge of psychology if they are to know how to deal with the mental obstructions that hinder faith in God. This book is devoid of padding; almost every page is worth re-reading. We ministers would be better pastors if we thoroughly mastered it.

F. C. BRYAN.

John Smyth and Thomas Helwys:

The Two First English Preachers of Religious Liberty. Resemblances and Contrasts.

JOHN SMYTH began his career with a devout belief in the efficacy of force for the suppression of error, as is proved by the following passage from his *Pattern of True Prayer*, a treatise which he published in 1605, giving the substance of certain sermons preached by him when he was Puritan "lecturer" to the city of Lincoln: "When there is a toleration of many religions, the kindom of God is shouldered out of doors by the Devil's kingdom: for without question the Devil is so subtle that he will procure, through the advantage of man's natural inclination to false doctrine and worship, more by thousands to follow strange religions than the truth of God's word: wherefore the magistrates should cause all men to worship the true God, or else punish them with imprisonment, confiscation of goods or death as the quality of the cause requireth."

But such stout words as these against heretics and certain hyper-Calvinist pronouncements[1] were in positively humorous contrast with the extreme kindliness of his nature. From the testimony of friend and foe alike, from his lack of personal bitterness against his opponents, from his actions and from incidental passages in his writings we gain the impression of a singularly loving and lovable disposition.

Helwys, on the other hand, so far as we can judge from the little that we know about him, would appear to have been cast in a far sterner mould than Smyth, capable of great harshness, not only towards "errors," but also towards individuals holding erroneous opinions—in short, just the stuff of which persecutors are made, even though a process of reasoning ultimately brought him to the conviction that religious persecution is a sin.

But, notwithstanding a hidden antagonism between the temperaments of the two men, Helwys was for five years after their first meeting so ardent and adoring a disciple of Smyth that

[1] See the passage in which from the fearful doctrine that God does not will the salvation of all men he draws the conclusion that "if we do discern any man to be a reprobate," it is our duty "directly and particularly to pray for his speedy damnation and all the means effecting the same"!

to tell the story of his leader's development is to tell his story too.[2]

Smyth did not immediately draw the full logical conclusion from his conversion to the faith of "the Separation" between Church and world. In a letter written near the close of 1607, shortly before his flight to Holland with his little "company" of Separatists from the Vale of Trent, he assured Richard Bernard, a Puritan clergyman in that neighbourhood, who with him had gone to the verge of Separation, but had then drawn back, that he not only ascribed to "magistrates" certain rights of supervision over the Church, but also taught "that it is the Magistrate's office to . . . abolish idolatry and all false ways . . . to command and cause all men within their dominions to walk in the ways of God being fitted and prepared thereunto, and that by the examples of David, Josaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, Nehemiah."

In 1609 he published this letter in Amsterdam, together with a voluminous commentary thereon, under the title *Parallels, Censures, Observations*. By this time he had come into contact with a congregation of Mennonite Baptists, whose pastor Hans de Ries had been profoundly influenced by the writings of Caspar Schwenckfeld, a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Luther who anticipated much of the teaching of George Fox and the Quakers. These new strains of mysticism and pacifism, which were gradually to become predominant in his thinking, were as yet in conflict with the semi-Erastian reverence for "magistrates" which he had brought with him from England. He still held that kings should act as iconoclasts, destroying the very buildings which had been defiled by the Roman worship. But at the same time he taught that the kings of the Old Testament typified "the saints" in the New.

By this allegorical method of interpreting the Old Testament, he soon became convinced that circumcision, which his fellow-Separatists took to be a foreshadowing of the rite of baptism, was a symbol of the sealing by "the Spirit of promise" of "a spiritual infant regenerate by the Spirit and the Word," and that therefore his own baptism as an infant was invalid. But he knew of no Church which he could "join with a good conscience."[3] For the Mennonites tolerated a heretical belief, expressly denounced by

[2] In a heartrending lament over his separation from a leader whom he now held to be an apostate from the true faith, Helwys protested that in past happy days there was no conceivable sacrifice that he and those who adhered to him in the breach with Smyth would not willingly have made to retain him as their pastor, and that they had actually "neglected" themselves and their families "and respected him," adding "and we confess we had good cause to do so in respect of those most excellent gifts and graces of God that then did abound in him: and all our love for him was too little for him and not worthy of him" (Declaration of Faith, 1611).

[3] See his *Last Book*.

Smyth in his treatise against infant baptism, that Christ's flesh was not "of the substance of His mother," but was miraculously formed in her womb. Hence in desperation he was driven to the desperate expedient of the se-baptism.

But during the months which followed the publication of his polemic against infant baptism—the *Character* (i.e. Mark) *of the Beast*—he was converted to the theology set forth by the Amsterdam Mennonites in the so-called "Confession of Waterland," a remarkable document, inspired by a simple and childlike faith in the love of God towards all mankind, denying the doctrine of original sin and asserting the unlawfulness of combining Church office with the holding of civil office. Finally he overcame his scruple about the toleration of a heresy concerning the method of the Incarnation by reasoning that "the Christ's natural flesh was made, but that we could search into Christ's spiritual flesh, to be made flesh of that His flesh . . . in the communion of the same spirit."[4] Not later than March, 1610, he and his tiny "company" of about thirty persons, signed a document expressing their repentance of the se-baptism and their desire to be admitted "to the true Church of Christ as speedily as it can be done": and in May, Smyth signed the "Confession of Waterland," thereby subscribing to the following declaration:

> "This office of the worldly authority the Lord Jesus hath not ordained in his spiritual kingdom of the New Testament."

It seems likely that Smyth's breach with Calvinism and surrender to the gentle influence of his Mennonite friends began the process of liberating the kindly instincts of his nature, so long overlaid by a severe theology and a rigid ecclesiastical creed, and of calming his once feverish zeal. Almost from the time of his arrival in Amsterdam he had started controversy after controversy with the previously exiled Separatist Church there, magnifying molehills of differences into mountains:[5] and his language about the time of his conversion to Baptist opinions had become vehement and acrimonious, though, as he naively begged Richard Bernard to believe, his rebukes were intended to be "sharp physic" for the restoration of his friends' spiritual health. But now he was to find himself excluded from "true" Church fellowship—on the urgent advice of a sister-Church consulted by the Amsterdam Mennonites—because of his "absurd" error in baptizing himself. Yet at the same time his reputation of the se-baptism exposed him to a furious onslaught from his former

[4] See his *Last Book*.

[5] See his *Differences of the Churches of the Separation* (1608), explaining the trivial difference about the conduct of public worship which had caused him to break off communion with them.

chief disciple and bosom friend, Helwys:[6] while many other former friends whom his contentiousness and his controversial methods had changed into bitter enemies waged war against him in the press. But, by a Divine alchemy, the harshness and hatred of his new foes so wrought upon his chastened spirit as to complete the work which the gentleness of his new friends had begun. From this time of sharp trial and cruel humiliation, he was to emerge to preach his new faith in religious liberty in language suffused with a sweet and passionate love to God and man expressing itself in the tenderest forbearance towards "weak" Christians partially blinded by "ignorance of errors."[7]

It was thus that he summed up—in a short treatise with the long title *The Last Book of John Smyth Called the Retraction of His Errors and the Confirmation of the Truth,* published by his "company" after his death, along with a Confession of Faith and an account of his last days—the great fault of his controversial writings and the moral which he had drawn from his recent bitter experiences: "The contention for outward matters . . . hath broken the rules of love and charity, which is the superior law. . . . My words have been stout and mingled with gall, and therefore hath the Lord repaid me home full measure into my bosom. . . . For my part, the Lord hath taught me thereby."

Being excluded from the only "true" and orderly Church which he knew, Smyth seems to have turned for comfort and help to the mystic who had quietly held aloof from outward communion with any Christian Church, bidding his followers await in patience the time when it should please God to "build a Church out of the world and gather together in one the children of God which are scattered abroad." While refusing to partake of the sacraments till a true Church should be established with a discipline separating believers from unbelievers, Schwenckfeld had nevertheless, on behalf of himself and his disciples, declared: "We separate ourselves in our course of life from no one who loves Christ and lives rightly." His mystical theology, with its emphatic differentiation between "inward" and "outward" helps, and "inward" and "outward" communion, had evidently supplied Smyth, not only with the impulse to a new joy and serenity, but also with (what to a man of his cast of mind was almost a necessity) a logical basis for his new hope and charity.[8] Moreover, it provided him with an additional ground for the belief that religion—to quote from his *Confession* ought to be left free to

[6] See especially his *Advertisement* (1611).

[7] See Article 78 of his *Confession of Faith*

[8] For my knowledge of Schwenckfeld's theology I am chiefly indebted to Barclay's *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth,* Dexter's *Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years,* and Dorner's *History of Protestant Theology.*

every man's conscience." For if—as he says in his *Last Book*—rites and methods of Church government, modes of worship and forms of words are "no part of saving righteousness," then to resort to force in order to suppress certain outward forms or to impose others is obviously an irrational proceeding.

A notable article of the *Confession* runs thus: "All penitent and faithful Christians are brethren in the communion of the outward Church . . . by what name soever they are known . . . though compassed with never so many ignorances and infirmities: and we salute them all with a holy kiss. . . ."[9]

Another actually declares that: "The new creature which is begotten of God needs not the outward scriptures, creatures or ordinances of the Church to support them (sic). Nevertheless, the regenerate, in love to others, can and will do no other than use the outward things of the Church for the gaining and supporting of others."

Christian love, Christian meekness, faith in the loving-kindness of God towards His erring creatures, the realisation that Christianity consists only in the soul's personal relation to Christ, the Mennonite repudiation of resort to force for any purpose, a mysticism imbibed from Schwenckfeld—all these thoughts and dispositions of the heart, gradually formed in Smyth by the experiences of his life in Holland, combined at last with that ideal of an entire "separation" between the kingdoms of this world, and the Kingdom of Christ which he had half grasped before he left England, to produce a many-sided, deeply rooted conviction that no form or degree of physical coercion ought ever in any circumstances to be used as a means of overawing the human spirit. One article of his *Confession of Faith*—the eighty-fifth—sets forth the Mennonite doctrine that the Christian duty of non-resistance to evil cannot possibly be performed by any man who, holding an office of authority in the State, has to draw "the sword" against his enemies and persecutors. The famous eighty-fourth Article declares that:

> "The magistrate is not by virtue of his office to meddle with religion or matters of conscience . . . but to leave Christian religion free to every man's conscience and to handle only civil transgressions, wrongs and injuries of man against man . . . for Christ only is the lawgiver of the Church and conscience."

After a brief illness, Smyth passed away in August, 1612, in the friendly shelter of the "Cake-House of Jan Munter"—a semi-collegiate building where a wealthy Mennonite manufacturer of

[9] Before his conversion to Mennonite beliefs, Smyth had been a "rigid Separatist," teaching that "false" churches unseparated from the world, were "antichristian," although he had always insisted that some of their members belonged to the Invisible Church.

ship-buiscuit had apparently housed him and his company—almost with his last breath joining eagerly with "the brethren" in discourse on Divine truth, ever seeking fresh light, but firmly refusing to discuss any question which "tended to strife" among Christians.

* * * * *

To turn from Smyth to Helwys is to be startled at once by a violent contrast and by an amazing paradox. The disciple had refused to follow the leader any further along the road to the Mennonite fold than the first step of repudiating the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation. In his case, at all events,[10] the doctrine of religious liberty took its rise not in any liberal opinions, but on the contrary, in the rigid ecclesiasticism of a fanatic, unsoftened and unswayed (though not quite untouched) by the teaching of Continental mystics and Anabaptists. And he actually made his intolerance the basis of his plea for toleration!

His *Mistery of Iniquity*, published in the year of Smyth's death, expressly dooms to everlasting perdition every man who had ever held the name, office or power of a bishop and had died without repenting of his error, every Puritan who remained in the Church of England, every Separatist who defended infant baptism, in short, everyone who in any single particular departed from the Divinely appointed Apostolic government of the Church —"unto which whosoever addeth or taketh away, either by word or action . . . the Lord will add unto them all His judgments and take away all His mercies."[11] "The simple-hearted, being led by

[10] It is impossible to be quite certain whether or not Smyth, and Helwys with him, had fully grasped and clearly stated in their teaching the doctrine of religious liberty before Smyth's surrender to the Mennonite influence caused the breach between the two. By the date of his publication—in 1609—of his treatise against infant baptism, Smyth had already reached the point of regarding the Mennonite doctrine of the unlawfulness of combining Church membership with the tenure of civil office, as an open question to be decided if and when a "magistrate" should be converted to the Separatist faith. (See his preface to the *Character of the Beast.*) Presumably, therefore, he had not long after the se-baptism so far outgrown the state of mind in which the *Parallels* (prescribing to "magistrates" the role of iconoclasts) had been written—although the earlier treatise was published in the same week with the later. But Smyth's development at this time was so extraordinarily rapid and the exact date of the breach beween him and Helwys so uncertain, that it is impossible to fix the precise time by which either man finally repudiates the last vestige of a belief in the lawfulness of any use of force for religious purposes.

[11] The actual wording of the passage here quoted is "the exact rule of the law of Christ Jesus distinctly and most perfectly set down in the New Testament for a law of election and ordination (i.e. of the ministers of the Church) for ever." The errors which were to be punished by the loss of the souls of the transgressors were apparently almost exclusively ecclesiastical, not doctrinal, errors. Any refusal to carry out with complete

their teachers . . . if they justify any one error or false way or condemn any one truth" would share their leader's doom.

Moreover, these amazingly harsh sentences were explicitly applied by Helwys to the individual cases of his own former dear friends and fellow-sufferers in the search for truth. He had recently called Smyth "that wicked man" and had accused him of having committed the sin against the Holy Ghost in going back upon the se-baptism[12] and he now denounced John Robinson, the beloved and honoured pastor of the Church which sent out the Pilgrim Fathers, as "a malicious adversary of God's truth" who had never at any time "known Christ." As to the Puritan clergy in the Church of England, many of whom must have been his guides and teachers in the days before his "separation," he told them that "the fire with which you kindle the hearts of men" was the "false enlightening and heat of a false spirit" breathed on them by the bishops at their ordination and warned them that "other spirit have you none."

But this awful bigotry was the outcome of Helwys' profound respect for the conscience of the individual. "Let all take heed," he urged, "and learn to know the truth of God and to love it and to understand His word themselves . . . if they be not able to judge and discern of themselves (by the direction of God's spirit) they can never have faith nor assurance in the way they walk. . . . False prophets or true prophets are all alike to them, they being ignorant of the scriptures whereby they should examine and try their doctrine . . . and yet such would have their ignorance excuse them, although their ignorance be only for want of love of the truth." For the true meaning of the New Testament is only to be discovered by Christians "reading and searching and meditating the Scriptures day and night, and praying without doubt that the Lord would give them the spirit of wisdom to direct them to the true understanding and meaning."

This clear realization that the meaning of the Scriptures is revealed only to the devout and earnest seeker, enabled Helwys to see through the strange fallacy by which "the magistrate" was supposed to be able to discriminate between "false" and

logical consistency the root doctrine of "the Separation" that "two or three gathered together in Christ's Name are a true Church" was regarded by Helwys as damnable. But he showed little or nothing of this bitter, fanatical spirit, in combating what he held to be unscriptural theological opinions. The curious belief that the New Testament contains a precise code of laws for the constitution of the Church had been held by Barrowe, the apostle of the "rigid" Separation, who had actually claimed that the model of the Christian Church had been planned in every detail by Divine care like the model of the Tabernacle under the Mosaic dispensation!

[12] Helwys unjustly insisted that in so doing Smyth had forsaken the true Separatist faith of which he had been a zealous preacher—an accusation against which Smyth defended himself in his *Last Book*.

"true" churches, and so to be commissioned to persecute the former but not the latter.

At the same time, his deep conviction that ignorance of the Scriptures is itself a deadly sin filled him with an intense dread of religious persecution. For he realised with agonizing vividness how impossible it was for ordinary men and women, subject to the threat of persecution, to read the Bible with an unbiassed mind. "There cannot be," he pleaded, "so unjust a thing and of so great cruel tyranny under the sun as to force men's consciences in their religion to God, seeing that if they err they must pay the price of their transgression with the loss of their souls. This hierarchy of Archbishops and lord bishops doth nothing differ from the first Beast: for the first Beast keeps both the spirit and the word from the people: and they keep the spirit of God in bondage, and then is the word of God of no effect."

But he did not confine himself to claiming freedom from coercion for those who sought to base their ecclesiastical practices and their doctrines solely upon Holy Writ. For all acts of obedience to Divine authority performed merely in deference to the authority of men were a kind of sacrilege.[13] Probably he would have included the negative obedience of refraining from "false worship" from fear or love of man under the same condemnation. At all events, he expressly disclaimed any wish to persecute Roman Catholics, "if they be true and faithful subjects of the King. For we do freely profess that our lord the King hath no more power over their consciences than over ours, and that is none at all. . . . He hath no authority as a king, but in earthly causes." "We could wish that the wholesome word of doctrine with all the cords of love were applied to them for their information and drawing them from their blind errors." Even the open enemies of the Christian faith were not to be coerced or restrained by force. "Men's religion to God," he argued, "is betwixt God and themselves. . . . Let them be heretics, Turks, Jews or whatsoever, it appertaineth not to the earthly power to punish them in the least degree."

This strange paradoxical blend of fanaticism with commonsense, of extreme harshness with a remarkable degree of charity, was apparently the spirit of all Helwys's little company, who, after their return to their native land, became "the first Baptist Church in England."[14] In 1615, a member of that Church (identified by

[13] "they . . . whom the love of God constraineth, their obedience only shall be acceptable to God, and will the King make men . . . bring an unacceptable sacrifice to God? God forbid."

[14] i.e. the first Baptist church on English soil of whose establishment, constitution and doctrine we possess any clear historical record, the first in a long series of churches which came to be recognised as the Baptist denomination in England.

most students of Baptist origins with John Murton, or Morton, who went with Helwys in the secession from "Smyth's company" and subsequently became a pillar of the London Church) published a treatise entitled *Persecution for Religion Judged and Condemned*, in which he pleased that "blasphemers" should be borne with, in the hope that if their lives are prolonged they may attain to conversion and salvation, and suggested that English Roman Catholics would probably be as peaceable and loyal citizens as their Dutch co-religionists if they were allowed similar freedom of worship. But in this same treatise he almost outdid his leader in the vehemence with which he prophesied the punishment in the next world of any unrepented error in worship.

> "As there is but one God, so there is but one way of worshipping Him, out of the which whosoever is and repenteth not thereof shall pay a dear price. They are all without exception, in this fearful estate, to be cast into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

The generosity, the Christian spirit, the "sweet reasonableness," the remarkable degree of enlightenment displayed by Helwys and his company when they pleaded for respect for the consciences of men whose "errors" they held to be damnable, are in the most extraordinary contrast with the fierce fanaticism of their contention that their own form of ecclesiastical organisation was the one true Church out of which no salvation was possible. It was as though men tossing in a hideous nightmare had, in the midst of the shapes of horror, seen some fair vision dawn.

M. Dorothea Jordan.

Welsh Baptist Polity.

I

NOTWITHSTANDING time and distance, the Baptists of Wales would trace their origin to Palestine and to the days of our Lord and His Apostles. Spiritual kinship, a sense of reality and oneness and a constant mental practice of associating their religious life with the New Testament far outweigh any thoughts of chronology or geography. To Baptists whatever may be the value of tradition and history, the simple and direct teaching and the example of the Master are paramount.

Church life during the twelve centuries from 300 A.D. to 1,500 A.D., cannot claim the sympathetic interest of Baptists. The organized Christianity of the New Testament ceased to be with the pagan catastrophe engineered by the Emperor Constantine. The Spirit of Jesus Christ, nevertheless, continued to bear witness to the message of Calvary. The so-called Church denied Him, still a holy remnant of the faithful remained. During the darkness and sorrow of the Dark Ages brilliant flashes of light pierced the gloom at intervals, but were soon quenched in blood. For the moment, these would quicken hope and awaken our sympathy, inasmuch as the martyr victims of those days stood, as a rule, for the truths and principles for which Baptists stand today. The long night had to give place to another day. In the West the power of the Church of Rome was broken by the Protestant Reformation. In the East, the Greek, or Eastern Church, held its unchecked sway into this century, then happily to be itself broken by the Russian revolution.

The clash of motives, powers and interests in the Reformation produced quite a medley of creeds and opinions. Personalities, schools of religious thought and political parties took part in the fray. Sophisticated theologians, political reformers, uneducated peasants and artisans and men simply enamoured of the truth as it is in Jesus were busy. All Europe, in a religious sense, was practically in the melting pot. The Anabaptists, having found an open Bible, bestirred themselves to preach the Christian doctrine of opposition to war, rejecting priestcraft, objecting to the christening of infants, the union of Church and State and all restrictions and interference with the rights of conscience. Luther opposed papal authority, preached justification by faith, condemned the sale of indulgencies and translated the Bible into his own native tongue, but he and Calvin still taught infant

baptism, the use of the sword and the union of Church and State. In different quarters baptism was given various forms. Some immersed, some sprinkled, while others practiced affusion. Later all Baptists adopted immersion. After Robert Browne's rediscovery of the New Testament ideal of the visible independent Church, Church independency gained favour with Baptists, and even Independents and Presbyterians became separate bodies. Baptists, and Quakers also, after much contention and argument, built for themselves separate folds. For years both had been cradled on the same hearth. Upon separation they divided the Anabaptist legacy between them. The Quakers became staunch Pacifists, held to belief in the "inner light," eschewed the official priesthood, but discontinued the celebration of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptists stood by Believers' Baptism and Baptism by Immersion, the Authority of Scripture, absolute freedom in religious matters, Church independence and the separation of Church and State. At no time could differences be distinguished and set apart by geometrical lines or labelled and kept apart like drugs on an apothecary's shelves. Baptists have never known authoritative denominational Confessions of Faith. England and Wales have had their Particular and General Baptists, Free and Close Communion Churches, Union or Strict membership Churches. Opinions may have differed on minor matters within the same local brotherhood. Still a Baptist Church is a fairly well known and understood entity

Wales Before the Reformation.

The Dark Ages told heavily upon the Principality, and left it poor, ignorant and superstitious. The dire legacy of a popish and corrupt Church had brought it low indeed. The great message of John Penry, one of the saintliest of souls, who was hanged in 1593, took long to tell among his native hills. Taking his description, together with those of Vicar Pritchard and Thomas Charles of Bala, Wales must have been in a sad plight in the sixteenth century. Hardly any of the lower classes could read. Gentle and simple folk, clergy and lay alike, practiced gluttony, drunkenness and licentiousness. In a spiritual sense the Church was non-existent. The Redeemer's name was never heard from a pulpit. Parishes were often without incumbents. Absentee bishops appropriated the tithes, but were allowing "known adulterers, thieves and roisterers, and most abominable swearers" to remain in the ministry.

John Myles and Ilston Church.

The story of Nonconformity during the seventeenth century is much the same in Wales as it is in England. Persecuted and

crushed under the Stuarts, the Nonconformists of Wales took heart under the Commonwealth, and grew fairly strong in the hope of religious liberty. With the return of the old order in 1660 again, persecution and revenge became rampant. Nonconformists, and especially Baptists, were fairly strong by the end of the reign of Charles I.

In 1639, the union Church of Llanfaches, Monmouthshire, was formed, Independent in name, but consisting of both Baptists and Independents. The Senior minister, William Wroth, was an Independent, with William Thomas, a Baptist as Co-Pastor. Baptists were scattered throughout South and Mid-Wales. A Baptist Church was formed at Ilston, near Swansea, in 1649; others followed at Llanwenarth and Carmarthen in 1651. Soon Pembrokeshire, Radnorshire, Montgomeryshire and East Denbighshire followed suit.

The church at Ilston, now recognised as the first Baptist Church in Wales, was formed under the leadership of John Myles, and, for a short period, gathered within itself all the Baptists of South Wales, from Llanelly, in Carmarthenshire, right across Glamorgan to Abergavenny in Monmouthshire. John Myles, who had studied at Oxford, acted as chief pastor, worthily seconded by a few strong fellow-labourers such as Lewis Thomas of the Moor, near Porthcawl. Early in 1649 Myles and Thomas Proud visited the church at the Glass House, London, for instruction and guidance, if not also for baptism.

After the Restoration in 1660, persecution became rife, John Myles escaped and migrated to America, settling down at Rehoboth, Massachusetts, Vavassor Powell (1617-1670) was cast into prison, and after passing through thirteen of these places of torture, and enduring eleven years of imprisonment, entered upon his rest at the Fleet, London in 1670. Powell's successor, Henry Williams, of Ysgafell, spent eight years in prison, accompanied by his courageous wife during most of the time. Hundreds of Baptists, Quakers and Independents were led in bonds like cattle along the roads, huddled into filthy and overcrowded prisons and in some cases, for the lack of accommodation, compelled to sleep out in the open.

The Ejections of 1660 and 1662 meant comparatively little to the Baptists of Wales, as they had been accustomed to live independent of Government aid. They were of Nonconformist origin and did not regard themselves as secessions from the State Church. During the Commonwealth, they had generally declined to receive Government grants even when they were pressed upon them. The Rev. T. Shankland mentions forty-three Baptist ministers, who flourished during that period, and claims that at least thirty-five of their number had never received Government

aid. In 1655, a resolution was passed by the central and influential church at Llanwenarth, withdrawing from all association with ministers who received state pay. Both Methodist bodies had their early Church associations. John Wesley died a Churchman. The Welsh Calvinists regard 1811 as their year of formal separation from the Church of England. Their "Legal Deed" is dated 1826. Of course their Societies existed long before this. The historical references have their bearing upon our denominational consciousness to this day.

Wrexham District.

The dissenting movement at Wrexham was initiated by clergymen of the Established Church. Walter Cradoc was curate of this parish for nine or ten months in 1635. His powerful preaching grew great crowds. Taverns became empty and breweries were closed down. Companies of preachers went around the country as evangelists. Cradoc was driven away by the Bishop at the instigation of the Drink Traffic and the Farmers. Later he was succeeded by a fiery pupil, Morgan Llwyd o Wynedd (1619-1659) who also became curate of Wrexham and established the Nonconformist cause in town and district. The resultant church at Wrexham was later divided into three Churches: The Baptist Church of "The Old Meeting," "The Independent Church" at Chester Street with its Presbyterian traditions, and the Independent Church now at Salisbury Park.

V. Powell and Mid-Wales.

Vavassor Powell was the Apostle of Mid-Wales. After leaving Oxford he kept school and became a curate. Converted by Walter Cradoc, as the story goes, he became a powerful preacher and gathered about twenty congregations, in Montgomeryshire mainly, but also in Cardiganshire, known as "Vavassor Powell's People" or "The Montgomeryshire Church." The chief centres were at Llanbrynmair and Llanfyllin. At first the Mother Church at Llanbrynmair had Baptist Pastors. Powell was, however, an open-communionist and the churches he gathered were Union-Churches, with necessarily an unrestricted Communion table. In time the Baptist Pastors gave place to Independents and all the Churches, with one exception, were lost to the Baptist denomination.

Radnorshire.

Hugh Evans (1617-1656) was born near the confines of Radnorshire and Shropshire. In 1642, he was a member of the General Baptist Church at Coventry, a brotherhood so full of missionary zeal that it sent the young man as a missioner to his

own people in Wales. As a pupil of Jeremiah Ives, he contended much with Quakers and Paedo-baptists and had also to cross swords with the hot Calvinists of his day. He laboured hard and successfully in Radnorshire, Breconshire and parts of Montgomeryshire. "Hugh Evans's People" were strict in membership and Communion and the clashes between them and "Vavassor Powell's People" were frequent and hot.

South West Wales.

South West Wales, or the counties of Pembroke, Carmarthen and Cardigan also have their apostle in the person of William Jones Rhyd-Wilym. Historians are still contending as to the details of his story. His name is enshrined in the name Rhyd-Wilym—William's Ford. His Nonconformity placed him as a King's guest in Carmarthen Goal. There he found quite a number of Baptists among his fellow-prisoners and the divine ordinance soon became the subject of debate among them. No sooner was William Jones free than he made for the Olchon (or Longton) Baptists in order to be baptised. By dint of conviction, zeal and hard work, West Wales was transformed and the Baptist Churches of the whole region are thriving to this day.

Anglesey and Caernarvonshire.

The last general region that calls for attention is the *ultima thule* of Wales, Caernarvonshire and the Island County of Anglesey. Baptist Churches were numerous and thriving in other parts of Wales for a century and a half before attention was paid to these parts. At long last, however, a mission was arranged mainly through the interest and influence of the Rev. William Williams, J.P., of Cardigan. The campaign was opened in 1776, and soon a number of enthusiastic young ministers were at work, hailing chiefly from Pembrokeshire, where William Williams's influence was felt. The Lleyn peninsula had particular attention. In 1789, Christmas Evans came into south Caernarvonshire and was ordained as pastor of the Church at Salem and its many branches. The work prospered, nevertheless, in 1791, the young seraph-preacher was translated to become Primate of all Anglesey. At that time the diocese would contain about half a dozen small churches. By 1831, they numbered upwards of twenty, together with several branches. The great preacher stood supreme in the pulpit. Physically also he overtowered all, but was not celebrated either for tact or for the gift of organisation. Fortunately Mrs. Evans was rich in these qualities. Though diminutive in body she knew how to supplement her eminent husband's failings. On one occasion, Christmas Evans, in a fit of temper, expelled one of the more prominent members of one

of his churches. Arriving at the Manse, he reported the deed to his good wife, expecting her approval and confirmation. But Catrin sensed the situation, laying down the law with a finality that knew no pity. "What? Expelled the best member in the Church? You must go back and apologise and set things right at once. There is not a morsel of food for you here until you have done so. What next, I wonder?" Poor Christmas! He could do nothing but walk about and moan: "Petticoat government, petticoat government, petticoat government." In due time the giant obeyed his little queen. The clouds disappeared, and sunshine brought peace and joy once more. But good and wise Catrin's call hence came. The mighty preacher lost his guide, philosopher and friend. In his simplicity, he would have liked to be the one absolute authority in Church affairs, but twenty churches, and a number of strong fellow ministers had other ideas, and the increasing demands of Anglesey could not wait. Respect for past services, experience and age were not enough to make up for the impatience and lack of time of a man of sixty. Pulpit calls throughout the Principality were still numerous and exacting. Christmas Evans left Anglesey in 1826, alone, forlorn and without his guardian angel, Catrin. His life at Caerflili, Cardiff and Carnarvon, his marriage with his old servant, Mary, arranged for entirely by others, together with his mighty preaching and temperance work are vital parts of the Baptist epic in Wales.

(To be continued)

E. K. JONES.

Marriage Covenants of the General Baptists.

SOME twelve months ago there appeared an article in the *Quarterly* on Barton-in-the-Beans from the pen of Percy Austin. Recently there was presented to the Melbourne Baptist Church an historically interesting document relating to the same group of General Baptists of the eighteenth century, namely—the Marriage Covenant of Francis Smith, the founder and from 1760 to 1796 one of its first pastors.

It is engrossed on parchment about twenty-one inches square, stamped with a five shilling stamp, and provides contemporary evidence of the method of solemnizing marriages among their adherents.

There is evidence that marriages among General Baptists were allowed in their meeting-houses, and were regarded as valid as far back as 1689. This was the year of the passing of the Toleration Act under William III giving to Dissenters, within its very restricted limits, freedom of worship generally.

Thomas Grantham's *Truth and Peace, or the last and most friendly Debate concerning Infant Baptism* published in 1689, has a postscript on the "Manner of marriages among Baptised Believers.

His pamphlet opens with the words—"Some of the Baptised Believers having been prosecuted as offenders for not conforming to the Ceremonies of the Ring and kneeling to the Altar in Celebration of marriages; we shall therefore humbly offer our reasons why we dissent from these ceremonies: and why also our marriages are good in the eye of the Law (for the substance of them) the omission of these ceremonies notwithstanding. . . ."

Grantham sets out to show that such marriages are valid in the sight of God; that Baptised Believers are not against public solemnization of marriage according to the law of the land; that the law of the land does not null or make void the marriages of Baptised Believers, but does rather establish them; and that there is no necessity for having a priest to perform the ceremony, etc.

In developing his thesis he quotes various precedents and authorities, and himself gives the form of Marriage Covenant which was in use among the General Baptists. This reads as follows:—

"These are to testify to all men, that we, A.B. of &c. and

C.D. of &c. have, the day of the date hereof, entered into the covenant state of marriage, according to a solemn contract heretofore made between ourselves, and with the consent of such as are concerned in order thereunto; and we do now, in the presence of Almighty God and the witnesses hereafter named, ratify the said contract and covenant-act of marriage this day verbally made: in both which we do, in the fear of God, mutually and solemnly, and for our parts respectively, promise, in the strength of God, to live together in the state of marriage, according to God's ordinance, from this day forward; to love each other as husband and wife, and faithfully perform all the duties to which we are bound by God's the Lord by death shall separate us. In testimony whereof, law, and the good laws of the land, in that case provided, till we have hereunto set our hands, the . . . day of &c.

A.B.
C.D.

" We whose names are subscribed, do testify, That the above said A.B. and C.D. the day and the year abovesaid, did mutually take each other into the state of marriage, acknowledging the contract and covenant, and ratifying the same by word, and by the subscription thereof as abovesaid. In witness whereof, we do hereunto set our hands, the day and year abovesaid.

E.F.
G.H. &c. &c."

(Quoted from Adam Taylor *History of General Baptists*, vol. I. p. 450 note.)

Adam Taylor adds, " this appears to have been the established form of the Marriage Covenant. The copy of the certificate of the marriage of John Hursthouse and Sarah Green in 1716 now lies before us; and is precisely in the terms of this published by Grantham in 1689."

This right to be married in their own meeting-houses was withdrawn from all dissenters except Jews and Quakers under the Act of George II. (26 Geo. II. c. 33 par. 8 and 18) which came into force on 25th March, 1754.

Prior to 1753, the date of Francis Smith's marriage, the Barton people had already availed themselves of the right of solemnizing marriages among themselves. Thus about 1750, John Aldridge, one of the first seven members who founded the Barton Society, had married Elizabeth Cooper in the chapel there. They were afterwards cited before a spiritual court for living in adultery; not so much to contest the validity of the marriage, which after full investigation was upheld and the prosecutor made

to give satisfaction to the injured persons, as to vilify the parties and bring the Barton people into contempt.

The Marriage Covenant of Francis Smith, which may have been similar to that in use among the Barton people, differs considerably from that given by Thomas Grantham as will be seen on comparing them; an exact copy of that of Francis Smith being as follows:—

> IT Having been publickly declared in Three several Meetings of a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters called Independents in their Licensed Meeting-House at Melbourn in the County of Derby: That there is a Marriage intended between Francis Smith of the parish of Melbourn and County of Derby Batchelor; And Elizabeth Toone of the Parish and County aforesaid Spinster: which publication being agreeable (not only to the just and holy Holy Law of God but also) to the good and wholesome Laws of this Land; in order that every one concerned may have the opportunity of making all suitable enquiry for their satisfaction, and that nothing may be done clandestinely. And upon due enquiry and deliberate consideration thereof by the said Congregation, it is by them allowed, there appearing no reason for objection, they both appearing clear of all others, and having also free consent of all persons whether Relations or others.
>
> NOW these are to certifie all whom it may concern; that for the Accomplishing of their said Marriage, that they the said Francis Smith and Elizabeth Toone, did this Twentieth day of August one Thousand seven Hundred and fifty Three appear in a Publick Assembly of the aforesaid Congregation and others met together for that purpose in their Meeting-House aforesaid; and in a Solemn manner He the said Francis Smith standing up and taking the said Elizabeth Toone by the hand (she likewise standing up) did publickly declare as followeth (Viz) Brethren and Sisters, in the fear of the Lord, and in the presence of this Assembly whom I desire to be my witnesses that I Francis Smith take this our dear Sister Elizabeth Toone, to be my Lawful Wife promising thro' Divine assistance, to be unto her a faithful and loving Husband, till it shall please the Lord by Death to separate us.
>
> AND then and there in the said Assembly, she the said Elizabeth Toone, in like manner taking him the said Francis Smith by the Hand did likewise publickly declare as followeth (Viz) Brethren and Sisters, in the fear of the Lord and in the presence of this Assembly, whom I desire to be my Witnesses; that I Elizabeth Toone take this our dear Brother

Francis Smith to be my Lawful Husband promising thro' Divine assistance to be unto him a faithful and loving Wife till it shall please the Lord by Death to separate us.

AND the said Francis Smith and Elizabeth Toone, as a further Confirmation thereof, and in Testimony thereunto, did then and there set their hands and Seals.

WE whose names are hereunto Subscribed, being present (amongst others) at the Solemnizing of the above Marriage, and Subscription in the manner aforesaid, as Witnesses thereunto, have also to these presents Subscribed our Names. the Day and year above written.

FRANCIS SMITH
ELIZABETH SMITH

SAMUEL HARRISON
THOMAS HUTCHINSON
ABRAHAM BOOTH
RALPH BURROWS
JOSEPH FOLLOWS

ROBERT CHESLYN
JAMES MITCHELL
JNO. ALVEY
NATHANIEL PICKERING
HENRY MORLEY
JOSEPH DONISTHORPE JUNIOR
ROBART GREGORY
THOS. TOMPSON
JOS. HOLINGWORTH

WILLIAM KENDRICK
JOHN WHYATT
SAMUEL DEACON
JOSEPH DONISTHORPE
THOMAS ROBINSON
THOS: TOONE
ROBERT BRONN
WILL EARP

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MARRIAGE COVENANT:

1. The most striking feature is the almost precise similarity of wording (as regards the description of the ceremony and the declaration made by the parties to the marriage) to that in use among the Quakers. (See Edward Grubb—*What is Quakerism?* J. W. Graham—*The Faith of a Quaker.*)

This close similarity, I suggest, can only be accounted for by borrowing. It is interesting to note that there was a Quaker Society and Meeting-house in Melbourne. The Society is now extinct and the Meeting-house and Burial-ground have become a cottage and garden.

In his search for spiritual enlightenment and before he became acquainted with the Barton people, Francis Smith had attended the Quaker meetings. "It fell in my way," he says, "oftentimes to hear the people called Quakers and to read their books. . . . " He would thus be familiar with their procedure.

2. On the name—"Protestant Dissenters called Independents." From their commencement in 1743 to 1745, in which year their first Meeting-house was built at Barton, they had no distinctive name, but simply regarded themselves as Dissenters.

Having become organised into a Society with a Meeting-house it became necessary, in the interests of protecting their property, to assume some distinctive name by which they should be known. After a good deal of thought on the matter they called themselves Independents; not because they agreed either with the doctrines

or discipline of those who were already called by that name, but because, like them, they were independent of other religious societies, and because they determined to act in religious matters for themselves uninfluenced by external control.

It was not until the year 1755, some twelve years after their commencement, that they adopted the Ordinance of Believers' Baptism, being led to that position by their reading of the scriptures; and it was not until 1760, in which year they divided into five groups of churches, that they became General Baptists in name as well as sentiments.

3. The large number of Witnesses who subscribed their names to the Marriage Covenant was probably in order to make impossible any question by malicious persecutors as to the validity of the marriage.

William Kendrick, as joint Ruling-Elder with Francis Smith over the Barton people, probably presided as the Minister for the occasion. His signature appears on the document in a ruled space immediately below those of Francis and Elizabeth Smith, where the name of the presiding minister and chief witness would be expected to appear.

Of the others—John Whyatt, Samuel Deacon, Joseph Donisthorpe, Nathaniel Pickering, and Abraham Booth were all preachers. Abraham Booth afterwards left them, becoming pastor of the Particular Baptist Church in Little Prescot Street, London.

Thomas Hutchinson introduced the preachers into Loughborough, and thus began the Baptist witness there. It was through conversation with him in the year 1764, that Dan Taylor became John Alvey that the cause at Kirkby-Woodhouse really began. Joseph Follows was an honoured family name connected with Castle Donington. Thomas Toone, Thomas Robinson, Will Earp, Robart Gregory, Samuel Harrison, Ralph Burrows, Joseph Holingworth, Thomas Tompson, and James Mitchell are all Melbourne names. Also Henry Morley. Joseph Donisthorpe, junior, needs no comment; while the names of Robert Cheslyn and Robert Bronn I have not been able to trace.

4. Their ideas concerning marriage. This was regarded as a solemn and serious undertaking, only to be embarked on after due notice of their intentions had been given to the Church, and with the Church's sanction. They had a high view of marriage as befitted their Christian witness and as was expressed in their home and family life.

Marriage was restricted among them to members of the Church. For many years marriages of members with those outside their communion were not welcomed; every effort was made to dissuade such unions, as being unscriptural and unwise. "Be

not unequally yoked with unbelievers. . . . " II. Cor. 6. 14. If such marriages were persisted in, the offending member was cited before the Church for remonstrance and discipline. Instances can be cited from the Melbourne Church Book which dates back to 1773.

There is a further point of connection here with the Quakers who likewise as far as possible restricted marriage to those among their adherents.

Indeed this question of marriage outside the community was an often debated issue among the Churches and at the Association Conferences and Meetings where the subject was brought in the form of a " case " for decision and guidance—particularly in the years 1782, 1793, and again as late as 1829[1]

In the Melbourne Church Book as early as June 1775, prior even to the discussion of the question in Association Meetings, a case of marriage of a member with " an excommunicated person who remained impenitent " caused consideration to be given to the subject, and to what was felt to be the guidance of the scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments in the matter, " and after mature thought thereon it was unanimously agreed by both ministers and people then present, that members so acting henceforward (except satisfactory proof is given to the Church of their being penitents) shall be excluded our fellowship."

It is interesting to note what these scriptures were. " Scripture that was Considered relating to the above affair was these following viz : Exodus 34. 16., Deut. 7. 39., I. Kings 11. 2., Ezra chaps. 9-10., Nehem. 10. 30., 13. 23-24., I. Cor. 7.39., II. Cor. 6. 14 to the end. Authority for Exclusion founded Chiefly on Acts 3. 22-23."

This marriage question agitated the Church many times. In December 1783, as several members had married outside the community, and as " it was expected it would be a growing practice and thought to have a pernitious tendency . . . the Minits of the Association held at Melbourne in 1782 was read, in which was a Case from Longford on the very Subject proposed and answered." It was " judged that the answers to the Quereys in the above Minits would be proper for a rule of the Churches Conduct respecting the above Case in futer time."

This view of marriage probably accounts in great measure for the fact of family inter-relationship which still persists, as for example, in Melbourne.

S. W. A. Moisey.

[1] See *The Minutes of the General Assembly of General Baptists*, edited by Whitley : also Wood's *Condensed History of the General Baptists of the New Connexion*, p. 282.

"The Distressed State of the Country . . ."

The background of poverty in the Baptist Churches of Lancashire during the Industrial Revolution, 1760-1832.

JOHN WESLEY wrote in his diary (February 8th, 1753) "In the afternoon I visited many of the sick; but such scenes, who could see unmoved? There are none such to be found in a Pagan country. If any of the Indians in Georgia were sick (which indeed exceedingly rarely happened, till they learned gluttony and drunkenness from the Christians), those who were near him, gave him whatever he wanted. O who will convert the English into honest Heathens?

On Friday and Saturday, I visited as many more as I could. I found some in their cells under ground; others in their garrets, half starved with cold and hunger, added to weakness and pain. But I found not one of them unemployed, who was able to crawl about the room. So wickedly, devilishly false is that common objection: "They are poor, only because they are idle." If you saw these things with your own eyes, could you lay out money in ornaments or superfluities?"[1]

There is plenty of evidence of political and clerical insensibility to the sufferings of the poor, though throughout the period the amount spent on poor relief continued to grow. The minute book of the Church at Accrington (November 20, 1816) on a day for prayer and fasting says " . . . multitudes crowd together with great anxiety to form petitions and offer them to a temporal prince totally destitute of grace and almost of the tender feelings of humanity, desirous that their sorrow may be alleviated and that they may obtain more of that meat which perisheth . . . " Dr. Whitley (*Baptists of North-West England,* p.171) points out that the delegates to the Association meetings held at Burslem in 1816 travelled by the same road by which the Blanketeers attempted to reach London, "but the Association was like Gallio as yet and cared for none of these things. Its outlook was still on purely denominational concerns, and the Churches were exhorted

[1] *The Journal of John Wesley,* Everyman Edition, Vol. II., p. 246.

to take an interest in the Irish Society and the B.M.S. being thus educated into some sense of corporate responsibility." Yet in 1792, Joshua Wood of Salendine Nook was attacking the barrenness of the hyper-Calvinism of many of the members. In the Circular Letter, "The Uniformity of Christian Zeal," he says, "Some professors have a kind of zeal for the doctrines of the Gospel which is not approved of God. When they hear these they smile, hearken diligently, and are ready to say within themselves, 'O brave! This is preaching'; but when they have duties strictly enforced from Divine Authority, and from Gospel motives, then they put on a frowning countenance, soon drop their attention and say, 'This is poor legal stuff, and the preachers of it are half Arminians, if not altogether so.' But the zeal of such persons is not genuine, and their wickedness in slighting duty is exceedingly vile, so that we are at a loss for a name fully to express its atrocious nature." It is true that there are no pu lic resolutions until 1811, when the Association thanked the London Committee for stopping Lord Sidmouth's Bill, but year after year there are notes in the Circular Letters on the state of the country. In 1807, The Itinerant Society was first suggested because of "the very destitute state of some parts of this country and the depressed state of many of our Churches." In 1809 the minutes record "Many (Churches) complain of embarrassed circumstances on account of badness of trade and dearness of provisions." In 1817, the Association agreed, "That it be recommended to the Churches to take into consideration the distressed state of the country and to observe such a day as may be most convenient as a day of fasting and prayer." It will be clear from other extracts from Church minute books and letters that the Churches took the only action of which they were then capable. They helped to bear each other's burdens.

The congregations were almost exclusively made up of poor, working people. There were merchants and mill-owners here and there—Ainsworth and Kelsall at Ogden and Rochdale, James Bury at Accrington, and the Hope family at Liverpool—but on the whole there were "not many mighty, not many noble" as this world judges. The minutes at Ogden and Accrington faithfully record the class struggles between the weavers and the owners, in which the Church was called to arbitrate. The Registers of Births and Deaths (many in Somerset House) record, though not as often as one could wish, the occupation of the father of the child or other person buried in the Church yard. At Colne, for example, between 1814 and 1816 twelve children were registered, ten of them the children of weavers. The registers at Ogden show, incidentally, the beginnings of the displacement of wool by cotton in Lancashire.

REGISTER OF BURIALS.

1793	November 14.	Sam Clegg.	Woollen Manufacturer.
1794	January 27.	John Whitehead.	ditto.
	May 26.	Benjamin Chadwick.	ditto.
		James Wild.	Husbandman.
	August 26.	Samuel Fielding.	Woollen Manufacturer.
	December 17.	John Gartside.	ditto.
	May 25.	Thomas Brown.	ditto.

REGISTER OF BIRTHS.

1794	July 20.	Benjamin Gartside.	Woollen Manufacturer.
	August 23.	Edmund Robinson.	Cotton Manufacturer.
	June 4.	Edmund Milne.	ditto.
	July 18.	Daniel Knott.	Woollen Manufacturer.
1795	August 7.	John Wade.	Cotton Manufacturer.
1797	October 20.	Eli Fielding.	Innkeeper.
1798	April 29.	Sam Brearley.	Cotton Manufacturer.
1801	February 7.	Eli Unsworth.	ditto.
1802	March 28.	Charles Taylor.	Innkeeper.

The Registers of the General Baptist Church, Burnley (Ebenezer) show the members about equally divided between farming and woollen industry (spinners, combers and weavers.) This does not mean that the two occupations were completely separate. It was a common thing for a farmer to have a few looms for his women folk to operate in their spare time and also for a hand-loom weaver to have his plot of land to eke out his earnings. Jesse Ainsworth, uncle of Henry Kelsall, who appears to have been treasurer of the Church at Ogden "supplemented his farming with woollen manufacture in a little mill at Ogden." (MS lent by Lord Rochdale, great grandson of Henry Kelsall.) At least four ministers worked at the loom—John Hirst of Bacup, who went back to the loom during his ministry to discharge a debt due to a failure in business, Edmund Whitaker of Burnley, Richard Ashworth of Lumb and William Gadsby who served two apprenticeships, first to ribbon weaving and later to shoddy weaving. The records of the Church at West Street, Rochdale throw another light on the social strata from which the members were drawn. Out of the first hundred members who signed the Church Covenant, over forty (probably forty-six) could not sign their names but made a mark.

The minute books of the Churches, the memoirs of ministers, sermons and Circular Letters provided abundant evidence of the poverty which existed everywhere among Baptist people during this period. John Wesley, in the entry which begins this essay, describes the homes of the people in cells and garrets. William

Pendered, minister of the York Street Chapel, Manchester, records in his diary on June 15, 1812. "During the past fortnight I have been engaged in calling on the poor children belonging to the Sunday School, and in the cellars and garrets in which I have been, I have met with many such instances of extreme wretchedness. Hundreds of poor families have nothing to eat but potatoes, and of these they are unable to obtain sufficient to satisfy the cravings of hunger."[2] The Sunday School at York Street had 424 children on the books when the School was visited by Government investigators collecting evidence for the report on "The State of children employed in manufactories in the United Kingdom, 25th April, to 18th June, 1816." Two hundred and eighty-four children were present on the Sunday of the investigations, eighty-six of them worked in factories. The Report states that the children were asked how old they were when they began to work in the factories. Four of them were five years old, five were five and a half, and five were six years old, The letters and memoir of William Gadsby confirm this picture, adding greater detail and continuing it up to the middle of the century.[3]

The poverty of the town and village Churches was no less than in Manchester. The Sunday School at Accrington was closed down for December and January, 1804-5, because the children had neither the shoes nor the clothes to withstand the cold. And not merely children. The Church Meeting at Ogden (1823, February 7th) was poorly attended "through the severity of the weather. After the devotional exercises it was agreed that a collection should be made for the poor." The minute book from Rochdale tells a similar tale. "February 28th, 1801. Times still continue to be calamitous and the poor want for bread. April 4th, 1801. Betty Bagshaw says that the cause of her absenting is with herself. She is poor and can scarcely find the necessaries to come, but wishes not to be cut off." It is necessary to remember that the members had to walk to Church meetings sometimes three and four miles over exposed country to understand the frequent references in minute books to the weather. The most revealing records are to be found in letters sent by Richard Ashworth, minister at Lumb, to the Particular Baptist Fund in London applying for help towards his salary. These letters are copied into the Church minute book. He sent the first letter on January 17th, 1829. He wrote, "It is not pleasant to me to think of becoming burdensome to our Christian friends, but necessity urges us to apply. . . . Neither my wife nor I has any private property and indeed, we have

[2] *Letters and Memoirs of the Late Mr. Wm. Pendered of Manchester*, by his son, 1819.

[3] *A Memoir of the Late Wm. Gadsby*, by Jn. Gadsby, 1844.

scarcely bare necessary utensils so that I am almost ashamed when Christian friends call upon us. . . . We are neither of us, my wife nor I, engaged in any secular occupation besides weaving calico by which we earn (both of us together) in general four shillings and sixpence a week." The letter is endorsed by the deacons who state that they are able to give their pastor £13. 10s. 3d. for his salary during the previous year and have made a collection for the Fund of 19s. 3d. "which though but small, is all that our poor people could contribute." The next letter was sent in September of the same year requesting the gift of some books, as he had "scarcely any books and no means of purchasing any . . . " He again states that, "We have no secular concern beside weaving calico which my wife labours at, and I when I have opportunity, but owing to my increasing labours and calls from home I think we have not earned (both of us together) on an average above three shillings in the week. . . . " The deacons' letter of endorsement shows a slight increase in the salary to £14 6s. 0d., but the collection for the Fund is down. "We have made a collection which amounts to £0 10s. 1d., which though small, you would not wonder at if you were acquainted with the distress of our neighbourhood. . . . " The third letter was sent up to London in the summer of 1830. His financial affairs had suffered with the growth of the Church and its activities. "We . . . are not engaged in any secular concern except weaving calico which my wife labours at and I also when not called off elsewhere, but as we have been getting a Chapel this year I have been from home a great part of my time and can scarcely help getting into debt."

With a pastor who was one of themselves and who appears to have written the minutes, it is not surprising that they are full of concern for the poverty of the congregation.

> "1829. September 26th. Preparation Meeting. Agreed that each member who is able pay one half-penny per week in order to defray small expenses of the Church."

The letter to the Association meeting at Shipley in 1830, describes the erection of the new Chapel. "We are erecting a new Chapel to the joy of the neighbourhood, many in which are working hard (that is on the building itself) and pinching themselves of the necessities of life in order to give as much as possible towards the Chapel. . . . " The Chapel was finished and the pews brought from the old building and installed. "The pews when let were first ordered to be 14d. the fronts; next 1s.; next 11d.; next again 9d., but at the Pastor's request they were lowered to 1s. the fronts and in proportion backwards." But by the next year the

rents had to be reduced again. "1832. April 28th. The Conversation meeting. Agreed to lower the seats a penny each through the Chapel on account of the extreme distress."

Richard Ashworth was not alone in sharing the poverty of his people. It was the lot of every minister who came to Lancashire. When Thomas Muckley of Wem was invited to the pastorate at Ogden he was offered the munificent sum of £50, but the Church was able to offer this extraordinary amount only because: "The old man Ainsworth (farmer and mill-owner) told us we did not need to fear the money would be made up." Richard Ashworth had to be content with what his people could find which rose from £13. 10s. 3d. in 1829, when he commenced his ministry to £18 in 1831. John Jackson who went to Accrington in 1817 had no idea what his salary would be! In the letter accepting the call he wrote: "I have only to add that I cast myself and my family upon the care of an indulgent Providence and under that upon your Christian liberality for support, and humbly hope that so long as God shall enable me to serve you faithfully I shall not fare the worse for not having stipulated any specific salary." His hopes might not have been very high had he read the minute of a meeting held a few days before his acceptance. "Privation of trade and consequently increased poverty agitated much fear whether all the Church could produce by way of temporal support, would be adequate to the minister's necessity. . . ." Richard Ashworth had three children to support out of his meagre income. George Dean took with him eight children when he moved from Burnley to Lineholme, Todmorden. At a meeting on January 17th, 1819, the congregation was asked to approve the coming of "Brother Dean with his family." The meeting went on to pass a second resolution which said, "We think it best that Bro. Dean has a certain sum quarterly to depend on for his labours. Agreed to give him £16 yearly till we are able to do more for him." The Rev. John Walker who has collected what information there is about the early days of Ebenezer, Burnley says: "So far as we know he never did receive a larger allowance than this mere pittance . . . The husband of one of his daughters died and left two children for his widow to support. She, with her children, removed to her father for assistance and protection. His aged mother about the same time lost her second husband. He took her and her daughter who was in a very infirm state into his house. After the two last removed back to Halifax he gave them something regularly to their support till they died. All out of £16 a year."

It is hardly to be wondered at that when the ministers died early in life they left widows and orphans quite unprovided for.

The Baptist periodical literature of the time contains many appeals for public subscriptions for families "left in necessitous circumstances." James Hargreaves in his *Life of Hirst*, gives details of two cases in Lancashire.[4] John Hindle of St. George's Road, Manchester, "died in 1800 leaving a widow and several children to mourn their loss. His family was well provided for by the liberality of religious friends. . . ." The circumstances of the family of Benjamin Dickenson do not appear to have been so comfortable. "The public papers at Waterford (he had removed there from Pendle Hill in 1806) noticed his death in a very respectable manner. They passed many and just encomiums upon his abilities, character and piety; and used successful endeavours to excite the sympathy and generosity of the public, in behalf of a bereaved, mourning widow and five children. Much was done by the benevolence of both Islands to place the family *above the reach of absolute poverty.*"

The public subscriptions for the widows and orphans of ministers makes a convenient point at which to turn to the way in which the poverty of the Church's members was met. It is impossible to say that what was done was in any way adequate to meet the amount of distress, but remembering that the majority of the members were poor themselves, what they did to relieve the poorest can only be described as a sacrificial outpouring of Christian charity. If the Association took no notice of the march of the Blanketeers, it was not because they were unmoved by the poverty which drove the weavers to such calamitous protests. The Churches relieved poverty directly, where they could; they began a system of self-help and education which raised up working class leaders. What Chesterton said of the first century is true of the Baptist Churches of Lancashire during the eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. "The spirit of the early century produced great men because it believed that men were great. It made strong men by encouraging weak men. Its education, its public habits, its rhetoric were all addressed to encouraging the greatness of everybody. And by encouraging the greatness in everybody, it naturally encouraged the superlative greatness in some."[5] This is not the place to describe how the Churches encouraged hand-loom weavers to take public office. The ill-prepared, pathetic adventure of the Blanketeers was soon routed by the defenders of the old order, but they were not able to hold back the rising tide of education of which the Free Churches were the consistent champions.

The Church at Rochdale drew up a declaration of doctrine

[4] *The Life and Memoir of the late Rev. John Hirst*, by James Hargreaves, 1816, p. 158.

[5] *Charles Dickens*, by G. K. Chesterton, p. 6.

in 1805, and followed it by a statement of the duties incumbent upon all members in the form of a Covenant which members had to sign. Two of the duties laid down bear on our subject.

> "5. That we will in Church affairs make no difference or distinction but condescend to the meanest person or service for the edification of the brethren.
>
> 14. . . . And if any of our brethren are reduced to want we will willingly communicate to them assistence as their necessities shall require."

The minute books of the Church, however, are not very helpful in showing how the assistance was given. Those at Ogden, Accrington, and the Coldhouse Chapel, Manchester contain some information. The members at Ogden on February 15th, 1821: "Agreed that John Clegg and John Garside, wait upon Mary Taylor at Bradley to know whether she is in want of help from the Church." The members of the Church at Accrington on August 10th, 1821: "Agreed to make a collection for the poor members of the Church." On September 7th, 1821 ". . . James Entwistle related his interview with Alice Pearson—she complained of want of clothing. . . . " On March 8th, 1822, "a collection to be made for the poor." Few attended the Church meeting on February 7th, 1823, "through the severity of the weather. After the devotional exercises it was agreed that a collection should be made for the poor." On January 12th, 1827: "It was agreed that a collection be made for Martha Foster of Haslingden Grain." On July 11th, 1828, ". . . a prosposal to form a Benevolent Society refered to consideration till next meeting." On August 8th, 1828, the rules of a society were read to the Church and Congregation and the Society was called, "The Benevolent Society for the Poor." On December 11th, 1829: "Agreed that there be a collection in the Chapel some Sunday before long for Jane Madin who is in great distress at present." The collection was made on Christmas Day and a Christmas Box given to Jane Madin of £1 2s. 6d. On June 11th, 1830, it was "resolved that Ann Cooper and Mary Holker endeavour to collect some relief for Ann Pilkington who is ill." The charity of the Coldhouse Chapel, Manchester, is innocently told on a small piece of paper pinned to the first page of the Church Roll and Account Book (1832-1874.)[6] It is quite obviously the statement prepared by the distributor of the Church's alms. It reads as follows.

[6] Church Roll and Account Book of the Old Scotch Baptist, Thorniley Brow, later the Coldhouse Chapel, Shudehill, Manchester, 1832-1874. In the Manchester Public Library.

"Church members," 1st April, 1836, £2 2. 9.

Mary Heywood	...	5	0	Not of the Church:			
Hannah Mather	...	5	0	Kenyon	... ...	5	0
Mary Edwards	...	2	6	E. White	... ...	2	0
Betty Burrows	...	2	6	S. Burgess	... ...	2	6
Willm. Petrie	...	5	0	Brett	... ...		6
Mary English	...	5	0	M. Edwards lodger		2	6
Jas. Carruthers	...	5	3½				
		£1	10 3½			12	6

The first thing to notice about this statement is that the entire collection was distributed. This was the normal practice of the Church. The accounts show that the Church's income was divided into two parts, the larger part being given to the poor and the rest spent on Communion wine. In 1832 the total income was £34 3s. 5d., of which £23 9s. 0d. was distributed; in 1833 the income was £34 10s. 4d., of which £23 9s. 4d. was distributed; in 1834 the income was £34 16s. 6d., and £23 16s. 1d. given away, and so on. In 1836 there was an addition £2 10s. 0d. to the total given away "for Joseph William's funeral." The second thing to notice is that "M.E.", presumably the Mary Edwards who appears in the list, and "M.H.", the Mary Heywood, appear many times in the Church accounts. "M.E.", seems to have received a regular five shillings a week for years. William Gadsby writing to Mr. Tiptaft in 1840 says, "I think there are about ninty upon our regular poor lists."[7]

Gadsby's exertions on behalf of the poor of Manchester were no doubt prompted by his own knowledge of poverty. His father was a road-maker and there were six children. John Gadsby says, "As soon as he was able to hold a child in his arms, even while seated, he had to fill the occupation of nurse, and he was then barefooted and ragged." At the age of thirteen he was apprenticed to a ribbon weaver. At twenty-two he began a second apprenticeship to a shoddy weaver, for which he had to pay 20s. down and 1s. a week for twelve months to learn the trade. He was so poor when he married that, "All he and his wife had was her umbrella which they sold to buy a deal table. He has been heard to say that he knew what it was to thank God for a single twopence sent by a friend."[8] No wonder that when he came to Manchester and worked among poverty he worked incessantly to beg money and clothes to relieve the distress. *The Manchester Gazette*, (December 9th, 1826) said, "We understand that the Rev. Mr. Gadsby, who by his praiseworthy exertions for the poor of this

[7] *Sermons, Fragments of Sermons and Letters by William Gadsby of Manchester*, 1884.

[8] *A Memoir of W. Gadsby*, by his son John Gadsby.

town in canvassing among his friends in London, obtained twenty cwt. of cast-off clothes (the carriage and the packing cost him £18) still continues to exert himself in acts of benevolence. We learn from very good authority that he has purchased and distributed within the last week ten pairs of blankets, four or five pieces of flannel, and that some of the members of his congregation have copied their pastor's laudable example." A study of his hymns, sermons and letters shows that this was not charity in the narrow sense, but proceeded from a lively and indignant concern for the condition of the poor.

The poverty of ministers was relieved in the way mentioned above. The Particular Baptist Fund in London made small grants to necessitous cases. But the amounts were exceedingly small though they were accepted with pathetic gratitude by the well-nigh starving ministers. Richard Ashworth whose letter we have quoted, received a grant of £6 to add to the £13 his congregation gave him, and the four shillings and sixpence a week he and his wife earned weaving calico. But it is clear from his letters that all ministers who could were expected to implement their salaries by teaching. In the first letter he says, "Neither of us as yet keep a school, and being inconveniently situated, we cannot at present attend to it." In the second letter asking for a gift of books he refers again to teaching. "Neither of us keep a school. In the present distress, and especially in our poor neighbourhood, there are scarcely any families who can afford to send their children to a weekday school." Hargreaves at Ogden, Littlewood at Rochdale, and Harbottle at Accrington all turned to teaching to provide a necessary and welcome addition to the Church gifts. Prof. Norman Sykes says, "The addition of the office of schoolmaster to that of curate or parish priest was a recognised means of eking out the inadequate stipends of curacies and poor benefices. The seventy-eighth canon 'Curates desirous to teach to be licensed before others' specially provided for this, in parishes lacking a public school, by decreeing that curates of the degree of M.A., or B.A., who were willing to teach children 'for the better increase of their living and training up of children in principles of true religion' should receive licence thereto from the Ordinary in preference to any other person."[9]

William Jackson, the minister of the Coldhouse Chapel, noted above for its generosity, had a short way with the poverty of ministers. Let them work in a secular occupation. He wrote a rather bitter pamphlet entitled "The duty of Christian Pastors to support themselves—illustrated in a series of letters addressed to Mr. J. Bennett, tutor of Rotherham Academy, containing

[9] "The Church," by Prof. N. Sykes, in *Johnson's England*, footnote to pp. 25, 26.

remarks on his sermon entitled 'The obligation of the Churches to support their ministers.'" To receive a salary from the Church is to "barter with the heavenly treasures of God and make merchandise of his professing people." Ministers are like men in other trades "wherein remuneration is proportionate to ability and the highest bidder generally obtains their services." In reply to the objection that if pastors were not supported by the Church they would soon be left without them he retorted, 'They would be left without hirelings who care not for the sheep, and that they may be so left is one reason why pastors are enjoined to labour with their own hands."

To end this survey let us look at the major sufferers in times of poverty—the children. The registers of births and deaths are probably very incomplete, but one gets the impression from them that deaths among children were numerous. "Progress in the attack on mortality figures was slow. 'You must remember,' said Johnson when consoling Boswell for the loss of a child, 'that to keep three out of four is more than your share. Mrs. Thrale has but four out of eleven.'"[10] And it is not surprising that it should be so when conditions in the town are remembered. William Pendered's picture of his Sunday School children living in cellars and garrets has already been quoted. George Gould, who gave evidence before the committee of inquiry into the condition of children in factories, was asked, "Do you know that many of these persons (who did not work in factories) work in damp cellars, or unwholesome garrets, very irregularly, and frequently dissipating their wages, wasting their wages, wasting their health by playing and drinking on Mondays and working fourteen or fifteen hours often on the other days?"[11] The investigator at the York Street Sunday School selected twenty children of "delicate and unhealthy appearance." Eighteen of these worked in factories. James Phillips Kay (afterwards Sir Kay Shuttleworth) in "The Moral and Physical condition of the working classes employed in the cotton manufacture in Manchester, 1832," says of the children that they were "ill fed, dirty, ill clothed, exposed to cold and neglect; and in consequence more than half of the offspring of the poor (as may be proved by the bills of mortality of the town) die before they have completed their fifth year. The strongest survive; but the same causes which destroy the weakest, impair the vigour of the more robust; and hence the children of the manufacturing population are proverbially pale and sallow, though not generally emaciated nor the subjects of disease." The children in the country probably fared

[10] "Industry and Trade," by H. Heaton, in *Johnson's England*, p. 228.

[11] "State of children employed in manufactories of the U.K. 1816," p. 96f.

better. "Outside the towns many, but by no means all, had the use of some piece of land, while the northern wife combined dexterity with the needle with ability to bake a large variety of bread and cakes."[12] How large a variety may perhaps be seen in a home-made rhyme by John Lord, schoolmaster at Bacup. "Beginning with Christmas, he carries us down through Candlemas to Shrovetide, seven days before Easter, the time when 'Pancakes are in their prime'; and when 'Fig-pies come thick and fast' we are fully reminded that Mid-Lent with its dainty Simnels is near at hand. . . .

> Now spiced bread and Christmas boxes,
> Cheese and cakes and tarts and ale—
> All for modest lads and lasses,
> Living in Rossendale.[13]

But even in the country where children worked for their parents in their homes the children's working life began early. Defoe says of the Yorkshire clothier's home which he saw on his tour, ". . . scarce any Thing above four Years old, but its Hands were sufficient for its own Support."[14] John Hirst began work at seven setting cards for his brother.

It must not be thought, however, that either the children or their parents, at least those who belonged to Baptist Chapels, lived lives of unmixed gloom. Edward Nuttall, historian of the Church at Lumb says that until the new chapel was built, parents and children went over the hills to Goodshaw. "They carried their dinner under their arms, as an old member now amongst us, who was one that crossed the rugged hills to Goodshaw some sixty years ago tells us. He says, 'there have been loads of currant cake carried over to Goodshaw on a Sunday and eaten there for dinner.' It is said by many of the children of our pious ancestors that it was no uncommon thing in those days for them to be roused out of a warm bed in the dark during the winter months in order to ensure their being at the Sunday School in time!' . . . They were often heard singing some of the songs of Zion as they went their way and hence could not fail to be reminded of the Jews going to Jerusalem to worship."[15] Singing for the people of the Dean valley was more than a past-time. It was, next to their religion, what made life worth living. The first minister of the congregation at Lumb and then at Goodshaw was John Nuttall, the founder of "The deighn Layrocks" (The Dean Larks), so

[12] "Industry and Trade," by H. Heaton in *Johnson's England*, p. 248.
[13] *Old Hymn Tunes*, by R. J. V. Wylie, p. 14.
[14] Quoted by J. L. Hammond in *The Town Labourer*, p. 161.
[15] *History of Providende Chapel, Lumb*, Edward Nuttall, 1879, p. 6.

that, however desperate the condition of the people, the Sunday worship never lacked in hearty singing and playing. On October 29th, 1831, the Church at Lumb " agreed to pay for the repairing and stringing of Robt. Ashworth's Bass Violin. . . . " Anniversaries and field days were looked forward to throughout the year. William Pendered records that during the Whit-week races in Manchester, they took five hundred children to a field out of town returning to the school for tea. On July 13th, 1829, the officers of the Sunday School at Accrington " resolved that Nancy Entwistle and Mary Holker be appointed to superintend the Fair Feast, and that John Marsh and Rt. Fish go abegging for the feast. . . . "

There were other indirect ways in which the bitterness of poverty was relieved—the Sunday services, evening and Sunday afternoon classes to read and write, libraries, opportunities offered to men and women of leadership in the local Church, encouragement of youths of ability to enter the ministry. Judged in the light of modern state-administered schemes of social welfare all this must seem pitifully inadequate. But let it be judged for what it was—an attempt by a poor community to share the common burden.

C. B. WHYATT.

A Letter from Dr. Ryland.

Copy of Letter from Dr. John Ryland, to the Rev Carapeit Chater Aratoon, Baptist Missionary at Surat. It has no address or date, but must belong to the year 1814-15. Aratoon was an Armenian; he joined the Serampore Church in 1808 and was baptised, following the submission of his case to the Home Committee, in 1812. The original letter is now in the possession of the Baptist Missionary Society.

My dear Bro^{r}.

Tho you are known to me only by name, and not by sight, yet I feel a sincere love towards you, for Christ's sake, who is your only hope and your only Lord, and who is also mine. You may have heard of my name, from our dear Brethren at Serampore, as formerly living at Northampton, and as being on(e) of those who first set on foot the Baptist Mission, who also baptised our dear Bro^{r} Carey and when I was removed to Bristol to superintend an Academy for the instruction of young ministers, I there B^{d}. our Bro^{r} Marshman, Grant and Brunsdon—Bro^{r} Chamberlain also, and others of our misionaries studied in the Academy over which I preside. I only mention these things to give you a little fuller knowledge of the person who now writes to you. The idear we can form of each other at this distance, however, must be rather indistinct. But we can well conceive of one another as fellow-sinners needing the same Savior, and depending wholly on his Obedience unto Death. We are his property, and being invited to him we feel a union of heart with all those who love him in sincerity, and rejoice in hearing of the prosperity of all those who love him, and rejoice in the success of his gospel, in every part of the world, and expect ere long to meet in one blessed world, where we shall behold his Glory, and wear his image, the outline of which is now imperfectly drawn in our souls, but which shall then be completed, so that nothing shall be left which can rend^{r} us unlike him. For that state of perfection we ardently long, that we may encircle his throne rejoicing and giving eternal praise to him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood. May we, having tasted how gracious he is, be assisted to recommend him with all our hearts to our perishing fellow sinners. May, you, my d^{r} Bro^{r}. be the instrument of turning many poor idolaters from the worship of idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, even Jesus

who saveth us from the wroth to come. I wrote a short Note to you last week, and inclosed in a little parcel, with 3 or 4 pamphlets which I formerly printed. I did not then think I should have time to write a longer letter, as I supposed the pedoBaptist Missionaries, by whom I shall send it, should leave this City on Monday. But they will stay in town till Wednesday, and I have just returned, from a village, called Keynsham, 5 miles from Bristol, whither I have been to the Ordination of a young minister, whose name is Ayres. Having therefore time to write a longer letter, I embrace the opportunity gladly. And if you can hear of any opportunity of sending a letter directly to England, I shall be very glad to hear from you, to know how you go on. I believe these are very good young men, tho they differ from us as to Baptism, thinking that sprinkling is sufficient, instead of immersion, and supposing it right to baptize infants; yet this is almost the only thing in which they do not agree with us. We must act up to our own light, and try to keep the ordinances pure as they were first delivered. But we must love all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, whether they follow with us or not. So I trust I do; and I do not question but you also are likeminded. At present we know but in part, and understand but in part. But I pray God we may press towards the Mark, for the prize of the High Calling of God in Christ Jesus. I pray the Lord to keep you, and to uphold your goings in his paths, that your footsteps slip not. And I beseech you to pray for me also, for tho' I am now an old man almost 62 years old, yet have I no strength of my own, but need to depend on Christ as much as ever. and unless he pleases to keep me, I cannot hold out to the end, but shall dishonour his cause at last, after having professed his name nearly 48 years.

My dear Bro[r] Sutcliff and his Wife are lately dead. He lived at Olney, in Buckinghamshire, and was one of my most intimate friends, and one of them who first set our Mission on foot. My Wife, who loves our Lord Jesus, joins me in love to you and your Wife. We are all one in Christ Jesus, and I hope to spend eternity with you in praising God, and the Lamb, I am

Your cordial brother

JOHN RYLAND.

Reviews.

The Gathered Community, by Robert C. Walton (Carey Press, 7s. 6d.).

We may well be grateful to the group of younger Baptist ministers and especially to the writer R. C. Walton for an illuminating discussion of the Baptist doctrine of the church under the title *The Gathered Community* (Carey Press). This is no dull theological treatise but a readable book written out of a deep concern for the welfare and witness of our Baptist churches and in a clear, pleasant style which conveys the thought readily to the reader.

The structure of the book is simple and straightforward. The first section deals with the witness of the past, offering in one chapter the evidence of the New Testament for a conception of the church and its ministry and then in a second chapter outlining the life and thought of the seventeenth-century Baptists. The second section turns the attention to the important theme of the renewal of the church's life today, discussing the community of the church, the ministry, the sacraments, and offering in a concluding chapter some suggestions regarding the way ahead.

Into these chapters a great deal of valuable information has been packed. The argument of the book is well supported by documentary evidence and this is no small part of its value; the reference both to passages in the New Testament and to writings of seventeenth-century Baptists offer the historical material upon which our judgments concerning the church and the ministry must be based.

The main purpose of the book is well maintained through its chapters, but in addition are many passages of lucid and virile thinking which challenge the attention: e.g. "The great interest of States and Kingdoms lies in men and women, who, having seen evil and found release from it, are prepared to live in and under the discipline of a holy community, the Christian society, the company of redeemed people whose influence may sweeten the bitter waters of national life and whose spiritual power may reinvigorate a world grown old and tired" (p. 55-56); ". . . the seventeenth-century Baptists never committed the error of thinking that the Christian life is a purely individual thing. It was, they believed, intensely personal, because it sprang out of a personal

experience of God, but it was also social, lived within the fellowship of the church" (p. 68); ". . . individualism is everywhere discredited and men are searching for new forms of community life. Their quest is more subconscious than conscious at the moment, but this felt need may well revolutionise the structure of society" (p. 110); "A true community is one which stands between the individual and the State, saving him, on the one hand from isolation, and on the other, from being an impersonal cog in the machine" (p. 111); "The grace of God and the benefits of Christ are given as we live the Christian life in all its fullness, and as we participate in the complete activity of the church. It is not only of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but of our whole life in the Body of Christ, in its proclamation of the Good News, in its observance of the sacraments, in the reality of its fellowship and in its call to righteous conduct and sacrificial service that we say—

> "Here O my Lord I see Thee face to face,
> Here would I touch and handle things unseen" (p. 161).

Passages like these, and there are many of them in the book, start the mind off on the track of vital spiritual issues and should result in a good deal of enriching thinking.

The main thesis of the book appears to be that, whereas the modern world is seeking new forms of community life, Baptists in their historic witness possess a distinctive form of community which belongs to the essentials of the Christian faith as we find it in the New Testament, and therefore they should recapture this historic community both as a needed contribution to the universal church in the modern world and as a preparation for God's further leading in the future. This is an important theme lucidly expounded and if its implications are accepted our church life will be invigorated. Yet it also compels certain questions. We may ask whether the way ahead is really to be found by looking back? The call to recover our historic witness is not a sufficiently impelling motive to bring renewal to the life of the churches. It is doubtful too if the way of renewal will be found by so much emphasis upon the external structure of the church. The discussion upon the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper occupies, in a book of 170 pages nearly 40 pages; this is out of all proportion in comparison with the amount of attention given to the sacraments either in the New Testament or in the life of the seventeenth-century Baptists. This brings us near to the danger inherent in the thinking of those within the Christian fellowship and familiar with its customs, namely that of taking fundamental experiences for granted and concentrating attention upon issues which, while they are important,

derive their importance only by reason of their expression of just those fundamental experiences.

But the most serious question raised by the book is why its theme is not more adequately related to the message and work of Jesus Himself. The New Testament references are taken chiefly from the Acts, then the Epistles and those chapters of the Gospels which deal with the Lord's Supper. Yet a discussion whose central theme is that the church is a gathered community needs a clearer appreciation of the message of Jesus about the Kingdom of God. It is stated on p. 20 that "the conception of the Kingdom of God is central in our Lord's teaching" but this central conception is introduced only in connection with the question whether Jesus intended to found the church. Yet the essential feature of the Kingdom as our Lord proclaimed it is community, a new kind of community among men rooted in a new fellowship with God. It has been clearly demonstrated, e.g. by C. H. Dodd, that the Kingdom is not to be relegated entirely to the future, but is also a present reality. The new relationships which constitute the life of the Kingdom are possible here and now; are indeed realised in Jesus Himself, fundamentally in His perfect union with the Father leading to the complete harmony of His own personality and issuing in relationships of love with his fellow men. This conception of the Kingdom as a life of new relationships into which we can enter now, so that as we accept them we do indeed pass from death to life, means that the church is the place where the Kingdom is partially realised inasmuchas here are people living in trust and obedience to God our Father and in mutual love and forgiveness with one another. What we need, therefore, is a deeper penetration into this conception of God's Kingdom and a more vivid realisation of these personal relationships which are open to all. This central message of our Lord has to be interpreted in terms of the modern world and has to be realised in our church life and witness. Just because a Baptist church is a gathered community we must go farther back than the apostolic doctrine; we must understand the nature of the Kingdom as our Lord proclaimed it and let this guide us in the shaping of the community of the church today. In such a task the material gathered in the book is invaluable and will no doubt stimulate much useful thought and discussion.

L. G. CHAMPION.

Henry Wheeler Robinson, a memoir, by Ernest A. Payne. (Nisbet, 12s. 6d.)

All who knew Wheeler Robinson will be grateful to Mr. Payne for this interesting volume. He is to be congratulated on the way in which, with the limited material at his disposal, he has

discharged the task of writing the memoir, and it was a happy idea to include seven unpublished lectures. The comparatively uneventful life of a scholar and a recluse does not provide anything in the way of thrilling episodes, but Mr. Payne's short biography will grip the attention of all who knew its subject.

That Wheeler Robinson's childhood was rather sad will be news to many. Wordsworth's dictum that the boy is the father of the man applies in a special degree to him, for as a boy he displayed that passion for punctuality, hard work, thoroughness and exactness which so pre-eminently characterised the man. After spending ten years as a student (at Regent's Park, Edinburgh, Mansfield College and German universities) and six years in two short pastorates (Pitlochry and Coventry) he entered upon the real work of his life, first as a tutor at Rawdon and then as Principal of Regent's Park at London and Oxford. His outstanding characteristic was his massive scholarship. In this realm, most of us felt that he towered above us like a Colossus. He seemed to have read everything. In every field of theological study he was quite at home, while as an Old Testament scholar he had few peers. As Mr. Payne records, W.E. Blomfield justly said of him: "He is a great scholar, perhaps the most outstanding scholar we have in our Church," while Arthur Dakin no less justly declared that it is only once in a century, perhaps not as often, that Baptists have in their midst a man of Wheeler Robinson's intellectual and spiritual eminence.

On the practical and administrative side, the outstanding achievement of his life was the establishing of a Baptist college at Oxford. For some years it had been recognised by the more forward-looking members of our denomination that it was high time that Baptists should have a college of their own at either Oxford or Cambridge. Oxford was Wheeler Robinson's choice, and for that choice he advanced some sound reasons. For ten years (1927-1937) he was the principal of a college that had no home, and had to divide his time between London and Oxford. Such a state of affairs must have been peculiarly irksome to a man of his tastes and temperament. It was during this perod, too, that three great friends of Regent's Park College died—C. M. Hardy, W. E. Blomfield and Herbert Marnham, all of whom had they lived a few years longer would have rendered invaluable assistance in raising funds for the new College. As it was, when the appeal for £50,000 was issued, Wheeler Robinson had to take the leading part in the raising of funds, and that was no easy task in view of the lukewarmness of the greater part of the denomination to the scheme. With characteristic loyalty and energy he gave himself heart and soul to the cause. Then, after the stone-laying in 1938, he devoted as much careful attention to the building

operations as the clerk of works himself. All this labour naturally interfered with the literary work on which his heart was set, but it brought him a great reward. It must have been pure and unsullied joy to him—perhaps the crowning joy of his life—when Regent's Park College at last had a new home, and at Oxford!

It is a rather sad reflection on the state of our denomination that Wheeler Robinson's gifts and achievements were not more generally estimated at their true worth, and were never recognised and honoured by his election to the Chair of the Baptist Union.

Yet it is only fair to admit that for this failure he was himself, in part, to blame. He was too severely academic—and it is just that aspect of his personality that is brought out in the Gunn portrait, while it was that aspect only which those who were superficially acquainted with him knew. His intimates were aware of his profoundly religious character and of the kindliness of which he was capable, but to those on the fringe of his acquaintance he appeared to possess only the sternness of an Old Testament prophet, and seemed to lack the graciousness which the New Testament commends, and which he undoubtedly possessed. The plain truth about him is that his passion for scholarship far excelled his desire to communicate the message of the Gospel to ordinary people. He was rather apt to look down on what he called "popular" or "semi-popular" work. He was inclined to overlook the fact that to present the highest truth in such a way that the ordinary man can grasp and assimilate it, and thus, in the best sense of the term to "popularise" it, is, in reality, a greater achievement than merely to state it in a scholarly way. And surely, if men of science, like the late Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir James Jeans could sometimes leave the Olympian heights of pure science and communicate the truths of science in a simple and untechnical way that fascinated ordinary people, it ought to be possible for the Christian scholar occasionally to leave the Olympian heights of academic theology and communicate the highest and best he knows to simple people even as the Master did to the peasantry of Galilee. At this crisis of civilisation, when everything worth-while seems at times to be tottering to its fall, those who have given the profoundest thought to the message of the Gospel ought to be the best able to present it in a living way to a world that is likely to perish for the lack of it. This "popular" work is not inferior to academic theological work, but is its true climax and its proper crown.

The memoir indicates that there were times when Wheeler Robinson's own mind and heart were deeply exercised by the very problem raised in the previous paragraph. How revealing are the words: "Benjamin, the thing that worries me is that I don't love men as Christ did," (p. 26); and a note written in 1918,

"The conviction grows upon me that the chief cause of my failure in the ministry . . . is want of a real sympathy with men in themselves, their outlook, their daily pursuits, their rough and ready reactions on life. One proof of this is the tendency to contempt for the obvious crudity of all this life from the intellectual standpoint. My interest in religion is much too psychological and metaphysical for the true 'pastor in parochia'." (p. 66.)

Thus while we can feel nothing but profound admiration for his scholarship, and gratefully recognise that he rendered magnificient service by raising the intellectual standards of theological education in our colleges, we must insist, as he to some extent failed to insist, that for the Christian minister scholarship must be a servant and not a master, a means and not an end in itself—a means whereby the truth of the Gospel may be set forth to our own day and generation in forms that are intellectually sound, and in terms that are arresting, clear as crystal, cogent and convincing. To produce men who are more or less capable of doing work of that kind is the supreme end for which the colleges exist.

Of the lectures published in this volume, the most noteworthy, perhaps is that on John Henry Newman. It reminds one of Harnack's brilliant essay on "Was wir von der römischen Kirche lernen and nicht lernen sollen," and it is not too high praise to say that the essay on Newman is no less brilliant. The lecture on "The Making of a Minister" is somewhat marred by that almost exclusively academic emphasis which has already been referred to. The lectures on "The Christian Doctrine of Eternal Life" are excellent examples of biblical theology. The other two lectures deal with the question of authority in religion and with the "goads" of God. L. H. MARSHALL.

The Life and Faith of the Baptists, by H. Wheeler Robinson. (Kingsgate Press, 6s. net.) *The Great Succession,* by Ernest A. Payne. (Carey Press, 3s. 6d. net.)

The welcome re-appearance of these two books relieves in some measure the present famine of literature dealing with the principles and history of the Baptists in this country, for the want of which many, especially the young, remain largely ignorant of their own faith and ancestry. Having acquired the copyright from Messrs Methuen who in 1927, published it in their series *The Faiths: Varieties of Christian Expression,* the Kingsgate Press have done well to re-issue Dr. Wheeler Robinson's exposition of Baptist beliefs and practices. It was revised, brought up to date, with a new concluding chapter added, shortly before its distinguished author died in 1945, and Rev. E. A. Payne has

appended a useful bibliography. Writing for sympathetic readers of other communions as well as for fellow-Baptists, Dr. Robinson describes the origins and general spirit of the Baptists, their conception of the Church and contribution to the Church Universal,some typical personalities and scenes, the meaning and value of Believers' Baptism and the missionary and freedom-loving passion which he claims to be outstanding characteristics of Baptist people. The seventh chapter is not only evidence of the author's rightful readiness to indicate the limitations no less than the strength of the denominational witness, one which he regards as no isolated phenomenon, but a particular expression of the consciousness of the whole Christian Church. Here, then, clearly and cogently expressed, is a comprehensive, authoritative account of the faith and life of English Baptists which should be in the hands of every Baptist Church member, and which will enlighten, inform and challenge all fortunate enough to obtain a copy.

The tour of the Baptist picture gallery on which Dr. Robinson in his second chapter conducts his readers, Mr. Payne in *The Great Succession* continues, along the missionary wing. Here are portraits of Angus, Underhill, Baynes, Knibb, Saker and others of that great company of leaders who served the Baptist Missionary Society at home and abroad during the expansive years of the nineteenth century, all portrayed with that insight, clarity, skill and knowledge based on original research which we have now learned to expect from Mr. Payne. Such men and women as these have a claim upon the grateful remembrance of present-day Baptists, and it is to be hoped that a wide circulation awaits this new edition of the little book in which Mr. Payne so vividly brings them before us. It would prove an interesting study to inquire into the reasons why the denomination no longer appears to breed the great and memorable leaders in which it was so rich in the homeland and overseas during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Meanwhile, the reading of these two books should help Baptists, in Martineau's words quoted by Dr. Robinson, to discover afresh, "how great a thing it is to live at the end of so many ages, heirs to the thoughts of the wise, the labours of the good, the prayers of the devout."

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

History of Western Philosophy, by Bertrand Russell. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 21s.)

A generation ago, Rudolf Eucken, whom the late Professor Laird regarded as a pioneer of the movement that led to "existence" philosophies in Germany, published his *Problems of Human Life*, which attempted to tell the story of philosophy largely in personal terms, that is, with each philosopher studied in the light of his personal reactions to the intellectual and practical problems confronting him. Professor R. G. Collingwood used to insist on the necessity of finding out where the shoe pinched in each generation, and what were the questions which each philosopher believed himself to be answering. One of the most distinguished of modern British philosophers has now issued as a *magnum opus* a *History of Western Philosophy*, which has as its sub-title "And its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day."

It is truly a *magnum opus*, great in conception and imposing in execution. There are 864 pp. of text and the index runs to another 50 pp. The proportions of the work are important. In the brilliant little *History of Philosophy*, which Professor C. C. J. Webb contributed in 1915 to the Home University Library, he devoted almost exactly half his space to the period since the Reformation. Of the remainder considerably more was given to Ancient Philosophy than to the two chapters entitled "Philosophy and the Rise of Christianity" and "Philosophy during the Minority of Modern Europe." Mr. Bertrand Russell, on the other hand, gives nearly a quarter of his massive volume to what he calls "Catholic Philosophy." Of the remainder, 300 pp. deal with Ancient Philosophy and 343 pp. with Modern Philosophy. The somewhat different proportions of the two books illustrate the revived interest in the thought of the Christian Fathers and the Schoolmen, and the central section is by no means the least interesting part of Mr. Russell's book. It is, however, not without significance that whereas Professor Webb thought it necessary in his brief sketch to give several pages to the rise of Christianity and to the teaching and person of Jesus, Mr. Russell passes rapidly from a 16 page chapter on the religious development of the Jews to a 10 page chapter on Christianity during the first four centuries. Moreover, a good deal of the latter is given up to comment upon and acceptance of Gibbon's famous analysis of the causes for the victory of Christianity. On Gibbon, Mr. Russell rests somewhat heavily in this section of his work.

Mr. Russell is certainly right in claiming that it is important that from time to time attempts such as his should be made to review the whole movement of European thought, even though

one man cannot hope to be equally at home in all parts of the field. The kind of survey which H. G. Wells attempted gallantly and fascinatingly, though at times wilfully rather than judiciously, in his *Outline of History,* which Professor Latourette has just successfully completed in regard to the expansion of the Church, and which Profesor Toynbee is so fruitfully engaged upon in the study of civilisations, Mr. Russell here offers in the realm of philosophy, which, as he understands it, is " something intermediate between theology and science " (p. 10.) One after another, the systems of the philosophers from Thales to John Dewey are passed under review. Mr. Russell sets each thinker in the *milieu* of his time and occasionally inserts chapters of purely social history. He writes, as always, with clarity and point, and the result is a book which is interesting from first to last, and is sure to be widely read. Many of his sections are most stimulating; almost all contain memorable paragraphs and phrases, as well as much that is entertaining. The chief surprises concern the relative space given to certain names, e.g., as much to Hobbes as to Thomas Aquinas, more to Nietzsche than to Descartes, and three times as much to Locke as to Leibniz. It is clear that what we have here is not so much a text-book as a personal appraisal.

At the end, therefore, one naturally asks, What are the author's conclusions? The value of the passing of so much material through one mind and the construction out of it of a unified tale is the moral that is drawn. Mr. Russell is eager to criticise the great ones of the past and to indicate the weaknesses and limitations of their thought, sometimes with devastating effect. His last chapter is devoted to " The Philosophy of Logical Analysis," of which he has himself been one of the most influential exponents. By its means he believes that definite answers, " which have the quality of science rather than philosophy," can be given to many age-long problems. He admits, however, that questions of value lie outside its purview. Such questions he appears to regard as " legitimately matters of feeling." He does not believe that " philosophy can either prove or disprove the truth of religious dogma " (p. 863). But he would have philosophy renounce the metaphysical questionings that have been its main subject matter, in favour of what he claims as the scientific truthfulness of analytical empiricism. This accounts for the impression made on one throughout the book that the author is standing at a distance throwing stones—often very bright and well polished ones—at the stream of philosophers as they pass. It accounts also for the strange and rather melancholy inconclusiveness with which it ends. One cannot apply to one of Mr. Russell's attainments the first part of Bacon's famous maxim, nor does it fit this book. But reflecting on the story of Western

Philosophy one may still at the end of it believe that "depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion," and that there is still a place for philosophy as metaphysics.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Salvation Symphony, by G. H. King. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 5s.)

This book consists of four Bible readings delivered by the author at the 1946 Keswick Convention. It leaves one with mixed impressions. Outstanding amongst them is that of the ingenuity with which the writer has schematized his interpretations of Scripture and Christian experience. The analytic method, when indulged to the extent it is here, can defeat its own object. It is intended to simplify; instead it becomes wearisome. Occasionally, too, the style of the writing becomes less than worthy of the theme, and that because the author cannot resist using "snappy" phrases. Many passages, however, are eloquent of his sincerity and earnestness.

Shrines of Christendom. The Reflections of a Pilgrim, by C. B. Jewson. (Kingsgate Press, Carey Press, 5s.)

This book contains the author's reflections on experiences of Christian fellowship which he has enjoyed and some account of the historical traditions associated with the places of his pilgrimages. He writes as a convinced Baptist who believes that "any curbing of the variety of ways in which Christians offer worship to the Almighty would be an unmixed evil." Part of the attractiveness of these essays is that there is no attempt at sequence between them or at uniformity of presentation. The reader is taken from morning service at St. Mary's, Norwich, to a little chapel in Brittany; from Norwich again (the Cathedral, Parish Church, and the Gildencroft Quaker Meeting) to Rome, Brussels, Chartres, Assisi; from Rugby Chapel to West Ham Central Mission and Fetter Lane Chapel. Mr. Jewson has gone to pains to verify the accuracy of his facts, but he does not offer "guide-book stuff." In Rome, for example, his objective was a small Christian fellowship meeting off the beaten track of the tourist. He has moved about with an alert and imaginative historical interest and his book will be read with pleasure. One's only complaint is that one or two of the essays are disappointingly short.

G. W. RUSLING.