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

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

Editorial Notes.

SINCE 1942 there has been a series of conversations of a semi-official character, between five representatives of the Baptist Union and five representatives of the Churches of Christ. Their aim has been to explore the possibility of closer association and co-operation between the two bodies. Those taking part on behalf of the Baptists have been Dr. Gilbert Laws, Dr. P. W. Evans, Mr. C. T. LeQuesne, K.C., Mr. R. Wilson Black, J.P., and Dr. Henry Townsend, the last named in succession to the late Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson. By a recent vote of the Baptist Union Council, the conversations have entered on a new phase, and have been given a more official status. The General Purposes Committee of the Council has been authorised to enter on negotiations for some kind of concordat between the two bodies. The Baptists and the Churches of Christ have, it is believed, already much in common and would derive mutual benefit from closer collaboration, whether or not this leads later on to actual union.

There are in this country 141 Churches of Christ with a membership of 10,628, together with 102 Sunday Schools with 8,392 scholars. In other parts of the word, and in particular in the United States, the Churches of Christ are a far larger body. They are engaged in conversations with Baptists in several other lands, including the United States, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa. Many important issues are involved, some theological and some practical. It is also to be noted that there are differences of emphasis and *ethos* within the various Churches of Christ, as there are among Baptists.

One fruit of the conversations in Britain has taken the form of a pamphlet entitled *Infant Baptism Today* (Carey Kingsgate Press and Berean Press, 6d. net). To this, Principal William Robinson, of Overdale College, contributes a valuable catena of quotations showing the judgement of leading scholars regarding the New Testament evidence about Baptism and the uneasiness regarding present-day practice in many different Churches. Dr. Evans discusses some of the doctrinal issues involved and Dr. Townsend writes on baptism and the Christian ethic. The pamphlet as a whole is an able and effective piece of propaganda. A copy has already been sent to all the Anglican bishops and further wide-spread distribution is planned. It should also prove

Baptist Quarterly 13.1 (January 1949)

very valuable for discussion in ministers' fraternals and with groups of young people.

* * * * *

The discussions with the Churches of Christ are not the only ones in which Baptists are at present involved. There are in this country the conversations between the Church of England and the Free Churches, begun again after the sermon of the Archbishop of Canterbury before Cambridge University in November, 1946. No details have yet been given as to the course of these conversations, which are certain to be influenced by the report of the Lambeth Conference and the recommendations of the Anglican bishops.

More immediately important are the negotiations in Ceylon, where a detailed scheme of Church Union has been drawn up by representatives of the Church of Ceylon (Anglican), the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church and the Jaffna Council of the South India United Church (Congregationalist). The Lambeth Conference described the Ceylon scheme as "in many respects among the most promising of the various schemes of its type". It builds upon, but modifies in important respects, the South India scheme. What is envisaged is an immediate unification of ministries under a constitutionally appointed episcopate by a service of "reception into the presbyterate of the United Church of those already ordained to the ministry of the uniting Churches". It is laid down that "no particular interpretation of episcopacy shall be demanded from any minister or member of the United Church", but the link with the historic episcopate is secured. Both the baptism of infants and believer's baptism will be the practice of the United Church, if the present scheme is adopted. The two groups resulting will be "unified as full members of the Church through receiving confirmation, which shall be administered by bishops," "for the sake of uniformity of practice".

The deep sense of spiritual urgency and eagerness inspiring the Ceylon leaders in all the negotiating churches is clear to all who have been in touch with them. Any guidance the West may wish to give must be given with sympathy and a desire to help, not hinder, for the Christian Churches of Ceylon have a difficult task in the face of a resurgent Buddhism. Over one hundred years of Baptist missionary effort have resulted in only 1,500 members of Baptist churches.

The General Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society has made clear that the Baptist churches of Ceylon must make their own decision on this scheme, but has drawn their attention to a number of points which would cause difficulty were similar proposals put forward in this country.

It is hoped that the United Church would be able to retain full recognition from and communion with those Churches with which the uniting Churches are now in communion. To the issues involved at this point Baptists as well as others will need to give much thought and prayer.

* * * * *

We extend a warm welcome to the *Scottish Journal of Theology* (Oliver & Boyd, Ltd., Edinburgh. Single copies 3s. 6d., Annual subscription 15s. 6d.). This new quarterly, under the editorship of Dr. T. F. Torrance and the Rev. J. K. S. Reid, bears the marks of Barthian influence, but it is clear that this is combined with the fine tradition of scholarship associated with the Church of Scotland. The two numbers that have so far appeared contain important articles and reviews, and suggest that the *Journal* will soon establish itself as one of the most important publications of its kind. The gap between the *Journal of Theological Studies* and the *Expository Times* has been all too apparent of recent years, while *Theology* and the *Church Quarterly Review* are ready, only occasionally, to admit contributions from non-Anglicans.

* * * * *

At the end of last year, Mr. W. H. Ball, M.B.E., retired from the service of the Baptist Union. There thus came to an end an association remarkable in duration and in quality. When it began, in 1892, the Union was still housed in the Baptist Mission House in Furnival Street. Samuel Harris Booth was secretary. A new chapter in Baptist history began with the arrival of J. H. Shakespeare in 1898 and the building of the Baptist Church House a few years later. Mr. Ball became Dr. Shakespeare's right-hand man, and throughout Mr. Aubrey's secretaryship has continued an indispensable figure in the growing work of the Union. To the revolutionary changes in Baptist polity and organisation during the past half century he has made his own distinctive contribution. By his efficiency, his integrity, his modesty and his friendliness, he has won not only the respect and regard of his colleagues and the members of the Baptist Union Council, young as well as old, but also the confidence and gratitude of the denomination as a whole. His services to the United Board during two wars won him official recognition. It is as difficult to think of the work of the Baptist Union without him as it must be for him to contemplate life without his daily journey to Southampton Row. All Baptists will join in thanking Mr. Ball for his outstanding services and in wishing him many more years of health and happiness.

Oxford's Attitude to Dissenters, 1646-1946.

A CONVICTION that, wherever else Nonconformity might gain a footing, Oxford ought to be "preserved free from the Infection of unsound and seditious Principles", persisted among university-bred Anglicans from the Restoration until the nineteenth century. In this may be found the explanation of the special degree of dislike and hardship experienced by Dissenters in the city and its continuance long after conditions had become more tolerable in other towns. The history of Nonconformity in Oxford during the three centuries after its introduction in 1646 may indeed be summarised by saying that only during the first fourteen years was anything like a fair field granted until, after roughly two centuries, genuine toleration was finally achieved in the last hundred years. Quakers, who were roughly handled even during the Puritan regime, got off to an even less promising start.

The fourteen formative years were those between the surrender of the city to the Parliamentary forces in 1646 and the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, when first the soldiery and later a strong government kept the ring, particularly against the university. Free from the organised interference, those who had come to believe in "gathered churches", and much besides that was counted revolutionary, were able to expound their beliefs to such as would listen. As might be expected, the latter were always a minority in a city where beautiful churches spoke to the eye of the dignity of the ancient ways of worship and able and learned divines presented the dominant orthodoxy in its most attractive form.

Religious toleration, although not all-embracing in practice, was at least an ideal of the Cromwellian period and was achieved in a measure not to be equalled again for many a long day. In contrast with the conventicle-hunting and harrying of Dissenters in Stuart Oxford is the fact that in Puritan Oxford a large group of "Episcopalians" met regularly for private worship, using the Anglican form of service. Dr. John Owen, the Dean of Christ Church, himself an Independent, refused to interfere with them although they met "over against his own door".[1] Public

[1] Register of the Visitors of the University. (Camden Society, ed. Burrows)., p. xlii.

use of the Book of Common Prayer was indeed forbidden and Presbyterian preachers occupied the pulpits of the city churches. But it is to be remembered that Presbyterians were simply the Puritan section of the national church, now temporarily triumphant.[2] At this date they were not Nonconformists. They looked with an intolerant eye on separatists and only with reluctance resigned themselves to the idea of becoming a "sect" after 1662.

After the Restoration the hostility of the university was the constant factor in the lives of generations of Oxford Nonconformists. The dice were loaded against them individually, and as religious groups so long as the town was almost wholly dependent economically upon the university. That economic power was consistently used against them. Their lot was best when relations between town and gown were worst. Thus, although during the latter half of the seventeenth century they suffered a good deal of official persecution (actively promoted by such Vice-Chancellors as Dr. Peter Mews), there does not appear to have been any general feeling of ill-will towards them among their fellow-citizens. For almost the whole of the century city and university were at variance not only on domestic issues but in their political outlook. In the Civil War the townspeople were for Parliament, the university for the king. Academic Oxford in later years witnessed with resentment the election by the burgesses of a succession of Whig Members of Parliament, and held aloof when the mayor and corporation lavished hospitality on the Duke of Monmouth in 1680.

A gradual change occurred after the re-modelling of the corporation by Charles II in 1684. The city lost its Whig complexion and by the turn of the century a common Toryism formed a bond between the two bodies. In the eighteenth century the city was content with a role that was little better than subservience to its neighbour and the old feud, which represented its fight for self-respect, was in abeyance. In the mood of servility to superiors characteristic of so much of the century, townspeople aped the manners and prejudices of their betters, including a rooted aversion to Dissenters. They joined with undergraduates to form the mobs that wrecked the Presbyterian, Quaker, and Baptist meeting-houses in 1715 and in the daily life of the city their ignorant prejudice found expression in vulgar abuse. As a young man Dr. E. B. Underhill (1813-1901), afterwards secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, was "hooted about the street as a Methodist and a saint".[3] The Journal of

[2] *History of the Plots . . . of Presbyterians,* H. Foulis (1674), p. 15. See also *Religion and Learning,* O. M. Griffiths.

[3] *Proceedings,* New Road Chapel Centenary (1883), p. 34.

Thomas Story (1670-1742), a Quaker, and the Journal of John Wesley, both describing visits to Oxford in the eighteenth century, show how stony was the ground. It is not surprising that the number of Nonconformists dwindled to a mere handful in the middle years. Only the stout-hearted with firmly-grounded convictions could survive in this atmosphere.

Undergraduate high spirits found an outlet in attendance at meeting-houses to disturb and ridicule simple men and women in their worship—a habit that persisted for 150 years. Sometimes the rowdyism was malicious, but very often it appears to have been no more than the buffoonery of parties of young men on the spree going to laugh at the manifest peculiarity of people who did not behave as everyone else did. In either case it was a sore trial to the victims. The long silences of the Quakers often baffled tormentors as Story noted in connection with his visits to the meeting-house in St. Giles' in 1715 and 1735.[4] Another restraining influence was the fear of conversion! Thus, later, in the century, some of the Fellows of a college who had been in the habit of attending the Sunday evening lectures at the Dissenting Chapel in St. Peter-le-Bailey parish (now New Road Baptist Church) suddenly agreed to give up the practice "because it so materially impaired the gaiety of the evening".[5] Eventually the university forbade its members to attend.

More serious than undergraduate levity and unruliness was the deliberate stirring up of mob passions of which Dr. Edward Tatham, Rector of Lincoln College, gave an example in 1792. From the university pulpit he attacked Dissenters in general, and those in Oxford in particular, for their alleged error and "enthusiasm" in religion, immorality and disaffection to the government. He repeated the sermon before the corporation at the city church and, although advised that the rabble were taking it as a hint, preached it in various churches on successive Sundays.[6] Yet even incitement of this kind was not so deadly in its effects as the power of the university to prevent Nonconformists from earning a living. Tradesmen were too dependent on the colleges to dare to offend by giving employment, even if they had a mind to do so. Strangers had little prospect of successful settlement. James Hinton, the Baptist minister in the city from 1787 to 1823, lamented that the children of his people had to go elsewhere when they reached manhood because they could find no suitable employment in their native city.[7] Another aspect of the same general policy was the prohibition (by the

[4] Story's *Journal*, pp. 474, 715.
[5] *Life of the Rev. J. Hinton*, p. 123.
[6] *Ibid*, p. 339.
[7] *Ibid*, pp. 107, 168.

insertion of a special clause in agreements), of the sale of any university ground for meeting-houses.[8] The coming of the railways in 1844 and 1851 respectively made the first breach in this position of economic dominance, for their employees, independent of local good-will for a livelihood, constituted a new element in the population. One senses the relief of the Baptist Sunday School workers in the Osney district at this new development. When they reported in 1863 that there was need for a new school building, they stated: "The population is a peculiarly promising field of Christian work. It is composed largely of railway servants. They are more intelligent than a rural people, having been brought from various parts of the country, and having seen much of men and things. They are more independent than a village people, and than many in towns in religious matters, being free from the dominion of both landlords and customers".[9]

Some of the results of university opposition have been indicated. What were the causes of such profound antipathy? Oxford's function as one of the two great national seminaries of the Church of England goes far towards providing an explanation. As in earlier times, its principal task in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and for a great part of the nineteenth was to train men for holy orders. It was committed to the honourable duty of providing, in the words of its ancient Bidding Prayer, "a due supply of persons qualified to serve God in Church and State". The order of priority is significant. While some of Oxford's sons entered the world of affairs or served in offices of State, a far greater number passed from the "pleasant groves of Academe" to rectories and vicarages up and down the country. The university itself was predominantly clerical in outlook. Until comparatively recent years Heads of Houses were with few exceptions ecclesiastics. At most colleges the holding of Fellowships was confined by the founder's statutes to those in orders. When election preceded ordination, as was sometimes the case, it was necessary for the new Fellow to be ordained within a specified time or forfeit his place.

For generations after the Restoration, the university's attitude to Nonconformity was coloured by recollection of the latter's associations with the Great Rebellion and the Interregnum —a period of bitter memories for university Royalists who had suffered a purge, extending even to the college servants, at the hands of the Parliamentary Visitors. The fact that Laud in his

[8] J. J. Moore, *Nonconformity in Oxford*, p. 6.

[9] New Road Chapel Sunday School Society Centenary Booklet (1913), p. 36.

heyday,[10] a few years earlier, had harassed unmercifully those in the university of an opposite school of thought theologically was naturally forgotten. During these years of upheaval, which Anthony Wood, the seventeenth century Oxford historian, commonly referred to as the "broken times", the ecclesiastical courts that had formerly enforced discipline in church affairs and insisted on attendance at the parish church, were in abeyance. This state of affairs favoured the growth of the "sects", that is to say the Independents (now known as Congregationalists), and Anabaptists (Baptists), who denied the ancient parochial tradition and held that true churches consisted of believers "gathered" out of the world. The Quakers (Friends) also flourished.

By the conservative-minded the very existence of the sects was felt to be one of the many evil outcomes of a period of ill-discipline in which wild fanatics were thought to have wilfully overthrown the settled order in Church and State. The sects were regarded as schismatical and, illogically, were felt to be tainted with militarism because it was the Cromwellian army that believed in liberty of conscience and saw that it was respected. During the Commonwealth both Episcopalians and Presbyterians regarded religious toleration as a hateful innovation that enabled schism to flourish and display itself in ever new forms.

Besides a general aversion on these grounds, the university had other and more immediate causes for dislike and fear of the new religious developments. During the Interregnum the whole conception of its functions in relation to the Church was called in question.

One of the first of its basic assumptions to be challenged was the belief that academic training was an indispensable qualification for the ministry. It had been accepted as self-evident that the graduate, duly ordained, had a prescriptive right to the pulpit, but now "humane learning" was regarded by many as a hindrance rather than a qualification. It is hard, in our times, to realise the horror (mingled with professional jealousy in the case of the universities), aroused by the spectacle of tailors, cobblers and tanners ascending the pulpit to preach. Wood speaks severely of those who "cherished up ignorance by suffering and encouraging pragmaticks, who had never seen a College, sacrilegiously to abuse pulpits; by which intimating to the people that a cobler's or taylor's stall was as good a nursery for a divine as either Universitie".[11] In Oxford itself the soldiery, in 1646, dared "to thrust themselves into the public Schools, and there, in the place of Lecturers, speak to the Scholars against

[10] Register of the Visitors (Burrows), pp. xxiv-xxx.
[11] Wood's *Life and Times* (ed. Clark). Vol. 1, p. 292.

humane learning, and challenge the most learned of them to prove their Calling from Christ".[12]

Although Presbyterians detested these practices and would gladly have suppressed them had they dared, Anglicans on returning to power reserved for them some of their most bitter reproaches on the ground that by supporting rebellion they had opened the flood-gates to abuses. Thus Wood observed: "But let the restless Presbyterians be thanked for the original of all these Evils and others that followed".[13] With feigned charitableness, the author of "An Expedient or a sure and easy way of Reducing all Dissenters to . . . Obedience", wrote (about 1675): "The Independents or Phanatiques, owe their being to the foregoing Sect, [Presbyterian] and if they wildly fancy a barne as good as a Church, or a Graduate not so learned as a Cobbler, with other odde extravagancies (the halfe of which no man can recount), let us not be more rigorous than the Pope, who only lookt upon them that came to Rome to convert him as mad; and I think neither S. Peter, nor his pretended Successors have lockt Bedlam out of Heaven".[14]

But the attack on theological learning, originally inspired by a belief that proficiency in such knowledge was advantageous only to careerists and formalists, was developed until it appeared to threaten the universities themselves. There were suggestions that college lands should be alienated. The position, as seen by Wood, was as follows:—

"Tis well knowne that the Universities of this land have had their beginnings to noe other end but to propagate religion and good manners and supply the nation with persons cheifly professing the three famous faculties of Divinity, Law and Phisick. But in these late times when the dregs of the people grew wiser then their teachers, and pretended to have received revelations, visions, inspirations, and I know not what, and, therefore, above all religion ordinarily profest, nothing could satisfy their insatiable desires but aiming at an utter subversion of them, church and schooles, or those places they thought might put a curb to their proceedings. Intelligent men knew and saw very well that it was their intent to rout up all and to ruine those things that smelt of an Academy, never rejoycing more than when they could trample on the gowne and bring humane learning and arts into disgrace.[15]

The universities were abused as "nurseries of wickedness, the nests of mutton tuggers, the dens of formall droanes". Presbyterians and Independents (who formed the two major sections at Oxford University during the Commonwealth), generally speaking opposed this tendency, but some extremists among the Baptists and probably the whole Quaker movement were

[12] Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (Vol. 2, 1692 edition), p. 740.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] Wood 617. Bodleian Library.
[15] Wood's *Life and Times,* Vol. 1, p. 292.

in the van of the attack. Vavasor Powell, a well-known Baptist who evangelised Wales, is said to have uttered a tirade from the pulpit of All Saints' Church in 1657, and Oxford "Anabaptists, Quakers and such like unstable people" declaimed against the universities in their conventicles. They were thought to be "backed by force of armes or else some authority".[16]

Actually the assault came to nothing, for the universities had powerful friends, and, at Oxford, learning flourished to a greater degree than in the succeeding Caroline age. Not unnaturally, however, the university bore a grudge against, and continued to be suspicious of, those whom it regarded as opponents of learning. Although Baptists always remained alive to the danger of an unconverted ministry, however brilliant its scholarship, they modified their views on the subject of a trained ministry at an early date. In 1689, when the Toleration Act enabled them to meet openly again after years of persecution, the Particular (i.e. Calvinistic) Baptists held their first General Assembly in London which was attended by a representative from Oxford.[17] At this Assembly it was agreed that ministers were entitled to an adequate maintenance and attention was drawn to the desirability of the education in classics and Hebrew of ministerial students. In the latter connection the Assembly was thinking in terms of Dissenting academies rather than of the universities from which Nonconformists had long been excluded. For generations, certainly to the end of the eighteenth century, the Friends maintained a very stiff attitude towards the universities. Oxford, to Thomas Story, was "one of the filthy Fountains of their Religion and Learning, from whence the whole Land is poisoned and undone".[18]

In Oxford, as elsewhere, the first care of the Royalists upon their return in 1660 was to restore institutions to the old footing as nearly as possible, to put down innovations, and to secure themselves against any repetition of the late upheaval. The mayor and burgesses, who during the interval had refused to take the oath to observe the privileges of the university, were speedily brought to due obedience. Steps were taken to break down the considerable influence of the Presbyterians.[19]

Bearing in mind the events of the Commonwealth, it is not surprising that the new religious groups should have been singled out for special attention. The safety of the State was considered inseparable from that of the established church. In fact, religious

[16] *Ibid*, p. 293.
[17] Narrative of the Proceedings of the General Assembly, 1689. Regent's Park College, Library.
[18] Story's *Journal*, p. 474.
[19] Wood's *Life*, pp. 360, 370.

and political considerations went hand in hand in the policy pursued against the "sectaries". In their ranks locally was a sprinkling of old soldiers and some who seem to have been republicans. Another factor that weighed heavily at Oxford was the feeling that it was particularly important to maintain the integrity of a seat of learning. So Clarendon, in 1662, instructed the Vice-Chancellor to take action against the Quakers "since it would be of very ill example that we should not be able to root them out of an University".[20]

Except in the case of the Quakers, doctrinal differences at this date were less important as causes of contention than questions of church order and politics. Heterodoxy could be forgiven in a man provided he were otherwise acceptable. An amusing illustration of this is provided by an incident in the career of John Tombes, one-time lecturer of St. Martin's, Carfax, and vicar of Leominster. Tombes developed Baptist views and organised a church at Bewdley but conformed in a lay capacity at the Restoration. "In 1664 he was present at the Oxford Act, and there in the Vespers he did modestly challenge to maintain against any person certain Anabaptistical Tenents, but none there did think it then convenient to grapple with him, and the rather for this reason that he had made those matters his study for more than 30 years, and that none ever before, went beyond him".[21] Nearly 130 years later, Hinton in a dispute with Dr. Tatham, could describe himself as varying little from the Church of England on doctrinal points.[22]

Fear that Dissenters might seek by force to subvert the established order in Church and State had ceased to be a serious factor in the situation by the beginning of the eighteenth century. After 1714 and the accession of George the First, which was welcomed with relief by Nonconformists, the possibility could definitely be ruled out. Presbyterianism was a visibly declining force and had long been out of the running as a rival to the Anglican Church. In the circumstances it might be supposed that there would be some abatement of rancour. Actually there was, if anything, an intensification as one may gather from many passages in the diary of Thomas Hearne, the Oxford Non-juror, which breathe a spirit of unyielding malice. Nonconformists were no longer feared as possible insurrectionaries; they were hated as political opponents and despised as socially inferior.

Party passions ran high during the early decades of the century—and the university and the small group of Oxford Dissenters were at opposite poles politically. The latter supported

[20] *Victoria History of Oxfordshire*, Vol. 2, p. 49.
[21] *Athenae* (1692 ed.), p. 410.
[22] Hinton's *Life*, p. 342.

the Whigs on whom they felt they could rely for the maintenance of the toleration so hardly gained. Their " insolent loyalty " to the House of Hanover during the first two reigns was particularly odious to the university, which was almost solidly Jacobite, and they were made to suffer for it. When the third George ascended the throne in 1760 and forsook the Whigs, the university wholeheartedly espoused the Hanoverian cause and indeed became noted for an exaggerated loyalty to the reigning monarch. Unity of sentiment in this respect may have had some effect in assuaging bitterness for a brief period, as will be noted later, but the Dissenters were quickly put in the wrong again. It is truly ironical that by 1792 university notabilities were accusing them of disloyalty. The wheel had come full circle. They were charged with Jacobinism—that is enthusiasm for the principles that has led to the French Revolution—and once again suffered mob violence.[23]

One of the most objectional features of Dissent in the eyes of its adversaries was the fact that it was held to be ungentlemanly. This, and its democratic tendency, an authoritarian and snobbish society found it hard to forgive. Not only were its adherents drawn mainly from the ranks of small tradesmen and artisans, but its ministry (largely recruited from the same source), lacked academic training. Taunts on this account were flung at them by the very people who denied them access to the universities. Dr. Tatham gravely informed the citizens of Oxford that an academic education was as necessary to the exercise of the ministry as an apprenticeship to the exercise of a trade.

An accusation often levelled against Dissenters and Methodists during the latter half of the eighteenth century was that of " enthusiasm ", by which was meant religious extravagance. This can be dismissed out of hand. In practice it was no more than a term of abuse employed aganst those who took their religion seriously.

Although it is clear that Dissenters, as a particularly unwelcome minority, were made to feel the displeasure of the all-powerful university, it would be wrong to suppose that academic Oxford was at all times and in all cases, ungenerous and oppressive in its dealings with them as individuals. One gains the impression that relationships were on a slightly easier footing between roughly 1770 and 1790. Of the two deacons of the New Road congregation, one, Thomas Newman, was cook and manciple of St. John's College, and the other, Thomas Pasco, a druggist in High Street, had a university clientele. The number of Nonconformists was now so small—there could scarcely have been a score when they were at their lowest ebb in mid-century

[23] Hinton, pp. 259, 349.

—that they were probably regarded as too insignificant for severity. They were still very much under observation as is shown by veiled references to individuals in a lampoon of 1755 but they were looked upon merely as figures of fun.[24]

One restraining influence upon the university, eventually, was its own innate conservatism. Custom and usage meant much in Oxford. Oddity (such as separation from the established church might then be deemed), gained as it were a prescriptive right to recognition by its very continuance. This applied to families as well as to the Dissenting group as a whole. In much the same way, traits that irritate when displayed in youth make a man a "character" in old age. Thus one generation of Nonconformists could pass on to the next what it had itself received, but any attempt at proselytism was severly condemned.[25] Not unnaturally the lay leaders of the little community were reluctant to do anything that would arouse resentment. When a real forward movement was begun (about 1790), under the active leadership of James Hinton, the new minister, the university immediately took offence.

As one would expect in an English community, character and solid worth often won the respect even of antagonists. This was true at all periods. One can instance the tribute in the *Athenae* to the blind Presbyterian preacher, John Troughton (1637?-81), and the fact that two Anglican clergymen risked reproach by attending the funeral of Josiah Woodcock, another Presbyterian minister, at All Saints' Church in 1709.[26] Towards the end of his life, Thomas Nichols, a noted Oxford Quaker (1735), by his personal qualities overcame general prejudice.[27] Hinton himself, conciliatory but firm in his dealings with the university, ultimately gained its respect.

There were probably always a few men big enough to rise above the prevailing pettiness of outlook. An illustration of this is provided by an incident in the career of Samuel Collingwood, Independent member of Hinton's church, which consisted of Baptists and Independents. Collingwood became Printer to the University (itself a sign of the changing attitude), and collaborated with Charles, Earl Stanhope from 1805 onwards in introducing new methods of printing, including stereotyping, at the Press.[28] The anecdote related concerning him reflects credit on the Vice-Chancellor of the day. "One Monday morning he visited the Vice-Chancellor on business, as was his

[24] *The Spy* or *Pasquin at Oxford.*
[25] Hinton, p. 108.
[26] Hearne's *Collections* (Oxford Hist. Soc.), Vol. 2, p. 217.
[27] Story, p. 715.
[28] *Collectanea* III. (Oxford Hist. Soc.).

custom. The Vice-Chancellor was standing by his fire-place and said to him :

"Oh, Mr. Collingwood! Do you know I have had a lot of letters about you?"

"Have you, Mr. Vice-Chancellor? What is their subject?"

"Oh, they say you are a Dissenter and it is not right for the University to employ you."

"Well, and what have you done about it?"

"Done! What I always do in such cases—I threw them all into the fire." [29]

Both Collingwood and his Vice-Chancellor were rather exceptional and their professional association provided an opportunity for personal intercourse that was also exceptional as between dons and Dissenters. Nevertheless times were changing for the better in at least one important respect. The university ceased to interfere openly with Dissenters' activities, preferring to hold itself aloof while remaining coldly hostile. The aged Rector of Lincoln College was one of the last to interfere actively. As workmen were building a new Methodist chapel in New Inn Hall Street (the building which stands behind the present Wesley Memorial Church), he ordered them to cease their labours, saying "it was monstrous to build so large a Chapel in Oxford!" What is more the men complied until they were ordered by the builder to resume work. When the Chapel was opened in February 1818, a Proctor appeared at the evening service and walked down the aisle to survey the congregation and ensure that no undergraduates were present.[30]

Throughout the long Oxford controversy with Dissenters pride and prejudice had been given full play, but one element of bitterness (that aroused by profound differences in theology) had for the most part been absent. This too was added in the nineteenth century when the Tractarian movement took its rise within the university. From the start it was apparent that the cleavage between Tractarian and Nonconformist views was fundamental. Local Nonconformists, who had hitherto avoided polemical theology, now entered into the public debate believing truth itself to be at stake. Their leaders were Dr. Benjamin Godwin, Minister of New Road Baptist Church (1837-45), and the Rev. Eliezer Jones of George Street Congregational Church (1840-44). Dr. Godwin published two tracts, "Apostolic Marks of the True Church" (1842), and "An Examination of the Principles and Tendencies of Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist" (1843). The "Examination" is an able and temperate exposition of the points at issue and of the Evangelical position that can still be read with interest. In particular, the

[29] *Proceedings*, New Road Centenary, p. 32.
[30] Moore, *Nonconformity in Oxford*, p. 27.

writer deplored the spirit of haughty superiority and the lack of Christian charity exhibited by many of the early followers of the Oxford Movement towards others, whatever their love, faith and zeal, who were outside its ranks or those of the Roman Church. This he contrasted with the apostolic benediction on "all who in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both their's and our's".

The impact of the Movement, which eventually revitalised the Church of England, began to be felt immediately in Oxford parishes in a renewal of religious life. A somewhat grudging testimony to the activity of the parish clergy is contained in the report of the New Road Sunday School Society for 1846. One paragraph reads: "How strange and peculiar are the times in which we are permitted to live. Our fathers during the last sixty years lived in the midst of a pleasure-seeking, slothful, and careless clergy who were indifferent to the moral and spiritual condition of the young and rising race, but a different spirit is now abroad".[31] The absence of enthusiasm apparent in this comment was due to the fact that economic pressure, in the form of both threats and inducements, was brought to bear on parents to persuade them to transfer their children from the Baptist schools to the parochial schools. Complaints on this score were repeated from time to time during the next twenty years.[32]

Censures from high places were still the portion of Nonconformists. Samuel Wilberforce, a great bishop who wrought a transformation in the Oxford diocese (1845-69), went so far as to say in one of his charges that the "three great obstacles to the work of the Church were, first, the public house; secondly, bad cottages; and thirdly, the presence and progress of Dissent".[33] In his Bampton lectures in 1861, John Sandford, Archdeacon of Coventry, stated that "Dissent has wrought and is working vast and extensive evil, and imperilling to a painful extent the faith and the loyalty and the moral and religious life of our people".[34]

But neither the snubs of prelates nor the cold-shoulder of the university could prevent the steady progress of the various Oxford Nonconformist groups in the nineteenth century. The genius of the place was against them but the spirit of the age was with them. Whereas in 1800, when the Quaker cause had almost died out, there were but two meeting-houses in constant use in the city—those of the Methodists and the Dissenters—by 1846 the number had increased to seven. An Oxford directory of that date lists the following additional churches:—Baptist, Commercial Road; Primitive Methodist, Bull Street; Wesleyan

[31] Society's Centenary Booklet (1913), p. 9.
[32] *Ibid*, pp. 10, 22. [33] *Ibid*, p. 16. [34] *Ibid*, p. 18.

Centenary, St. Clement's; and Independent (Congregational), George Street.[35] Summertown Congregational Church had just come into being. Scarcely less important was the existence of three schools in which the children of Nonconformists could be educated. Both the Baptists and the Congregationalists were responsible for the running of what were described as "public schools", the former in Penson's Gardens and the latter at Summertown. A Wesleyan school for boys had been built in what was then known as Bulwark Alley in 1831 and was now under the headmastership of John Walker Sixsmith. It continued to serve many generations of Oxford boys until its very useful career came to an end in 1928.

The ancient feud between the university and Nonconformists gradually died away during the remaining years of the century. This is probably to be ascribed to the growth of a liberal party in the university after 1845, caused by a reaction from the Oxford Movement, and to the progressive secularisation of the university and its studies as the various measures of university reform took effect. The University Reform Act of 1854, which abolished religious tests for matriculation and the B.A. degree, enabled Nonconformists to enter the university, but they were still debarred from the M.A. degree and election to fellowships.

During the 'sixties vigorous efforts were made to complete the reform by abolishing all religious tests, and it is pleasant to record that a group of Oxford men, including Benjamin Jowett of Balliol, Professor Goldwin Smith and the later Viscount Bryce, were active in their advocacy of this measure. The main obstacle was the feeling of many that it was the duty of Oxford, in a changing world, to maintain a standard of orthodoxy. Support for this view came from an unexpected quarter. When John Henry Newman was asked for his views on a project for establishing a Roman Catholic College in Oxford, he wrote (1863):—"I have personally a great dislike to mixed education in se. I love Oxford too well to wish its dogmatism destroyed, though it be a Protestant dogmatism. I had rather it was dogmatic on an error than not dogmatic at all. At present I had rather that it excluded us from dogmatism, than admitted us, from liberalism. Dogmatism is not so common in these days that we can dispense with any one of its witnesses. Oxford has been a break-water against latitudinarianism; I don't wish to have part in letting the ocean in".[36] Nevertheless, when the University Tests Abolition Bill came before the Lords in 1871, most of the bishops present gave it their support and the measure was carried. Religious tests for all degrees (other than Divinity) were abolished,

[35] Hunt & Co.'s City of Oxford Directory.
[36] *A History of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford*, p. 464.

and Nonconformists were admitted to lay fellowships, and a share in the government of the university. Fellowships and headships of Houses were freed from clerical restrictions in the majority of cases, in 1882.

The immediate result of the opening of the university was as disappointing and humiliating as it was unexpected. Sons of Nonconformists often achieved academic distinction, but many drifted away not only from Nonconformity, but from Christianity itself. Concern at this development was felt within the university as well as without. At an early date Professor Thomas Hill Green expressed to Dr. R. W. Dale his belief that the young men should be followed to the university in order that their religious life and principles might be maintained.[37] This view was pressed by other university men and the eventual outcome was the removal of Spring Hill College from Birmingham and its establishment as Mansfield College at Oxford. Congregationalists subscribed £50,000 to achieve this end. The inauguration of Mansfield, the first Free Church college in Oxford, in 1889, was a notable event. Dr. Jowett described the event as a great festival of union and reconciliation, adding: "We may be divided into different sects—I would rather say into different families—but it does not follow that there is anything wrong in the division, or that there should be any feeling of enmity entertained by different bodies towards one another".

Unitarians, following the example of the Congregationalists, transferred Manchester College from Gordon Square, London, to Oxford in 1889. The college buildings were completed and opened four years later. A chaplaincy to Presbyterians, again admitted to the university in which they had once been such a force, was founded in 1908. The university showed its interest both in this and the subsequent erection of St. Columba's Presbyterian Church, Alfred Street (opened 1915). The same good-will was shown towards Baptists when Regent's Park College was transferred from London, largely through the instrumentality of its Principal, the late Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, himself an Oxford man. The Board of Theology passed a resolution assuring the college of a welcome. A site in St. Giles' had been secured in 1927, but building did not begin until 1938, and the present portion of the college was completed in 1940. Another sign of the changed outlook was the election in 1936 of Dr. Wheeler Robinson as Chairman of the Board of the Faculty of Theology—the first Free Churchman to hold the office.[38]

WALTER STEVENS.

[37] *History of the Free Churches*, H. S. Skeats and C. S. Miall, p. 683.
[38] *H. Wheeler Robinson: A Memoir*, by E. A. Payne, p. 87.

The Realism of "The Pilgrim's Progress."

A tinker out of Bedford,
A vagrant oft in quod,
A private under Fairfax,
A minister of God——

So began Kipling's verses on John Bunyan in the first World War, when once again that immortal voice awoke a reverberent echo in the hearts of English-speaking men. In the second World War, Miss M. P. Willcocks gave the world the first wholly satisfactory psychological study of this extraordinary man. He was, to be sure, extraordinary in more ways than one: a man of whose life we know little, while of his soul we know much; a man without power or place, whose word, in scores of languages, has nevertheless gone out through the entire Protestant world; that rare, inexplicable thing, a man of genius.

Of his genius there is no doubt. Every page, every paragraph, every sentence, every word of *The Pilgrim's Progress* is alive with it: this tough, vigorous English with the rhythm and assonances of popular ballads, these four-square characters, personified virtues and vices, perhaps, but essentially individuals; the doggerel rhymes, the solid green realism of the symbolic country, so recognisably Bedfordshire.

John Bunyan was one of the dispossessed, a tinker by trade, but descended from English peasants who had once tilled their own fields and pastured their own beasts on the common land, but who, with the march of Enclosure, had become the landless, the vagabonds, the oppressed. One protester against the Enclosures, who had walked to London to make known his plaint, declared: "I kept four cows before the parish was enclosed, and now I don't keep so much as a goose; and yet you ask me what I lose by it!" And this man, curiously enough, came from Bedfordshire. Bunyan was born on the eve of the great conflict between King and Parliament, from which the little band of the Levellers were to carry no harvest home. The poor men were crushed between King and Parliament, as the Independents were crushed between Church and Presbytery. Bunyan was poor and an Independent; what could he reap from all this? A life of poverty and hard work, as tinker or soldier, struggling to

earn shelter and bread for his wife and children; twelve years of imprisonment for speaking the word of God without a licence—to his neighbours, and, worse than imprisonment, ever-present anxiety for his family and fear of his own future, fear of humiliation, pain and death. And at the end of his life some little satisfaction from the success of his book, some little liberty. His was a narrow life, too, circumscribed by poverty, lived almost wholly between Bedford and London, but for the brief experience of Fairfax's campaigns. Yet from this barren stuff Bunyan's genius mined the gold which has been current for centuries.

Although Bunyan in his immortal allegory testified to having "dreamed a dream," there is every probability that the vision was intensified by certain scenes with which the writer was personally acquainted, and by the local associations of his own early years.

That the personal experiences of Bunyan at the seige of Leicester plainly find some indication in the allegory of *The Holy War* has been pointed out more than once. It is somewhat curious that little corresponding endeavour has been made to localise the scenes, and enliven the characters, in *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The task is always worth attempting. To one who knows the neighbourhood of Bedford and Elstow, it is not very difficult to fix on the exact site of the Slough of Despond, the Narrow Way, By-path Meadow, the Shining Gate, the Celestial City, the Delectable Mountains, and other places mentioned in the undying dream.

Not a man or woman in *The Pilgrim's Progress* but has, under the general outline of vice or virtue, the detailed reality of a human being. That is, of course, what makes the power of this great book. No symbolic conflict that between Christian and Apollyon, but a genuine fight in which our hero is not above considering, as the enemy advances, that he has armour only on his breast, none on his back, and therefore cannot turn and flee. (Private Bunyan, perhaps, pike in hand, facing his first cavalry charge?) Surely in Faithful we have the gentlest, the most human, the most lovable "good man" Bunyan ever encountered; but Faithful suffers and dies at Vanity Fair almost as Bunyan himself might have suffered and died. The characterization of Evangelist, the guide, mentor, and friend of Christian, was surely modelled on a real person, and most likely it was good John Gifford, Bunyan's own minister. In *The Pilgrim's Progress* we have nothing invented, but all is written down much as it was under an English judiciary savagely unjust in a country torn by moral conflict; nor is Vanity Fair the imagining of a poet but the fair held annually on Elstow Green drawn to the last booth and side-show by a man who had been there and could not forget it.

Elstow was to Bunyan a spot inseparable from memory, and upon it much of his great work was focussed. There his boyhood and youth were spent at tip-cat and other games until he left to join the army. After his soldiering he returned to Elstow and indulged in such "wiles of the devil" as "bell ringing and dancing."

Bedford was, doubtless, regarded by Bunyan as an extreme contrast to Elstow; for whereas the latter was mainly remembered as the scene of his wrongdoing, and the devilry more than mere revilry of its fair, Bedford was closely associated with religious life. It was there that he threw in his lot with a "strict" sect of the Baptists, and the town, in his moods of spiritual exaltation, may well have seemed like the Celestial City. If Bunyan had blasphemed with zest, so did he begin to worship with passion.

On a mind so imaginative as that of Bunyan's, contrasts must have made an indelible impression, and well might the Priory, a part of which still remains, almost adjoining the fine old tower in which Bunyan so often rang the bells, appear, in comparison with the tinker's humble home, as the House Beautiful, and the fine entrance way, yet standing, as the Shining Gate. Furthermore, in olden times the nuns in Elstow were known as "the ladies," and tales about them were probably remembered in Bunyan's time by the grandfathers of the village. One may almost imagine that, when he wrote of Charity, Piety, and Prudence at the House Beautiful, he had in mind the ladies of Elstow Priory.

Taking Elstow Green, where a fair is still held, as the site of the City of Destruction, it may be noted that there is immediately "on the left-hand side of the road a meadow and a stile to go over it," and that meadow is called By-path Meadow. How many thousands of lovers of *The Pilgrim's Progress* have taken the "by-path" leading from the "narrow-way"—as the road from Elstow Green to Bedford was and still partly is—to the "broad road"—from Ampthill to Bedford. Not only is the thoroughfare from Elstow to Bedford "narrow," except where it was widened during the last century, but it is also "straight." The present bending of the road to the right before the railway is reached is clearly a deviation from the original alignment in order to facilitate the building of the station.

By making a pleasant detour at Elstow Green through By-path Meadow, the broad road can, as before stated, be reached, and the Slough of Despond site avoided; but nevertheless the River Ouse has to be crossed at the same spot as if the narrow and straight road had been taken.

To Bunyan's highly imaginative mind what inferences must

have arisen respecting the two ways so familiar to his locality? The road from his own rude home to Elstow Green, which is doubtless the average width of the way throughout to Bedford before the alteration in its course was carried out, is not more than twenty feet in breadth, while the road running parallel is nearly eighty feet from hedge to hedge.

It was open to the traveller to choose his own way to the city—just as the saint and the sinner, so distinctly present to Bunyan's acute religious consciousness, travel through life by such widely different paths, and yet meet before the end of each pilgrimage—by the respective roads to Bedford. In the allegorical journey through life there must be an arrival at the river, with the result, in a spiritual sense, that all who take the broad road have to meet the cold waters of death, while those, enduring to the end the dangers and hardships of the straight and narrow way, in triumph cross "the River of the Water of Life" to receive "that crown of glory which fadeth not away."

There is no place more frequently referred to in *The Pilgrim's Progress* than the Slough of Despond; and such a spot as would be likely to supply inspiration for the symbol of mire and wretchedness can clearly be traced as nearly as possible half-way between Elstow and Bedford.

Although a culvert now prevents the sluggish watercourse, which it crosses, from again becoming a "slough" to vehicular traffic and pedestrians, such an undrained low-lying spot, with its willows suggestive of damp soil, must, particularly in wet weather, have been a veritable quagmire, all the worse after the trampling therein of the many "fair cattle," to say nothing of the people who, passing and re-passing, would yet make the "slough" yet wider and deeper by churning up the filth and mud.

Not only were there few bridges made over such places in the seventeenth century, but rural road-making, and the same applies to mending, never was in any way properly carried out. The ever-observant Bunyan lets in no little light upon the subject when "the old gentleman" who addressed Christiana at the "slough" upon the deplorable condition of the spot, said "many there be who pretend to be the King's labourers and say that they are for mending the King's highway, that bring dirt and dung instead of stones and so mar instead of mend." Doubtless the way-warden of the Elstow district, who must have been well-known to Bunyan, was no exception to the usual run of those having charge of the King's highway, and very likely the condition of the "Slough of Despond" was one of the results of his remissness.

Though only the Ouse is crossed in travelling from Elstow to Bedford, Bunyan mentions two rivers—the one that of "the

water of life," and the other "the river of death." It is worth noting that below the old bridge the Ouse divides, there being actually two rivers running parallel for some little distance—certainly a mile—and of one it can well be said "there is a meadow on either either side green all the year long." The upper stream, though apparently a continuation of the Ouse as it runs past the "city," is but a kind of backwater to the actual course of the river, and it might in Bunyan's mind have been typical of death, while the ever-flowing stream symbolised life.

Of the Delectable Mountains the fact might be noted that Bedford, which itself lies very low, is surrounded by districts rising in places to three and four hundred feet. There is a clear rise of more than a hundred feet in the land behind the town, and to a poor, weary pilgrim, with recollections of the slough's mire, such rising slopes, dressed in living green, and bright in all the unclouded glory of a summer sun, might well be looked upon as veritable mountains of delight.

While inordinately tall men, like fat women, may doubtless have been exhibited at Elstow Fair, we need not suppose that either Bunyan's "giants" or his "lions" were derived from such a source. Their origin is to be sought elsewhere. Among the few books which the author of *The Pilgrim's Progress* possessed was a copy of *Sir Bevis of Southampton,* which is full of giants and fighting. Moreover, a couple of lions figure most prominently in the story, and so enabled Bunyan to yet further amplify and embellish his dream when there were no scenes or objects of local interest to enable him to do so.

When the young tinker was on the turning-point of his career he was intimately acquainted with an elderly villager who displayed a good deal of zeal for religion, only, however, to become a very extreme freethinker, or "ranter" as the Antinomians were then called, and he, in all probability, was the Atheist of the allegory. Christian addressing Atheist said, "You dwell in the City of Destruction, the place also where I was born"—thus localising it; and "the whole world," as usually represented, could scarcely have been in Bunyan's mind. Christian was born in the City of Destruction, which was the Elstow of fact, and Bunyan was born in Elstow, the City of Destruction in the "dream".

That Elstow was the City of Destruction in Bunyan's mind does not seem doubtful; for even apart from such suggestions as have already been furnished, it may be observed that Christiana and her four "children" were "a mile away" from where the dream was dreamed—the "den" or gaol—and Bunyan's wife and four children were living a mile and, to be exact, two hundred and fifty yards from Bedford Bridge.

It is not a little remarkable that, doubtless owing to an error by "the King's surveyers" before Bunyan's time, the mile post—one still marks the spot—was erected immediately opposite Elstow Green, and so impressed the distance definitely on the author's mind in writing "Pilgrim's Progress,"

Many readers of the golden dream must have thought there was a dimming of the lustre when Christian hurried on his way to everlasting bliss and left Christiana with her children behind to share in the downfall of the City of Destruction. It seems that he hardly played the manly part in doing so. But something must be allowed for Bunyan's actual experience with his first wife, and his frame of mind at the time. Mrs. Bunyan, it is certain, lost a good deal of patience with her husband, who had become so convicted of his enormous transgressions, as they appeared to him, that he had, in the opinion of his wife, "some frenzied distemper," and went on "worse and worse." And so Bunyan's wife and little ones, it is recorded, "began to be hardened—sometimes deride, sometimes quite neglect him." He would walk solitary in the fields; and for days he spent his time reading, and crying, "What shall I do to be saved?" Certainly with the Dissenters of those days there was a very literal interpretation of divine injunctions; and Bunyan no doubt found it quite natural to make his immortal Pilgrim depart from Christiana for conscience's sake, and so carry out to the letter the law of Christ, and escape the condemnation that "he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that doth not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me."

For the Enchanted Ground of the allegory any valley on a drowsy summer day will serve. But as Pilgrim reaches the end of the journey the topography grows more and more vague.

Bunyan rejoiced to see a little satisfaction from the success of his book. Of the first part he writes in merry mood:—

> My Pilgrim's book has travelled sea and land;
> Yet could I never come to understand
> That it was slighted, or turned out of door,
> By any kingdom, were they rich or poor.

But if by chance Christiana should meet someone who dislikes Part One of his parable, then she must remember that—

> Some love no cheese, some love no fish, and some
> Love not their friends, nor their own house or home;
> Some start at pig, slight chicken, love not fowl,
> More than they love a cuckoo or an owl.
> Leave such, my Christiana, to their choice,
> And seek those who to find thee will rejoice.

That is, it's a queer fellow who cares neither for friend, nor

home; neither for chicken nor fish—nor for my doughty Pilgrim.

Enough has been said now to indicate the local basis and colour on which the great allegory was built up. It is curious to reflect how many thousands of readers, beyond the seas of Britain, beyond the Atlantic and the Pacific, have hung enraptured over the geography of *The Pilgrim's Progress,* all unconscious that the map and the road-book of Christian's unforgettable journey are to be found to this day in a quiet town of rural England and its sleepy neighbour villages.

No man was more suited than he to write *The Pilgrim's Progress,* who was himself the pilgrim, while only a genius at once so simple and universal could, at the turn of the mediaeval to the modern world, have charged the threadbare allegory of man's earthly pilgrimage with new and actual meaning.

JOHNSTONE G. PATRICK.

Isaac Watts, by Arthur P. Davis (Independent Press, Ltd., 8s. 6d.)

This is the English edition of a book which appeared in the United States in 1943. The Independent Press is to be commended for making it available in this country, for it is based upon careful research, and, though it does not contain much new material, it replaces the older biographies by Gibbons (1780), Milner (1834), Paxton Hood (1875) and Wright (1914), providing a readable and comprehensive survey of Watts's life and writings. The appendices (which include a complete list of the known letters of Watts) and the thirty pages of notes indicate the labour that Mr. Davis put into the book and will prove of considerable value to those interested in eighteenth century Nonconformity. One wishes, however, that Mr. Davis had known the essays of the late Bernard Lord Manning and that he could have found room for a more extended and deeper examination of Watts's hymns, for it is on these that his enduring fame and worth rest. Why did Watts cease so early in life to use his poetic gift? One would like to know more details about his early sale of the copyright of *Hymns and Spiritual Songs.* But Mr. Davis's main concern was to provide a full documented biography and to show how many sided were Watts's interests. In this he has admirably succeeded.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Judson on Baptism.

ADONIRAM JUDSON, the apostle of Burma, is one of the outstanding heroes of the Christian story, and certainly one of the greatest on our Baptist roll. It is a pity that he is so little known in this country.

As a theological student he was instrumental in causing the founding of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1810. He was the author of a memorial sent to the General Association of the Congregational Ministers by a group of students, asking that they be supported as foreign missionaries. In 1812 he sailed for Calcutta hoping to start work in British India.

On the long voyage he devoted himself to a careful study of the subject of baptism. He hoped to meet the Serampore band and wanted to be armed to meet the arguments in which he might get involved. Much to his annoyance and with extreme reluctance he found himself being convinced that Carey and his friends were right; infant baptism was unscriptural and generally indefensible. It was a painful situation. Here he was on his way to start work as a pioneer Congregational missionary for a society he had largely called into existence. He wanted to go on being a missionary but he had no other means of support for himself and his wife. The latter was, if possible, even more reluctant than he to become a Baptist. Yet if he was to be honest he would have to sever his connection with his Congregational colleagues. Some further weeks of study after reaching Calcutta clinched matters for himself and his wife. He went to Serampore not to argue but to announce their conversion to Baptist views and to ask for baptism. This took place in Calcutta in September 1812, by Ward of the Serampore trio.

Judson's actions led to the founding in America of the Baptist Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in India and other Foreign Parts. But the British government ordered him out of India and he set sail for Burma to join Felix Carey. At the time of his death in 1850 the Burmese church had a membership of seven thousand, and Judson had the oversight of a staff of 163 missionaries, Burmese pastors and assistants. He had translated the Bible, published much other literature, prepared a grammar and nearly completed a great dictionary. But only an exceptionally strong constitution and a will of iron had prevented him in the early days from joining the noble army of martyrs,

under the strain of prolonged imprisonment under the most horrifying conditions, to say nothing of spells of deliberate torture.

In the present writer's possession is a slim, stained volume: *A Sermon on the nature and subjects of Christian Baptism, by Adoniram Judson, D.D., Burmah.*[1] It is the second edition and was published by Peter Sinclair in 1835. This is the sermon of which William Carey said, "Judson has since then (his baptism) preached the best sermon upon baptism that I ever heard upon the subject". The "Sermon" contains over twenty thousand words and has obviously been enlarged for publication. It has also been furnished with a whole battery of footnotes in Greek and English, and with many references to ancient and modern authorities. It was delivered probably in Calcutta or Serampore. Much of it naturally covers ground familiar to readers of the *Baptist Quarterly*, but an outline of the argument may be of interest.

The text is Matthew xxviii, 19, and Judson sets out to ask two questions: What is baptism? and To whom is baptism to be administered? Under the first head he establishes that the Greek word means immersion, with many quotations from Greek dictionaries and the support of eleven non-Baptist authors, including Beza and Luther. There are no instances in the New Testament which suggest that the word is to be interpreted in any other sense.

Further, "not only all the branches of the Greek church, but the whole Christian world, for the space of thirteen hundred years, practised immersion as the only valid baptism. Sprinkling, or pouring, was never tolerated except in case of dangerous sickness, or want of sufficient quantity of water—Never by an Christians in any age was sprinkling or pouring allowed in common cases, until the Council of Ravenna, assembled by the Pope in the year 1311, declared immersion or pouring to be indifferent." To substantiate this assertion he devotes eight pages to quotations from "Paedobaptist authors of acknowledged authority."

Judson now turns to his second question: to whom is baptism to be administered? The commission makes it clear that Jesus commanded the apostles to baptise "disciples" only. Why then does the greater part of the Christian world practise infant baptism? The New Testament never mentions it, and the baptism of households is shown to be no exception.

[1] The book has an added personal interest because it is inscribed on the fly-leaf, "Joseph Martin, 1839," the signature, I believe, of my great-grandfather, and because it bears unmistakable signs of having been in India in the possession of my grandfather during his long missionary career.

The next part of Judson's argument is learned, detailed and involved. It concerns the paedobaptist contention, evidently much emphasised at that time, that children are involved in God's covenant with their parents, that Christians are the inheritors of the covenant with Abraham, and that infant baptism seals the Christian covenant as circumcision did the older one. Judson has not much difficulty in showing that the covenant with Abrahama cannot apply literally to Christians, though he devotes no less than twenty pages to the task. Christians, he concludes, are heirs of Abraham only in so far as they have faith. "Proper caution" is necessary in applying analogies from the Old Testament. "In the words of Dr. Scott . . .' common sense is usually sufficient to preserve men from such absurdities, when there is no personal or party interest to serve by them'."

Judson quotes and demolishes four arguments advanced by Dr. Worcester, "a late distinguished writer", whose book he had been studying on the voyage, to prove that infant baptism is to replace circumcision. The argument that Jewish proselyte baptism, including the baptism of infants, was familiar in the time of Christ and would naturally be taken as a guide by Christians, is next handled. He holds that there is in fact no evidence that the Jews in the time of Christ admitted proselytes by baptism. The only Jewish baptism known was the baptism of John, a baptism of repentance and therefore of adults only.

Finally Judson turns to assault the last line of defence of the paedobaptists. He quotes Bossuet: "Experience has shown that all the attempts of the Reformed Church to confound the Anabaptists by the scripture, have been weak and, therefore, they are at least obliged to allege to them the practice of the Church."

But the Christian writers of the first and second centuries never mention infant baptism. The first reference is one of opposition by Tertullian in the beginning of the third century. The practice no doubt began in the late second century, on the spread of the belief that baptism was necessary to salvation, but there was much debate about it until the Council in A.D. 418. Judson quotes freely from paedobaptist historians in support of his case.

He sums up, "The reasons stated in both parts of this discourse, lead us to the conclusion, that *the immersion of a professing believer into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is the only Christian baptism.*"

His concluding appeal comes from one who had already paid a heavy price for loyalty to his convictions and reflects his own mental and spiritual struggle. "If when your mind adverts to this question, you fear the consequences of an examination, and dread those sacrifices, which a discovery that

you have been mistaken, may enforce on your conscience; or if you feel the influence of long-established sentiments, or imagine that the subject is too dark and intricate for your investigation, look to the Son of God, who hesitated not to make the greatest sacrifices and to endure the most painful sufferings for you; and look up to the Father of lights, to send the Holy Spirit, according to the promise of His Son, to guide you into all the truth."

HUGH MARTIN.

The Living Christ in Modern China, by G. A. Young. (Carey Press 7s. 6d.)

Here is a book which is a tonic to read, for the author's own passionate faith in Christ as the only but sufficient Saviour of mankind has communicated itself to what he has written. The story pulsates with the vivid spiritual experience of a man who is a blend of the mystic and the intrepid campaigner for Christ. The reader is grateful too for the honesty of the book. No one is likely to forget the graphic account of the remarkable growth of the Bible Study Fellowship in Sian which Mr. Young led, and of its dramatic and almost complete disintegration when the members realised that their leader was claiming a unique position for Christ and His religion. Recent events in China provide a poignant commentary upon Mr. Young's story. He devotes one of his chapters to Communism. In Europe we are tempted to think that the Communist is almost as difficult to convert as the Jew, but here is a story of Communists being brought to the foot of the Cross. In his discussion of the relation of Christianity to Communism Mr. Young is our teacher. In Britain and America the contemporary Christian attitude to Communism is far too negative and complacent. Mr. Young, on the other hand, boldly calls for "a rebirth of Apostolic Christianity with a flaming evangelism and a Kingdom of God social programme which will be more revolutionary than that of the Communists." Only at one point does the reviewer find his judgement parting company with the author. It is in the latter's too sympathetic account of the excesses of the Chinese revival-movements. But that is a small point. Here is a book to rejoice in and to commend enthusiastically to all one's friends.

JOHN O. BARRETT.

John Horsch: Mennonite Historian.

DURING the past two generations American Mennonites have made a number of notable contributions to the scholarly study of the radical spiritual movements of the Reformation period. As long ago as 1871 there was published at Elkhart, Indiana, a complete edition in English of the works of Menno Simons. More recently, from Goshen College, Indiana, and from the Mennonite Publishing House at Scottdale, Pennsylvania, there has come a series of publications on the history of the Mennonite and Hutterite communities of both Europe and America. The pages of the *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, founded in 1927, regularly carry contributions by H. S. Bender, John C. Wenger, Ernest Correll, Robert Freidmann, Cornelius Krahn, C. Henry Smith and others, which throw much new light on the history and the theology of early Anabaptism. Some of these scholars are American born; others belong to the great company who of recent years have left European lands in search of larger freedom and peace. A link between the publications which came from Elkhart seventy years ago and those now being produced at Scottdale, as well as a living link with Europe, is provided by the life and work of John Horsch. All those interested in Anabaptist history are his debtors. His career vividly illustrates some of the changes which have come, not only in this field of study, but also in the outlook of the Mennonite communities. Moreover, the fact that Horsch was for a few years in membership with American Baptist churches provides an additional reason for making some account of him available in this country.

Horsch was born on December 18, 1867, in a village in Bavaria, not far from Würzburg. Both his father and his mother came of old Mennonite families of Swiss and South German origin, families which had for generations been engaged with skill and success in farming. They belonged to a hard-working, devout and self-contained community. John's upbringing was strict. His father was a Mennonite "bishop" or "elder", as well as a farmer, a stern and aloof man, but the possessor of a fairly large library of old Mennonite books. John was the fourth of nine children. He was never very strong, and it was chiefly from his mother that he learned a love of the Bible and an

introduction to the devotional writings of Thomas à Kempis, Tauler, Arndt and C. H. J. Spitta. Baptised by his father when fifteen years of age, he was put in charge of the family's dairy herd and in his later teens spent some months at the Bavarian State Agricultural School.

A decisive intellectual awakening took place as he read some of the contributions which Ludwig Keller (1848-1915), the Münster archivist, was making to the study of Anabaptist life prior to the tragic episode of the Münster siege (1533-1535). A generation earlier C. A. Cornelius (1810-1903) had blazed a new trail in Reformation studies by showing how different was the picture of the Anabaptist "Kingdom" provided by the documents, from the exaggeration, condemnation and abuse ignorantly and unquestioningly repeated by opponents for over three hundred years. In 1882 Keller had published a life of Hans Denck and in the following years wrote a number of articles describing with enthusiasm the tradition of spiritual religion to be found alongside of and often in opposition to the Lutheran movement, a tradition with its roots in the Middle Ages, but suspicious of chiliasm, rejecting the sword and standing for toleration and freedom of conscience. Young Horsch responded eagerly to Keller's presentation of that spiritual heritage which was his as a Mennonite. In May, 1885, the youth, not yet seventeen and a half, wrote to Keller asking where the writings of men like Denck and Langenmantel could be obtained. Keller warmed to the young man's interest and lent him Denck's *Von der wahren Liebe*. Then there began a correspondence which lasted nearly ten years and which gave the impetus to much of Horsch's subsequent work. Keller encouraged the young Mennonite to prepare a new edition of the *Theologia Germanica* and of selections from Tauler's sermons, as a first step towards recalling his community to its older spiritual treasures. Together they planned a literary campaign that should have "Back to the times before 1535" as its motto. But as Horsch came to admire Denck and as he studied the story of the Anabaptist martyrs, he became growingly distressed at the prospect of compulsory military service. Shortly before his nineteenth birthday, unbeknown to his father but aided and abetted by his mother, he slipped away from home, made his way to Rotterdam and took ship for America.

Keller at first feared he was losing a valuable recruit and ally but Horsch assured him that he hoped to carry out some of their projects in the larger opportunity provided by the Mennonite community in the United States. Making his way to Elkhart, Indiana, he was successful, at the second attempt, in securing employment with J. F. Funk, the Mennonite editor and publisher,

and quickly demonstrated his own literary and historical interests and gifts. For eight years, broken by brief periods improving his education, the young man continued in association with Funk. Letters to and from Keller crossed the Atlantic. Horsch read steadily the writings of left-wing Reformation figures like Sebastian Franck. He began to build up his own collection of Anabaptist literature. He prepared a new German edition of Denck's pamphlet. He filled the Mennonite periodicals which went out from Elkhart with extracts from sixteenth century writers and brief historical articles. As early as 1890, he even published a short history of the Mennonites in German.

It must have seemed to Horsch and his friends that he had successfully established himself in the New World. In 1893 he married, his bride being like himself a member of an old Bavarian Mennonite family. Two years later, however, his association with J. F. Funk came to an end, and in circumstances which compelled him to sell to his former employer most of his library. For the next few years he tried various means of livelihood—business, teaching and finally the editing of a farming journal. Then in 1900 there began eight years of association with J. A. Sprunger, an ex-Mennonite of evangelical sympathies, who had established an orphanage and various publishing enterprises. Horsch assisted Sprunger, in Berne, Indiana, in Cleveland, Ohio, and elsewhere. It was at this period of his life that Horsch was in membership with Baptist churches. Articles on Mennonite history still came occasionally from his pen and in 1903 he published *A Short History of Christianity*, a book of 300 pages which indicated his growing mastery of wider issues. It became clear that his interests were turning from "spiritual reformers" like Denck, and away from the standpoint of Ludwig Keller, to a greater concentration on the witness of the Swiss Brethren, whose Biblical attitudes, it seemed to him, were rightly reproduced and re-emphasized by Menno Simons.

In 1908, at the age of forty-one, Horsch stepped at last into a position where his powers and convictions found proper scope. He was appointed German editor of the Mennonite Publishing House in Scottdale, Pennsylvania. This Publishing House had recently bought out the Funk enterprises at Elkhart and was starting on a new and growingly successful career. Horsch's position gave him adequate opportunity for both research and writing. He helped with the starting of the Mennonite Historical Library at Scottdale, and this library was able to acquire the valuable books he had had to part with to J. F. Funk in 1895. It is now one of the most important collections of Anabaptist and Mennonite material in the world and is housed at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

History was for Horsch "an instrument for evangelism in the truest and best sense". Mennonitism was not an antiquarian interest but a way of life. A ceaseless flow of articles and pamphlets appeared, some in English and some in German, and he developed into a vigorous controversialist. In 1916 he published a biography of Menno Simons, which remains the best account in English, though it now requires comparison with the more recent life in German by Cornelius Krahn (1936). In the following years Horsch was drawn into the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. His *Modern Religious Liberalism* (1920) was one of the most trenchant contributions from the side of the Conservatives. Books on Infant Baptism and on the principle of non-resistance followed.

But it was not in these fields that Horsch's most enduring work was done. He had been one of the first to call the attention of Ludwig Keller and others to the fact that there were in Canada and the United States little communities of Hutterian Brethren, living in *bruderhöfe,* the direct descendants of those who had been driven by fierce persecution from Hungary and Moravia eastwards into Southern Russia, and who at the end of the eighteenth century had been allowed to seek a new home across the Atlantic. Horsch's study of this wing of the old Anabaptist movement led in 1931 to his valuable book *The Hutterian Brethren.* In 1922-23 he had been able to pay a long visit to Europe and to the Germany of the Weimar Republic. Old contacts were renewed and new ones formed. Naturally he became a contributor to the important but as yet incomplete *Mennonitische Lexikon,* edited by Christian Neff and Christian Hege, and also to the *Mennonite Quarterly Review.*

The growingly threatening situation in Europe caused Horsch much distress of mind. He was particularly concerned that certain groups of Mennonites seemed ready to compromise their witness to the principles of non-resistance. The outbreak of the war and the over-running by Germany of the Low Countries, the scene of Menno Simons' work, could not but deeply affect him. After some months of growing weakness he passed away in October, 1941, three months before his seventy-fourth birthday. His main energies during the closing years of his life had been given to a comprehensive study entitled *Mennonites in Europe.* It was published posthumously in 1942 and is likely to take its place as his most important book.

A. H. Newman (1852-1933), W. T. Whitley (1861-1948), and John Horsch (1867-1941) may fitly be named together. The American, the Englishman and the German were contemporaries. They knew and appreciated one another's work and there were a number of links between them. Taken together the detailed

studies of these three scholars may be said to have opened up new vistas for those English-speaking communities, the origin of whose witness is to be found in the left-wing of the Continental Reformation. Judged by technical and academic standards Horsch was not the greatest of the three. Certain of his interpretations of Mennonite history have already been challenged. But Horsch was second to neither of the others in enthusiasm and devotion to his subject, and as a pioneer and propagandist he was probably the one chiefly deserving of honour. Horsch's son-in-law, H. S. Bender, writing of his life and work, refers to "what he so valiantly began."[1] There are British Baptists as well as American Mennonites who will gratefully recognise the truth of the phrase.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Service Book for the Young. (Oxford University Press, 4s. 6d.)

Prepared by the Church of Scotland Committee on Public Worship and Aids to Devotion, this manual should, if rightly used, fulfil its avowed purpose of encouraging orderly and reverent worship in Sunday Schools and at children's services in church.

[1] *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* XXI, No. 3 (July, 1947), p. 144. The issue is a John Horsch Memorial Number, and includes a full bibliography of his writings compiled by the late Edward Yoder.

The Injunctions of 1547 and 1559 in Relation to our Traditions of Worship.

THE worship of all historic communions is rooted in tradition. For the Roman that tradition is crystallised in the Canon of the Mass; for the Anglican in the Book of Common Prayer. The Free Church tradition consists in a certain frame-work, undefined but well understood, into which prayers, praises, the reading and expounding of the Scriptures, and the celebration of the sacraments are fitted. Within this frame-work there is a wide liberty of expression. In times past, stress has been laid on what the Anglicans rejected when they cut themselves off from Rome and on what the Free Churches rejected when they became separated from Canterbury. It is perhaps of greater significance to ask what we have retained from the past. The Free Church tradition may claim to have retained some elements of worship which have been obscured in the more restricted and legalised formularies of the Anglican Church. G. R. Owst in his book *Medieval Preaching,* which merits the attention of all historically minded Free Churchmen, claims that the sermon is the part of worship which passes through the centuries of the reformation ferment without any break or sudden change of form or content. If this thesis be accepted then the Free Churches may claim to have been more faithful than their established brethren to the ancient tradition of preaching which has always had a primacy in their worship but is only an extra to the Anglican service.

Some of the early Congregationalists, from whom sprang Baptist as well as Congregational churches, complained bitterly of "innovated injunctions in the worship and service of God" under Archbishop Laud. This charge has been looked upon as a very English form of propaganda but it may have more truth in it than has been suspected. Rome in the time of Charles I was not what she had been one hundred years earlier. The Council of Trent had intervened and Romanism had reacted strongly to the Reformation. If Laud brought the Anglicans nearer to the Rome of his day it does not necessarily mean that he brought his Church more into line with medieval tradition. Possibly those who allowed themselves to be cast out of the Anglican communion

rather than fall in with Laud's "Popish ceremonies," were carrying on a living tradition of no less historic importance than that to which Anglicans have clung.

The forms of worship of the Free Churches at their first emergence cannot have been wholly new or deliberately planned. Our forefathers must have had habits of worship which they had received. They certainly developed them; they cannot have originated them. Evidence of the ways of worship in England at the time of the break with Rome are therefore of great interest to us and as evidence we have two very illuminating documents in the Injunctions of 1547 and 1559. These injunctions are especially interesting as being practical rather than theological documents. England had broken with Rome. The government feared on the one hand reaction in favour of the Pope; on the other wild and unauthorised innovations. The Injunctions therefore describe the situation as it is and give such directions as a government which, though autocratic, had an ear for public opinion, considered to be feasible.

The main body of the Injunctions issued by Queen Elizabeth in 1559 is identical with those put out in the name of King Edward VI by his "most dear Uncle" Somerset in 1547, though Queen Elizabeth made substantial additions and left off a few articles which had ceased to be of practical importance. It is proposed here to pick out from the injunctions what they have to say on matters pertaining to the worship of the Church and in doing so to indicate any divergences between 1547 and 1559.

On the matter of prayer generally we are instructed that all goodness, health and grace ought to be looked for only of God and of none other—particularly not of images or relics. Almighty God is altimes to be honoured but especially in time of common prayer. Therefore in the time of Litany, Collects and common supplications all manner of people shall devoutly and humbly kneel upon their knees and give ear thereunto. Immediately before the Communion the priests and others of the quire are to kneel in the midst of the Church and sing or say plainly and distinctly the Litany set forth in English to the intent that the people may hear and answer.

For the reading of the Scripture a book of the whole Bible in English is to be provided in every church. King Edward VI provides the every Sunday and holy day the parson shall plainly and distinctly read or cause to be read one chapter of the New Testament immediately after the Lessons and at evensong after the Magnificat one chapter of the Old Testament. This injunction is omitted by Queen Elizabeth, the reading of the scripture having, we may suppose, by her time obtained an undisputed place in the services. Besides public reading it is provided that no

man is to be discouraged from reading the Bible in Latin or English. Rather all are to be exhorted to read the Bible as the very lively word of God and especial food of man's soul which all Christian persons are bound to embrace, believe and follow if they look to be saved.

The injunctions have much to say about the sermon, for their compilers clearly recognised that, besides its significance for worship, the sermon might be a potent weapon of propaganda, and were anxious to ensure that its propaganda value should be exploited to the advantage of the national and protestant regime. Edward VI laid down that all parsons should make or cause to be made one sermon every quarter at least wherein they should purely and sincerely declare the word of God and exhort their hearers to the works of faith, mercy and charity prescribed in Scripture, as opposed to works devised by men's " phantasies " as wandering to pilgrimages, offering candles or relics or images or kissing or licking the same or praying upon beads or such like superstitions. Elizabeth's injunctions call for this sermon to be preached monthly. In default of a sermon one of the Homilies prescribed by the Queen's authority may be read. When no preaching is to be had, then the parson is to recite from the pulpit the Paternoster, the Creed and the Ten Commandments in English to the intent that the people may learn them by heart. Four times a year all ecclesiastical persons are to use the utmost of their wit knowledge and learning, purely and sincerely and without dissimulation to declare that all usurped and sovereign power, having no ground by the word of God, is for most just causes abolished and that the Queen's power in her realms and dominions is the highest under God—in other words they were to preach that the Pope could have no jurisdiction in England.

King Edward's injunctions have little to say upon the service of praise but Elizabeth adds an important section on singing in worship. There is to be a modest and discreet song so used in all parts of the Common Prayer that the same may be as plainly understanded as if it were read without singing. For the comforting of such that delight in music it may be permitted that in the begining or in the end of morning or evening prayers there may be sung a hymn or song in praise of Almighty God in the best sort of melody and music that may be devised, having respect that the sentence of the hymn may be understanded and perceived.

The Lord's Supper is referred to by Edward VI as High Mass and by Elizabeth as the Sacrament of Communion. King Edward allows two lights upon the High Altar for the signification that Christ is the true light of the world. By 1559 many altars had been removed. Where this had not yet been done it was to be supervised by the curate or church wardens to avoid riotous

and disorderly scenes. A holy table was to be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood saving when the Communion of the Sacrament was to be distributed when it was to be placed in the Chancel for convenience of hearing and communicating.

There are hints that the conduct of the congregation in those days was not always irreproachable. Queen Elizabeth directs that no man woman or child is to be otherwise busied in service time than in quiet attendance to hear, mark and understand what is read, preached and ministered. Furthermore no man is to let or disturb the preacher in the time of his sermon, or to let or discourage any curate or minister from singing or saying the divine service now set forth, or to mock or jest at the ministers. Incidentally we learn that in those days men wore their hats in church for they are bidden to uncover their heads at the pronouncement of the name of Jesus.

The quality of the ministry too left much to be desired. Many priests, say Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, are utterly unlearned and unable to read. These are not to be admitted to any cure or spiritual function. Even when these have been excluded the standard is low enough. Ministers and readers of public prayers, chapters and homilies are charged to read leisurely, plainly and distinctly and "mean readers" are to peruse over before once or twice the chapters and homilies to the intent that they may read to the better understanding of the people.

These injunctions were really short term instructions indicating the path to be followed when the church of England was separated from Rome. Our Anglican brethren are the direct inheritors of them but it is not unfair to suggest that if the implications underlying them to be logically followed they lead to the Free Church and Baptist position.

Two principles appear in the injunctions which are the very basis of our tradition. The first comes to light in the attitude towards Bible reading. There was nothing controversial in the description of the Bible as the "very lively word of God." This had always been assumed as is witnessed by the medieval sermons which were packed with scripture references and proof texts. What was revolutionary was the exhortation to all men to read it. A year or two earlier the very possession of the Scriptures in English had been an offence which might lead to the stake. This injunction presupposes the right of private judgement. The doctrine of the priesthood of all believers is inherent in it. From it flows the attempt of the Baptists to recover the rites of the New Testament obscured in the medieval church by the accretions of the centuries. The second principle is stated again and again—it is that worship must be with understanding. The medieval church has broken down because its practices had become hope-

lessly divorced from realities. As the injunctions say men had been taught to go wandering on pilgrimages, to offer candles, to kiss relics instead of learning the religious duties of mercy and charity. This weakness had been all too apparent in its worship. The Latin tongue was unknown to the mass of the laity and some of the priesthood could not read their service books with understanding. The makers of the injunctions were emphatic that if there was to be any ornamentation its meaning must be clear—men might sing as long as the words were as well understanded as if they had been read. It is a principle we do well to bear in mind today.

Dr. Moffat has said that the ultimate test of a tradition is not that it is being carried on with liturgical precision but rather does it inspire the worshipper? Does deep call deep? If the Spirit of God is manifest in our worship we need not fear changes of form; such changes have been and will be healthy growth following naturally from what has gone before.

CHARLES B. JEWSON.

Reviews.

How Came Our Faith, by W. A. L. Elmslie. (Cambridge University Press, 21s.)

Principal Elmslie has published relatively few books, but has now given us in this volume the ripe fruits of many years of study and teaching of the Old Testament. The title of his book may cause some surprise to those who open it and find it is concerned only with the Old Testament, and mainly with the pre-exilic period. Yet the author is right to find the roots of the Christian faith in the Old Testament. This does not mean that Christianity is a natural and inevitable development out of Judaism, but that the God who revealed Himself in Christ also revealed Himself in Israel, and that the one revelation presupposed the other, and requires the other for its understanding. The author quotes with approval some wise words of S. A. Cook's: "The Bible is an indivisible whole, and to rest content either with the Old Testament alone, or with the New Testament alone, is to miss the real inwardness of that which makes the Bible the most remarkable book in the world" (p. 43). Needless to say, this recognition of the unity of the Bible does not preclude the recognition of its diversity, and is compatible with the acceptance of a historical attitude towards it. It is not regarded as on a flat level of authority. "Christian worshippers should be made aware" Elmslie observes "of the truth that theirs is a Faith that developed in history, and should glory in the fact. They should know that the Old Testament is record of God's mercy and patience in dealing with wayward uncomprehending men, and rejoice in the marvel of Israel's gradual ascent towards heavenly wisdom" (p.70 n.). The theory that the Bible was verbally inspired, inerrant in all matters and authoritative in all its parts he declares to be a house built on sand, unable to sustain itself against the tide of knowledge (p. 80).

The book is divided into three parts. The first deals with the Old Testament To-day, the second with the Religion of the Hebrews, and the third with the Faith of the Prophets. The first section treats, amongst other things, of the modern study of the Old Testament and of the successive methods of interpretation whereby the sacred character of the Old Testament has been maintained by successive generations of Christian writers. Here the captions under which they are considered are of interest:

"The clouds gather (Typology)", "'The Ice-Age' (Allegory)", "The Sun returns (Renaissance and Reformation)", "'A Depression from Iceland' (The infallible Bible)", "'The Clouds disperse' (Opportunity)", "'The Open Vision' (Responsibility)". The second section deals with the land of Israel, the God of the Hebrews, the Gods of Cannan, and Jehovah, the God of Israel. The third section deals with a few selected prophets only. These are Moses, Samuel and Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Poet-Prophet, who is more generally known as Deutero-Isaiah.

There is little that is strikingly new in the positions adopted, and the chief value of the book will be found in the freshness with which the author presents his interpretation. Pertinent observations linking modern situations to ancient abound, and a certain imaginative quality pervades not a little of the book that will make it perhaps more welcome to the preacher than the scholar. The purely imaginative story of Simeon, with which Elmslie enlivens his discussion of Amos, is a piece of historical fiction and not of Biblical interpretation; but it is probable that many congregations will be held by it.

Not always is the book quite up-to-date, and in particular there is little evidence of an intimate acquaintance with the important Ras Shamra material. There are occasional references to it at second hand, but it is really surprising that Ashtarte and Asherah are identified (p. 145), and that we should be referred to Burney's *Judges* for Amarna evidence that Asherah was the name of a goddess without any mention of the much richer material now available from Ras Shamra.

On critical questions it may be observed that Elmslie maintains the thirteenth century date of the Exodus and devotes a short excursus to this subject (pp. 110 f.), holds that Hos. i and iii are successive and not parallel accounts, and rejects the view that Jeremiah's early prophecies had anything to do with a "Scythian menace". Many of his readers will recall the great book on Jeremiah by a previous Principal of Westminster College, and its persuasive presentation of the Scythian hypothesis (Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion*). It is more surprising that the author follows Torrey in the view that Trito-Isaiah should be abolished, and that the last twenty-seven chapters of the book, together with chapters xxxiv and xxxv belong together, but come from the end of the fifth century B.C. Like Torrey, he deletes every reference to Cyrus and the Chaldeans and Babylon, and further removes chapter xlvii bodily to go with chapters xiii f., and also xlvi. 1 f. Very few British writers have been converted by Torrey, and it will cheer the veteran American scholar to make one convert twenty years after the publication of his book.

We are promised a sequel to the present book, and we are given a hint that Nehemiah is to be transferred to a later age than has been commonly allowed, since Deutero-Isaiah is said to precede him while himself standing in the latter part of the fifth century B.C.

Many readers will be interested in Elmslie's view that the name Yahweh sprang out of an ejaculation Ya. He does not note that Mowinckel and Montgomery have recently and quite independently put forward the view that his name originally had the form "Ya hu", and meant "O he".

Among minor points it may be noted that on p. 148 we find *Massebach* and on p. 171 *Mazzeboth,* where the diverse transliteration of the sibilant conceals the fact that we have the same word. On p. 125 n. the Hebrew word for *liver* is inaccurately stated to be *kebedh.* Such details will not worry the general reader, who will rejoice rather in the penetrating and stimulating quality of this book, and will find it one of the most vital books on the Bible issued in recent years. It presents the fruits of scholarship in an arresting and always suggestive way, rather than the dry bones of scholarship to be picked over by scholars.

H. H. Rowley.

The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, by Le Roy Edwin Froom. Vol. 2. (Review and Herald, Washington, D.C. $5.00.)

The author of this massive work has planned four volumes, of which this second volume and the third are already available, while the first and fourth have yet to be published. The reviewer has read this volume with mingled profit and disagreement—profit because of the valuable survey of the history of interpretation of certain passages in Daniel and the Apocalypse, and disagreement with the canons of interpretation whereby the author judges those whom he discusses.

The volume deals with the period from Wyclif down to the eighteenth century, and introduces the reader to the mysteries of the pre-millennial and post-millenial views of these books, as well as to the Futurist and Preterist views, and what the author regards as the orthodox historical view. Common to almost all the writers of the period was the belief that the books of Daniel and the Revelation contained a chart of the ages down to their own day and beyond, and many of them gave an anti-papal interpretation that is much to the taste of the author. He is impressed by the weight and unanimity of the voices that identify the Pope with Antichrist, but he is less impressed by the

complete diversity and proved falsity of the results to which their principles of interpretation led them. For as the reader threads his way through this volume he will see that with monotonous regularity the writers of the school which Froom regards as orthodox believed that the climax of prophecy was to be expected shortly in their own day and revised the starting point of the period they were locating. Hence the precise dates which they successively gave were steadily pushed forward, as time proves the estimates of their predecessors false. While Froom *believes* them to be true interpreters in their anti-papal views, he *knows* them to be false interpreters in their views as to the climax. His study is therefore of real importance in that it establishes objectively the errors of the whole school. Again and again they wrongly read into the prophecies the events and circumstances of their own day, and read them in because of their initial assumptions. To the reviewer the moral would seem to be clear that the initial assumptions call for examination.

A few examples will suffice. The Fifth Monarchy men accepted these principles, and by their application were led to the delusive hopes which they cherished. The mathematician Napier "calculated that the day of judgment would probably come not later than 1700" (p. 457) and the author quotes the words of Adam Clarke: "So very plausible were the reasonings and calculations of Lord Napier, that there was scarcely a Protestant in Europe, who read his work, that was not of the same opinion." To the reviewer it is not impressive, but lamentable, that all Europe was so deluded. Somewhat similarly Thomas Beverley dated the ending of the 1260 years of the rule of the Antichrist, into which the three and a half years of Daniel and the Apocalypse were translated by a large proportion of the writers dealt with, about 1697 (p. 581). On the other hand Cressener, in what Froom calls a "really remarkable forecast" (p. 596) thought the 1260 years would end about 1800.

Froom accepts this date, and believes the period came to an end in 1798 with the overthrow of the Papacy. It is hard to think that the days of Antichrist ended a century and a half ago. For since these writers believed that the millennium was to follow the overthrow of Antichrist, their impressive unity would lead us to expect that we should now be living in the millennium. Few of us are conscious of it, and most would somewhat differently describe this age. Moreover, the Second Coming of Christ was believed to be due when the papal rule ended.

The author records with some zest the attempts to prove that the Number of the Beast pointed to the Pope. Here we find some variety of ways to this pre-determined goal of the Interpreters, but surely the most fantastic—though readily copied

once it had been proposed—was that it represented the summation of the numerical values of the title Vicarius Filii Dei. The creator of this impossible theory admitted that the Popes never assumed this title, but the title Vicarius Christi, which would not serve his purpose. He therefore substituted for it one which did serve his purpose. A player who claims the right to change the value of the pieces at will ought to be able to win a game of chess, and on these principles anything can be proved to the satisfaction of those who are willing to substitute blind prejudice for reason.

Yet having said this, the reviewer would recognize with gratitude the immense labour that has gone into the making of this volume, and its real value as a study of the history of interpretation. We are given biographical facts about a very large number of writers, and specimens of their interpretation which are of interest and value even to those who do not share their presuppositions. The reviewer has for many years been interested in the history of interpretation of these passages, and acknowledges with gratitude that he has learned much from the pages of this book. He has only studied at first hand a fraction of the works here surveyed, and has been content to confine his own reading to a few examples of the various schools. He has some ideas of the incredible industry which has marked the author, and commends its fruits to those who will read its pages more objectively than the author intended, and who will be immune to his presuppositions.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Vedanta for the Western World. Edited with an introduction by Christopher Isherwood. (George Allen & Unwin, 16s.)

This is the English edition of a book which appeared in the United States in 1946. For some years a group of English intellectuals have spent much of their time in California and have, in their writings, advocated a kind of eclectic mysticism as the way of salvation from the evils and fears of our time. The best known among them are Mr. Aldous Huxley, Mr. Gerald Heard and Mr. Christopher Isherwood. Deeply attracted by certain notes in the teaching of Christ, they have yet sought to compare and combine them with material drawn from the Hindu and Buddhist traditions. The volume before us, edited by Mr. Isherwood, consists of articles contributed to a magazine started in 1938 under the title *The Voice of India* and now appearing as *Vedanta and the West.* A dozen of these pieces

are by Mr. Heard, rather more by Mr. Huxley, one or two of whose contributions have already appeared in this country as part of *Grey Eminence*. Nearly two dozen are by Indians, now resident in America as agents of the Vedanta Society, which is an extension of the Ramakrishna Mission. Readers of J. N. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in India* will recall the story of Swami Vivekananda (1862-1902), the most famous of the disciples of Ramakrishna Paramahamsa (1834-86). Vivekananda made a deep impression at the Chicago Parliament of Religions in 1893 and again visited America in 1899. His message was that all religions are true and good; that God is impersonal, unknowable and non-moral, but manifested in all things; that Hindu civilization is ancient and spiritual, and superior to the materialism of the West. The magazine from which Mr. Isherwood has gathered the papers here reprinted, is issued under the auspices of the San Francisco and Los Angeles centres of the Vedanta Society. One of the most interesting of the papers is a hitherto unpublished autobiographical lecture which Vivekananda delivered in Pasadena in 1900. There is much that is interesting in these pages, much that is valuable for an understanding of certain sides of liberal Hinduism, much that is important for appreciating American conceptions and misconceptions about India. But the syncretism that underlies the whole, and which has affiliations with theosophy and Christian Science, is an old story, and a dangerous story. It blurs essential distinctions, both historical, intellectual and moral. It is twentieth century Gnosticism.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

The Cruciality of the Cross, by P. T. Forsyth. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d. Second edition.)

This Life and the Next, by P. T. Forsyth. (Independent Press, 5s. Reprinted).

The decision to reissue a number of the more important books of the late Principal P. T. Forsyth was well taken. Nothing that he wrote was negligible. Much of it was far in advance of the thought of his time, and it has today a relevance and freshness which are enhanced rather than diminished by what the world has passed through since the first appearance of his work.

These two books enable some of the main features of Forsyth's theology to be clearly seen. In the first, the starting-point is " the supreme holiness of God's love, rather than its pity,

sympathy or affection". This is "the watershed between the Gospel and the theological liberalism which makes religion no more than the crown of humanity". So the Cross is rightly claimed to be "crucial", for it was there that through "the exhaustive obedience and surrender of His total self", Christ vindicated the holiness of God, and made possible the final reconciliation of God and man.

In the second of these books Forsyth deals with the effect on this life of faith in another. Christianity is not "an election to prerogative, privilege and exemption, but to God's own responsibility, service and sacrifice", and as such it is "the action of a moral process that goes on after death". To put it another way: "The Kingdom of God is the mergence into the life of history, both by growth and crises, of that saving sovereignty which is the moral power and order of the spiritual world". As men allow the sovereignty of God's holy love to take hold of their lives, they become sharers in its undying quality. Immortality is not mere survival. It is the projection beyond death of that new life of holiness and love which begins here in time through the creative action of the Living Christ upon human hearts. Those who here and now receive that life from Christ do not perish at death but rise with Him to new ventures of fellowship and service in the Beyond.

Both books need careful reading. They deal with profound themes in a great way, and those who are prepared to give them their attention will find them richly rewarding.

R. L. CHILD.

Poetry and Prayer, by Edward Shillito. (Independent Press, 4s.)

This book has been prompted by the hope that it will do something to end a serious "estrangement between the Church of Christ and the poets of earth". As our "spokesman in the realm of imagination" the poet can quicken adoration and though he may be no moralist he may lead men to repentance. Perhaps it is significant that the chapters on Intercession and the Communion of Saints lean rather much on Christian sources but elsewhere the author makes a persuasive case for the recognition of other poets as allies of the man of prayer. They often serve him in more ways than they know or intend. This book is eloquent of a ripe experience of both the worlds with which it deals. Its religious insight and literary grace are well matched with its theme.

G. W. RUSLING.

Christian Pacifism after Two World Wars, by Leyton Richards. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.)

The late Rev. Leyton Richards managed to get a long title for his short essay, but the importance of the book is out of all proportion to its size. Like the apologetic of the late Dr. C. J. Cadoux in *Christian Pacifism Re-examined* (1940), the arguments of this essay by a well-beloved, conscientious pacifist deserve reverent and unpatronising consideration. So many notices in the religious press about pacifist literature are exasperatingly condescending: "Pacifism may become a live issue in the near future if ominous signs fulfil themselves"; that is the profound judgment expressed in a note to introduce Mr. Richards' book in the November issue of a Christian periodical of recognised pedigree, and this generous concession is followed by an unctuous comment on the volume, which, with its innocent protestation of non-participation in the conflict, seems calculated to upset the conscientious pacifist and make him decide to join the all-in wrestlers: "This is, of course, an able book, and what the writer says ought to be considered sympathetically, and no doubt a hearing will be, and ought to be, given to the point of view urged in those pages. It is not the purpose of this notice to enter into the controversy, but simply to direct attention to the appearance of the book. Readers will find the arguments for a Christian Pacifism presented here forcibly."

The arguments are, indeed, presented in a sound and orderly fashion, under four main heads: (1) that loyalty to Christ takes precedence over every other loyalty; (2) that the way of war contradicts the way of Christ; (3) that Christ's way is God's; and (4) that the Gospel of Christ is compromised by Christian approval of war. Objections to pacifism—theoretical, (religious and moral) and practical, (social and altruistic)—are discussed and answered, and there is an enlightening chapter on "The Valuations of Christian Pacifism". Particularly relevant at the moment (when people have become "conditioned" so thoroughly, that eighteen months' compulsory military training instead of twelve months for conscripts evokes no protest worth recording), is the section on conscription. Serious criticism is offered, alike from the military, the political, the economic, the democratic, the moral and Christian points of view. (It would have done us all the world of good if arguments like these had been read to us at the Baptist Union meetings in the year when peace-time conscription was first introduced, when not a word of protest was uttered against this act of tyranny, but a great deal of indignation was shown concerning gambling and strong drink. Surely Baptists who pride themselves on their concern for human

liberty should find something to say on the subject of coercing eighteen-year-olds, if they are *so* concerned with other secular activities which we can either follow or renounce.)

Mr. Richards' closing statement in his section dealing with this subject is convincing: "conscription is always an abuse of political authority. It is a denial of those moral characteristics which distinguish Man from the brute creation; above all, it is an affront of Heaven, and for that reason it can have no place in the economy of a Christian society." Such a conviction is absolutely necessary for a Christian if he is to face an impersonal, totalitarian era without trepidation. The Church could well do with more simple Christian faith and less fatuous juristic arguments in this atomic era, and, in any case, apologetic becomes the military wing more than the pacifist. As Professor D. M. Mackinnon said in a recent broadcast, ("The Church and the Atomic Bomb" in *The Listener*, October 28); "We must never forget in our enthusiasm for something we call Christian civilisation that it was from the rootless and the outcast that the Christ called his own, and that upon a gallows-tree, between two criminals, He was content to die". Christian Pacifist apologetic must base itself on this indisputable fact, and Leyton Richards never forgot this.

D. Eirwyn Morgan.

Seventh Baptist World Congress, Copenhagen, 1947. Office Report, edited by Walter O. Lewis, Ph.D., D.D. (Baptist World Alliance, London, 1948., 12s. 6d.)

Dr. Lewis, and those who have assisted him with this publication, and also the printers, are to be congratulated on this report of the seventh Baptist World Congress. The gatherings at Copenhagen are still fresh in the minds of the five thousand Baptists who journeyed to Denmark from overseas. Many also who were not able to be there will welcome this full official record of the proceedings. In addition to the Minutes prepared by Dr. A. T. Ohrn, the text of the main addresses is given, together with a list of the delegates, the revised Constitution of the Alliance and the names of the officers and members of the Executive, and eighteen pages of pictures, mostly of individuals. Publication difficulties have prevented the printing of more than a few of the addresses given at the sectional meetings. This is to be regretted, as is the absence of any descriptive account of the proceedings. Copenhagen was an important landmark in Baptist history. It proved that the Alliance had survived both

the War and the loss of Dr. Rushbrooke. It is good to have in full the tributes paid to the late President for they have historical as well as personal value. With one or two exceptions, the other addresses do not seem to compare in weight and permanent interest with those of previous Congresses. The Executive will no doubt give much more detailed attention to the programme for Cleveland, 1950, than was possible for the Copenhagen meetings. It is also to be hoped that, when the report of the eighth Congress is issued, the Editor will insist on up-to-date portraits for all his illustrations. Several of those used in this volume suggest, quite inaccurately, that Baptist leaders still look as they did in 1939, or even earlier.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.