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

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

Editorial Notes

AS previously announced, Dr. Winthrop S. Hudson of New York will be the speaker at the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society at 4.30 p.m. on Monday, 3rd May, in the Lounge at Bloomsbury Central Church. His subject will be "Who were the Baptists?" We hope for a good attendance of members and friends to welcome this distinguished Baptist scholar who is Professor of Church History at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and President of the American Baptist Historical Society. It is hoped to arrange for tea to be served, and those who intend being present will help by notifying the Secretary well beforehand.

* * * * *

The significance of the Building Society movement has largely been overlooked by social historians in spite of the fact that, in its modern form, it has existed for well over a century. In 1952 there were 755 permanent societies with assets amounting to the amazing total of £1,477,071,000. Of these one of the most enterprising and influential is the Temperance Permanent Building Society, founded in 1854 and having today assets totalling £30,250,000. In a handsome, illustrated volume, issued as a souvenir of the Society's centenary, its story has been recorded by one of its directors, Mr. Seymour J. Price who, among other offices he holds, is of course the President of the Baptist Historical Society. Entitled *From Queen to Queen,* the book is published by Franey & Co. For Baptists it has a special interest, in view of the fact that members of our denomination have prominently figured in the Society's affairs throughout its existence. Of the present eight directors five—Mr. C. W. Black, M.P., Mr. H. H. Collier, Mr. T. Lister, Mr. Price and its brilliant managing-director, Mr. Ronald Bell—are Baptists.

The story is told with the literary skill, historical knowledge and business acumen for which Mr. Price is well-known. Of absorbing interest, the narrative is illuminated by vivid pen portraits of those stalwarts who have been leaders of the Society and its management. Generally they were, as now, Nonconformists and, reading about them in these instructive pages, one realises afresh what solid virtues they and others like them embodied in themselves, in the purpose for which the Society was established and the spirit in which their work was

done. Typical Nonconformist qualities they were, regarded by many today as old-fashioned virtues yet, fortunately, still widely cherished. Who can deny that these qualities of hard work, thrift, sobriety, independence, integrity and love of home are as vital to the national character and the stability of our country now as ever they were? More of the "unmistakable puritanism . . . firmly grounded in principles based on the rock of Nonconformist integrity" and of the "stern Calvinist rectitude" which Mr. Price here ascribes to the pioneers of the Society, would elevate and strengthen social life today.

* * * * *

Does the venerable language—now nearly 350 years old—of the Authorised Version make the Bible obscure to numerous people? Many experienced judges would say that it does. While various modern translations of at least parts of the Bible have been published, there is no complete version in good modern English embodying the best scholarship and commanding general acceptance. Soon after the war the Churches co-operated in setting up a Joint Committee to supervise the making of a new and authoritative version from the original languages. On this committee the Church of England, Church of Scotland, the major Free Churches, the Society of Friends, the Churches in Wales and Ireland together with the British and Scottish Bible Societies are represented. The chairman is the Bishop of Winchester, the Secretary, Professor J. K. S. Reid, and the General Director, Professor C. H. Dodd. The translation is being done by panels of scholars chosen for their qualifications in the field of Old Testament, Apocrypha or New Testament studies or as judges of English style and language. Individual translators make the first drafts of the books allotted to them and these are then criticised by the panels in the interests of accuracy and good English and are finished by a process of discussion and mutual agreement. Steady progress is being made. The Gospels of *Mark* and *John*, *Romans*, 1 *Corinthians* and *Galatians*, and *Ruth*, *Ezekiel* and *Amos* with the first half of *Exodus* have gone through all their stages. It is hoped to have the New Testament ready for printing in 1958 and the Old Testament not until several years later. This may seem slow progress but the Joint Committee intend this to be an authoritative translation, backed by the best scholarship, suitable for private and public reading and fit to stand beside the great translations of the past.

* * * * *

From 1913 until he retired in 1953, Dr. William Wright Barnes was teaching Church History in the South-western Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky. He has crowned a

distinguished career by writing the first, comprehensive history of the Southern Baptist Convention. Through kindness the writer of these notes has received a copy of this new and important volume *The Southern Baptist Convention*, 1845-1953, which is published by the enterprising Broadman Press, at $3.75. Our college libraries, as well as all British Baptists who wish to inform themselves on denominational history and progress, should obtain a copy. The story Dr. Barnes so ably tells is a remarkable one. When the Convention was formed in 1845, it comprised some 4,000 churches and 350,000 members. The figures for 1952 show nearly 29,000 churches and nearly 8,000,000 members who, in the year, raised more than $248,000,000 and recorded 354,000 baptisms! The formation of this virile, powerful and expanding body grew out of differences among American Baptists in the field of home missions, later accentuated by disagreement on the slavery issue (and it is not always realised that there was opposition to slavery in the South as well as the North). Attempts at re-union failed and the Southern and Northern groups went their separate ways, though with the avowed determination to maintain fraternal relations and to co-operate wherever possible. One of the fields in which they have worked together is that of Negro ministerial education. But the principles of comity agreed by the two Conventions, as a result of meetings in 1911 and 1912, are likely to be strained in the immediate future for, as Dr. Barnes states, "The constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention specifies the United States as its field," while Northern Baptists have significantly renamed themselves The American Baptist Convention and there is already considerable overlapping of activity. That this will turn, in course of time, into a yet closer and deeper fellowship will be the confident hope of many. In the Baptist World Alliance the Southern Convention plays an active, leading part, but it has declined membership of the World Council of Churches (not, however, without protest from within its own ranks). By the publication of this timely volume—well documented, with useful indeces and bibliography—Dr. Barnes has met a real need and rendered notable service to Baptist history. Elsewhere, as well as in the United States, he will be congratulated upon telling with unique knowledge and devoted skill the amazing progress of what must be one of the most rapidly expanding Christian bodies in the world.

* * * * *

If the Southern Convention is the largest of the world's Baptist groupings, among the smallest though by no means the least virile are the General Baptists of America. With these brethren we have recently made a welcome contact. General Baptists first made

their appearance in America in 1700 but the present General Association was formed in Indiana in 1870 on the basis of thirteen articles of faith. We look forward to the forthcoming publication of their history by one of their leaders, Dr. O. Latch, of Poplar Bluff, Missouri. From a reading of their official *General Baptist Doctrine and Usage* and their weekly journal, *The Messenger*, much may be learned. Rather conservative theologically and keenly evangelistic, the local churches are formed on the basis of a covenant and co-operate through, first, the district presbytery (comprised of ordained ministers, licenced preachers and deacons), then the local Association and finally the General Association. Home and foreign (in the Pacific islands) missions, publications, religious education, with a college at Oakland City, Indiana, are among the denominational activities. Deacons, we note, are solemnly ordained by the presbytery and the accepted practice is to regard that ordination as perpetual. Many General Baptists consider feet-washing to be one of the ordinances of the Church, and in a number of congregations it is practised in connection with the Communion service; others, while unable to accept it as an ordinance, view it as an example of humility worthy of being perpetuated in the Church. To our General Baptist friends across the Atlantic we send greetings, and wish for them a continued progress.

Essays in Orthodox Dissent, by Bernard Lord Manning. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.)

A reprint of these stimulating essays by Bernard Manning is most welcome. First published in 1939, they offer a vigorous presentation of the Free Church position. For the most part they were addresses given to Congregational and other Free Church bodies in the immediate pre-war period. The addresses still have pungency and directness: the title reveals the two aspects which are emphasised—a defence of the Free Church attitude and a challenge (primarily to Congregationalists but indirectly to others) to loyalty to the fundamental spiritual ideas on which that attitude rests. The chapter, "Our Inheritance in Faith and Practice" is most stimulating. The re-reading of these essays has been refreshing and we realise anew what a loss Congregationalism and the Free Churches sustained by the early death of Bernard Manning.

W. S. DAVIES.

The German "Te Deum"

MANY and rich gifts have we received from the immense treasury of German hymns (said to be larger than that of all the hymns of the rest of the world put together), but to none perhaps are we more indebted than Rinckart's *Now thank we all our God.* In numerous services held in connection with the Coronation it served equally the great Thanksgiving in St. Paul's and the humblest gathering in country chapel or down-town mission hall.

Contrasting greatly with Watts, in certain respects his nearest English parallel, Martin Rinckart was a tall man of imposing presence, black full beard and resounding voice. Nelle tells us he lived with the air of a conqueror, albeit in simple clerical garb, hastening ever to impart Christian hope and consolation to a country desolated by war and famine, pestilence and death. He entered on his pastorate at Eilenburg, a small town near Leipzig, one year before the Thirty Years' War broke out; a ruined man but still "more than conqueror," he laid down his charge, with his life, one year after it ended.

Rinckart's literary work was a far larger thing than the writing of hymns only. In the nineteen large volumes which contain it we find examples of dramatic, lyric, pastoral and religious verse, including many poems in Latin; he "could leave nothing that happened within his ken unsung." Three years before the war began he was crowned as "imperial poet" and his play for the Centenary of the Reformation in 1617 carried his name and fame far through the Lutheran lands. One of the ablest critics of his day maintained that Germany could be as proud of her Rinckart as France of her Ronsard.

Our poet was born at Eilenburg in Saxony on April 24th, 1586. So gifted did he prove in music, song and verse that at the age of fourteen he was granted a scholarship in the Thomasschule at Leipzig, the school which J. Sebastian Bach a century later raised to such world-wide renown. Then he became a student in theology at Leipzig University, covering his expenses by music and singing lessons. In 1611 he went as pastor to Eisleben, the town where Luther had begun and ended his life. There he spent six happy years, five of them at the side of his dearly loved wife, Christina. It was during this period he began his cycle of seven plays on the life of Luther, the first, "The Knight of Eisleben," being acted by his own choir in 1613. Four years later he received with great

joy a call to the pulpit of his native town, Eilenburg. He records in his day-book a quatrain indicating the temper in which he took over this new responsibility:

> At Thy word, Lord, my nets I prayerfully review
> And in this storm-swept sea I cast them forth anew.
> Do Thou with precious souls their emptinesses fill,
> Use Thou, Lord, ship and wind and net to work Thy Will.

Henceforth his life was bound up with the fortunes of the little town on the Mulde.

Throughout the grievous years of the War he demonstrated what a good minister of Jesus Christ and a faithful shepherd to his flock should be. Specially terrible were the years 1637, 1638 and 1639. At that time Eilenburg was a walled town and hence soon became choc-a-bloc with refugees. Early in 1637 it was visited with a fearful outbreak of the plague. Over 8,000 people perished, including almost all members of the Town Council and Rinckart's two fellow-clergymen. Before the plague a Montaigne would leave his mayoralty of Bordeaux and flee to the mountains, but a Rinckart is made of sterner stuff and stands his ground. There he remained like a rock, discharging conscientiously every detail of his three-fold task—visiting the sick, comforting the dying and burying with due Christian ritual the dead. His records show that he himself buried 4,480 persons, among them, alas, his beloved help-meet for twenty-five years, Christina. For months on end he was forced to make three visits a day to the pits (there was not labour sufficient to dig so many graves), each time reading the words of Christian hope over eight to twelve corpses. Yet through all this, the pest, as the old record has it, "never touched so much as a finger" of this right valiant soldier of the Cross.

In the following year there appeared the normal companion of plague, famine. The food-lands of the country lay untilled, partly owing to the rush for safety to walled cities and partly to the ravages and pillage of marauding soldiery. A contemporary of Rinckart's puts the matter thus:

> Now War and Hunger, his mate,
> Are two wretchedly brought-up brothers,
> Who with joy tread everything down
> They can find, belonging to others.
> War always marches ahead;
> When with murder and theft and burning
> He's content, what Hunger can do
> We are not a great while in learning.
> For he's so ferociously wild,
> Gorging this one, then that, then another,
> That when he has swallowed the lot,
> He will generally gulp down his brother.[1]

[1] F. von Logau, *Sinngedichte*, I, 539.

"A stone," says Koch, "would have had pity on the wretched Eilenburger digging through every rubbish heap to find so much as an old bone." From every house there rose a cry for bread. Dogs, cats, rats, pieces of horse carrion, were the prizes for which hundreds strove. Rinckart tells of a melée he surprised on the town green, only to find that forty or fifty people were fighting for the possession of a dead crow. He did what he could. For nearly a year he had two bushels of corn baked into bread once or twice a week and dispensed this to the eager crowds besieging his house.

On February 31st, 1639,[2] the greatly dreaded Swedish troops (deprived since Lützen of their lion-hearted leader, Gustavus Adolphus) entered Eilenburg and demanded a war-levy of 30,000 thalers (£4,500) from the now de-populated town. All remonstrances were rejected by Col. Dörffling, their commander. Then Rinckart went to plead their utter poverty because of the two previous years, but in vain; if not paid, the town would be given over to fire and sword. Rinckart rang the church bells, summoned everyone thither who could walk, and sang with them the touching Reformation hymn of Melancthon's friend, Paul Eber: *Wenn wir in höchsten Nöten sind*, a true "cry from the depths"; then the pastor prayed long and earnestly. Somehow Dörffling heard of the proceedings and in the end departed—with the precious communion vessels of the church and 2,000 thalers only, a sum to which Rinckart himself contributed heavily. Thereafter Eber's hymn was sung in the churches of Saxony for years, in commemoration of this great deliverance. The pastor soon found himself all but penniless, for foreign troops continued to be quartered in his roomy manse, and litigation re an unjust house-tax inflicted on him by his ungrateful fellow-townsmen consumed the last remnants of his fortune.

It has long been stated, and copied from one manual to another, that *Now thank we all our God* was a swan-song written by Rinckart some months before his death to celebrate the signing of the Peace of Westphalia and the end of the War. This is not true. The hymn had been printed twelve years before, in the *Jesuherzbüchlein*, and Rinckart said of it then that the MS. had already "been fully completed for six or seven years." The mistake probably arose because of the passage of Scripture on which the hymn is based: "Now therefore bless ye the God of all, which only doeth wondrous things everywhere, which exalteth our days from the womb and dealeth with us according to His mercy. He grant us joyfulness of heart and that peace may be in our days in Israel for ever" (*Ecclus.* l. 22-24). At the Thanksgiving Services

[2] Julian puts this happening in 1635, I cannot tell why. German records are unanimous in attributing it to the date given above.

held in Leipzig on January 1st, 1649, all Swedish chaplains were ordered to preach from this text and the fact that the hymn suited the discourses so perfectly doubtless accounts for the erroneous idea that it was written for that occasion. The truth of the matter, though modern research has not yet been able to establish it, is most likely that Rinckart wrote his poem in honour of the landing, to the joy of all Protestant hearts, of Gustavus Adolphus in Pomerania on June 25th, 1630. The known facts are that Gustavus was Rinckart's hero, that to the end of the King's life Rinckart wrote an annual ode or hymn of praise in his honour and that *Nun danket* was said by its author, in 1636, to have been written half a dozen years earlier.

Rinckart composed many other hymns, but this one only has obtained universal recognition; like Löwenstern, Stegmann and Knorr von Rosenroth, he remains for us the man of one hymn. On the strength of it alone he has been styled "the Ambrose of the Protestant Church." Poor hide-bound Opitz was his master and pattern, and the verses are in excellent alexandrines, a measure Opitz so strongly desired to introduce into German literature. But its real origin is far from the domain of belles lettres. Its earliest printed form is prefaced by the words: *A little Grace before Meat, in Parts, by which three little children may ask Grace one after another.*[3] So apparently its actual intention was that Samuel (born 1622), Salome (1625) and Anna Sophia (1628) should each repeat a verse before they got to their porridge! Now what was once a rather stately children's prayer has become an international psalm of thanksgiving. Beside our version there exist no less than twelve other recognised translations into English. And its author would seek no higher guerdon than was paid to him when, in the grey dawn of September 2nd, 1870, from every mist-enveloped pine-clad summit surrounding the pit of destruction at Sedan, in which lay 25,000 wounded or dead and where 100 000 Frenchmen, an Emperor among them, were held prisoners, there arose the notes which alone were capable of expressing the feelings of those who had won so great a victory:

> Nun danket alle Gott
> Mit Herzen, Mund und Händen.

Thus has a simple Grace before Meat become the Te Deum of the German people and a paean of praise for all Christendom.

SYDNEY H. MOORE.

[3] *Tischgebetlein und Wechselordnung, wo drei Kinderlein eins umbs ander beten.*

Fishwick and Ward

EVEN the specialist in Baptist history may perhaps be forgiven if he does not know who Fishwick and Ward were.[1] They have a small niche in records of various Baptist churches, especially at Newcastle, and are referred to in one or two biographies of other Baptists, thereby gaining a few incidental references in the *Dictionary of National Biography;* they are also at last coming to be recognised as partners, with a third and greater name, in an industrial enterprise which may claim its place in English economic history. If they are now forgotten, they were not without importance in their day; it is not alone as Baptists that they will have whatever small share of fame may be allotted to them. But while other denominations have already found historians to relate the work of their forefathers to the social, economic and political background of their times (the Quakers, for example, in Dr. Raistrick), Baptists appear to have neglected this aspect of their history, especially the part played by eminent laymen. Fishwick and Ward were successful businessmen, besides being zealous Baptists, at a period when industrial England was changing rapidly and when English Baptists were, largely under the influence of the Evangelical Revival, beginning to display a new vigour.

Richard Fishwick was a Hull man who, born in 1745 and admitted a member of John Beatson's church there in 1777, came to Newcastle in 1778[2] to take his part in conducting what came to be known as the Elswick White-Lead Works. The story is that on his arrival in Newcastle he enquired at his inn whether there were any Baptists in the town: the waiter did not even know "what" these people were. Making further enquiries, however, Fishwick heard of Caleb Alder, from whom he learned that there were indeed a few local Baptists, but that they were not in a very happy state: in common with many churches at that date, it appears that Socinian doctrines had infected them "with most baneful effect." Alder, once a pillar of the church had adopted these Unitarian

[1] The main printed source about Fishwick and Ward as Baptists, is David Doug'as, *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England from* 1648 *to* 1845 (1846), a volume without an index; its meandering arrangement makes it difficult to consult, but it is a valuable record. It was used, with some additions, by Rev. F. G. Little and Rev. E. T. F. Walker in their *Story of the Northern Baptists* (1945) a concise and popular account. I have had access to ms. sources to supplement the story: these are the Kinghorn letters, and for permission to transcribe and make use of them I am greatly indebted to C. B. Jewson, Esq., of Norwich, the owner.

[2] Douglas says 1780, but the date 1778 given by Little and Walker seems preferable, especially in view of the partnership agreement to be mentioned later.

views and was preaching in a room on North Shore, assisted by his son-in-law, William Robson. Fishwick soon put new life into the old body and a new era in the life of Tuthill Stairs began, not, however, immediately nor without curious and even scandalous incidents. Some mention of these incidents will be made later, but it is not quite correct to assume that it was Fishwick alone who revivified Tuthill Stairs at this period: his partner Ward played a large part also. These two had a prominent share in resolving a long and complex squabble about the ownership of the property of the church.

His enthusiasm for Baptist work in all its forms never flagged: he was especially keen to help young men into the ministry, by encouraging them individually and at one time proposing to found an academy for their training. About these young men, among whom were Joseph Kinghorn, William Ward the missionary, and Robert Imeary,[3] as well as his premature scheme for an academy, more will be said presently, in referring to his work for various Baptist churches. Newcastle was the real centre of his activity, and Tuthill Stairs owed much to him ministerially, as well as legally and financially, but he had a habit of turning up in the most unexpected places, Norwich, Hull, Scarborough, or Bishop Burton, generally at the exact moment when his advice was wanted. In 1798 the Northern Evangelical Society appointed him its first Treasurer.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century he had become a very rich man, and with his money he was moderately liberal while it lasted. He subscribed to Carey's appeal, for example, lent continued support to the missions, and gave half the sum of £700 required to purchase a building for the use of the North Shields church. Towards the end of his life, it is said that he indulged in speculations which proved unfortunate. He removed to London in 1806 and in the following year was dismissed to Dr. Rippon's church. On January 17th, 1825, he died in his eightieth year at Park Street, Islington, after having suffered mental aberration for many months.[4] He was twice married. About the first Mrs. Fishwick, by whom he had a son and a daughter, little is known; she died on March 25th, 1797.[5] The second was his housekeeper, Ursula Grey, niece of a well-known Baptist minister, Charles Whitfield.

Archer Ward seems to be best remembered for his connexion with the church at Derby, of which he was founder and deacon, but by origin he was a Bishop Burton man who had links with Hull and London, and quite as close a connection with Tuthill Stairs

[3] Little and Walker, *op. cit.*, 22.
[4] Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 243, and *Gent. Mag.*, 1825 (i) 188,
[5] Kinghorn mss., April 5, 1797. On the daughter, see later.

as his colleague Fishwick while he remained in Newcastle. He was born on September 28th, 1743[6] and seems to have taken up farming as a young man. He was thrice married. His first wife, Rebekah, died in September, 1770, apparently in childbirth, for on the "grey stone, with black letters" which Ward placed in Bishop Burton chapel to her memory[7] (stirred thereto only in 1797 after the decease of his second wife) both mother and infant are named, the mother being only twenty-two years old. The second lady was Elizabeth Autherson,[8] member of an East Riding family well known to the Kinghorns from whom most of this information is derived, and through her Ward became brother-in-law to two Baptist ministers, William Pendered and William Shaw, themselves not unknown at Hull and Newcastle at the end of the century.[9] She died on December 26th, 1796, but it did not take Ward long to recover from any sense of loss at her demise, for on May 25th, 1797, he married Nancy, daughter of that Richard Hopper, Baptist minister at Nottingham, who had been first pastor of the church at Bishop Burton.[10] Throughout life he was thoroughly surrounded by Baptists: he never forgot his poor relations and, like Fishwick, gave much of his substance to Baptist work.

He died on July 2nd, 1800, "at his house near the White-Lead Works," Greenhill House, Derby, at the age of fifty-six, and a memorial tablet to his memory was placed in the Baptist church in that town.[11] His widow married Thomas Ward Swinburne, banker, of Derby. Both Mr. and Mrs. Swinburne likewise supported the Baptist cause there: he is remembered in another memorial inscription in the chapel—"Sacred to the Memory of Thomas Ward Swinburne, of Mill-Hill House, Derby, who died June 20, 1825, aged 64"—while it is recorded that she furnished the church with an organ, at a cost of £170, in 1827.[12] Something of the character of these two latter ladies will emerge at a later stage.

[6] Kinghorn mss., July 8, 1797, for the day and the month; the year is deduced from the tablet mentioned below.

[7] *Ibid.*, April 22nd, 1797. There is also among these mss., a rough sketch, presumed to be in Ward's own hand, of the lettering on this tablet.

[8] There are variant spellings of the name.

[9] Pendered spent much of his stormy career quarrelling with his various flocks and wandering the British Isles in search of new pastorates. Shaw, says Douglas, *op. cit.*, often preached at Tuthill Stairs, being preferred by some to the distinguished essayist John Foster, who was likewise invited to preach there.

[10] Kinghorn mss., December 31st, 1796, April 5th, 1797 and other letters of April and June, 1797. Douglas, *loc. cit.*, is therefore in error in speaking of Miss Hopper as Ward's "second" wife.

[11] Stephen Glover, *History, Gazetteer and Directory of the County of Derby* (1829), II, 499. *Gent. Mag.*, 1800 (ii), 702. [12] Glover, *loc. cit.*

PRACTICAL BUSINESSMEN

Ward and Fishwick are often thought of as the founders of the Elswick White-Lead Works at Newcastle, but they were two only of three original partners, the third bearing a greater name than theirs. In April, 1778, an agreement was signed between Samuel Walker the elder, Richard Fishwick of Hull, gentleman, and Archer Ward, merchant, of the same place, to become co-partners in the business of making and selling white lead.[13] This Samuel Walker, of Rotherham, was no other than the famous founder of the celebrated iron works at Masborough, who finds his place in English economic history as an early example of the new capitalism created by the Industrial Revolution. He seems to have found the larger proportion of the capital for the new enterprise, doubtless out of the increasing profits he was making in his foundry; Ward placed his business connections, and Fishwick his practical knowledge, at the disposal of the firm; such, in brief, was at any rate the tradition at a later date.

Two acres of land, says the official record, were obtained on a ninety-nine years' lease from John Hodgson at an annual rent of £20, situated in the township of Elswick and known as East Tyne Heughes; or, as Archer Ward himself said, writing, naturally, to one who knew the ground :[14]

> . . . the ground we have a lease for 99 years belongs to Mr. Hogson, one end is about 30 yards from the well called King James well, which we have a right to bring the stream into our ground, the other end comes to the road which parts Andersons ground from the above, the side is along the tyne and about 40 yards broad . . .

John Kinghorn told his brother in the following April that Messrs. Ward and Co., as he called them,

> have Wrected a Mill and Several houses next field to Jemmys Well for the purpose of making paints

In 1780 they rented Bussell's Factory House in the parish of Benwell for eighteen years and converted it to a factory for painters' colours, adding the manufacture of red lead in 1784. Meanwhile, Samuel Walker the elder had died in 1782 and was succeeded by four sons in the partnership of the white-lead works. In 1785 further premises were opened at Islington, and, a little

[13] The documentary history of the white-lead works is given in *The Walker Family, Iron Founders and Lead Manufacturers*, 1741-1893. ed. A. H. John (Council for the Preservation of Business Archives, 1951), p. 33 ff. The Walkers have long been known to historians from the account of them given in J. Hunter's *Hallamshire* and J. Guest's *Rotherham*.

[14] David Kinghorn. Kinghorn mss., 21 July, 1778.

later, at Red Bull Wharf, London, when Thomas Maltby entered into partnership also.

The Newcastle firm had now become Walkers, Fishwick and Co., the four Walkers holding four shares each, Fishwick five, Ward five and Maltby two, with a proviso that Fishwick's son and a nephew of the Walkers should become partners on attaining their majority. Thus the official record once again; but the firm was known loosely by various names, for example simply Ward, Fishwick and Co., to those who knew those two partners. In 1787 the manufacture of shot was introduced at Elswick, after the purchase of a patent from the inventor, Watts of Bristol, for £10,000. The famous shot tower, erected as part of the necessary equipment, took more than a year to build, the firm employing its own workmen at a wage of about £10 a week each (an unprecedented amount in those days); but when completed in 1797, it was found to be two feet out of the perpendicular. By a somewhat dangerous expedient of digging down to the foundations, soil was removed on one side, and the tower gradually righted itself.

In a period of rapid expansion, new branches were formed at Chester, Liverpool and elsewhere, with which Ward and Fishwick had nothing to do,[15] except at Derby, for when the partnership agreement ended in 1799, Fishwick withdrew along with Samuel Walker junior, and Ward had not long to live. The official record describes how Joseph, Joshua and Thomas Walker took premises at Derby for a lead factory in 1792, and when a new deed was drawn up in 1800, the other partners paid them £1,000 for participation in that property. Ward appears to have been overlooked by the firm's historian, who blandly continued, "in 1809 Mr. Ward retired from the partnership." This is not surprising, for he had died in 1800. What is more surprising is the lack of any mention of his part in establishing the Derby concern: this part is displayed in one or two references in the Kinghorn letters about to be quoted.

How the original Walker had made the acquaintance of Ward and Fishwick is not revealed; but the lead and iron trades were not unconnected at that date, and "many of the merchants at the more important ports traded in both classes of metal. Hull was one such port."[16] However this may be, once begun the business prospered exceedingly, so much so that its rapid development and great profits were almost certainly the reasons why Walker's sons left the iron works to "concentrate their activities in the industry in which the bulk of their fortunes now lay."[17] The recent editor

[15] Though it may not be without significance that Fishwick died (1825) at Islington, where one of these branches was situated.

[16] So Mr. A. H. John, *Walker Family*, p. iv.

[17] The assets of the lead works in 1817 were valued at £456,799.

of the firm's records, Mr. A. H. John, has much to say of their importance to economic historians, and to his remarks[18] in full the reader is referred for further details; it is hoped that the present paper will add fresh information, and not least help to establish the claim of two Baptists to a small place in English economic history. They laid the foundations of a great industrial enterprise which survived them for nearly a century and was of major importance.

Both of them were inventors in a small way; they were never sleeping partners in the firm. In 1787 Fishwick patented a "new method of making white lead," a quite simple change in the ordinary method of manufacture which substituted "spent tan" or used tanners' bark for the usual "horse-litter" then employed,[19] but one which Mr. John asserts was "the only generally accepted advance in the making of white lead in the century" (1778-1893) covered by the firm's annals. Ward's invention was of a more humane kind. Among the premiums offered by the Society of Arts in 1794 was one of £50 in chemistry for a "method of preparing white lead which shall not be prejudicial" to the health of the workmen. Next year the Society announced that it had awarded its gold medal to "Mr. Ward" for an invention which it hoped would prevent the "horrible complaints" to which the workmen were subject in that manufacture arising "principally from the dust of the corroded lead." Ward's own account of his discovery, in a letter to More, Secretary of the Society, is dated from Derby White Lead Works, January 2nd, 1795; it was printed in the Society's *Transactions*[20] for 1795, with attestations from Samuel Walker, Parker and H. Browne; Parker said Ward's method had been used at Islington for some time past, and Browne, writing from Irongate, Derby, thought it a valuable improvement.

Ward and Fishwick, then, were good, practical, businessmen; what were they like in their private capacities? Their relationships with the Kinghorns, now to be described, will reveal something of that side of their characters.[21]

[18] A. H. John, *op. cit.*, "Introduction," where little or nothing is said of Fishwick and Ward.

[19] *Patents for Inventions: Abridgements of specifications relative to acids* (&c.) 1622-1866 (1869), p. 35. There is a full description in *The Repertory of Arts* . . . III (1795), pp. 225-30.

[20] Vol. XIII, p. 229 ff., with a plate. It was a fortunate coincidence that both Fishwick and Ward should have appeared before the public in print at the same time.

[21] The Walkers were great patrons of the Congregational Church at Masbrough and the Rotherham Academy, in the same way that Ward and Fishwick were of various Baptist churches. The piety of the first Samuel Walker is very like that of Archer Ward. Cf. J. Guest, *Historic Notices of Rotherham* (1879), 458-9, 461, 488, 500.

THE KINGHORNS

Early in 1770 a young man aged thirty-two arrived at Bishop Burton in the East Riding of Yorkshire to take pastoral oversight of the church formed there in 1764; a chapel had only just been built and was not yet properly licensed;[22] but the members were anxious to have a successor to their "gifted brother" Richard Hopper, who had accepted a call to Nottingham. The new probationer was David Kinghorn,[23] a Durham man, once a shoemaker but now a preacher; already he had married a second wife, one of a numerous clan of ancient and honourable Northern Baptists, the Joplings, and it was largely through her that he had become a Baptist himself. She had borne him one son, Joseph, four years old at this date. David Kinghorn decided to settle. Among the deacons who signed the invitation to him, and later the formal call,[24] was Archer Ward, destined to be of great service to him; Ward also came to be related by marriage to Richard Hopper.

It was perhaps but natural that after a while David should have felt a little homesick for Newcastle, where he had learned to preach and where he was well known, not only for business, but also for family reasons. It is fortunate that his correspondence, full of enquiries about the state of church affairs in what was virtually his home town (strictly he was a Gateshead man), has survived in large quantities: from it a fuller picture of the unhappy state of the cause at Tuthill Stairs may be gleaned than from any source hitherto available. The Kinghorns had lodged with that very Caleb Alder who was to be Fishwick's first Baptist discovery on his arrival in Newcastle; for another thing, they had in Philip Nairn, a hypersensitive Christian much concerned about the state of his soul, an excellent if odd correspondent about the state of Newcastle affairs also. Nor was it long before Newcastle again was to prove of vital service to David; as it had changed the course of his own life, shortly it was to alter that of his only son; so once again information about Newcastle poured in to Bishop Burton.

[22] A copy of the original licence, dated July 10, 1770, is reproduced in E. H. Skingle, *The Story of a Country Baptist Church* (1929), p. 11.

[23] The main facts for the early career of both David and Joseph Kinghorn are to be found in M. H. Wilkin, *Joseph Kinghorn* (1855). This biography was compiled from a vast hoard of Kinghorn letters, now in the possession of C. B. Jewson, Esq., of Norwich; they have been used in the present study to supplement Wilkin's account, and are referred to as "Kinghorn mss." For the Joplings, and a brief series of notes on David Kinghorn, see D. Douglas, *op. cit.*

[24] The first invitation to David Kinghorn was dated January, 1770, a second and more formal call was written in April, and still a third in November of that year, the spelling of which, by modern standards, is atrocious.

At the end of 1774, David, always inclined to pessimism, lamented that amongst various misfortunes that had befallen his church, one was the impending removal of Archer Ward.[25] In March, 1777, Ward is referred to as being at Hull, but on July 21st, 1778, he sent a note to David from Newcastle[26] of which the very first words are significant of his double interests:

> As I have now been a few weeks at this place you perhaps will Expect a line from me with Respect to the preachers . . .

He sends news of friends and relations and mentions that though the Baptist interest had for some years been on the decline, it now appeared to be stirring: they wanted preachers, and maybe at some future date the Lord would bless their labours with a stated minister. He went on to give the description of their lease of land which has been already quoted. Writing again on February 23rd, 1779, and apologising for delay in answering David's letters, he said:

> I readyly agree with your thoughts in the Close of your first Letter Viz. the Grand end of preaching or hearing is Edification—I cant say much of being Edify'd with preaching in General, my Comforts Chiefly consists in a simple Veiw of the Redeemer . . . (sic)

He cheers Kinghorn up with views on the trials and discouragements of this life which speak the man, especially the economic man who was also a dissenter:

> While we are in search After any Object Natural or Speritual Tho with great difficulty in our Acending yet the Object in view is a Spring to the movement of our Whole frame. But when obtain'd we are pleas'd with the prospect thereof. However pleasing the prospect in such a state is much Expos'd to Storms of various Kinds shou'd we ob'ain any good in our proceeding we ought to be joyfull but if to the Contrary Consider he that Gives the Blessing also witholds, who only knows what is best for us. Ecc. C 7—V 14. Mr. Fishwick has seen Mr. Hague at Scarbro & heard Mr. Rogers at Bridlington the 21st In . . .

He wrote on June 2nd of the same year to report on a visit to Hamsterley, where he had met Mrs. Kinghorn's folk, and to tell of the Association meeting:

> As to our own concerns is not much Either flattering or frowning time is to determine these things I wish for patience in Every Situation and Due Submission to the Allwise Disposer of all Events. I hope I am still Leaning on Jesus as I go along this Wilderness State.

At the end of this year it was felt that the time had arrived for Joseph Kinghorn to find a job. Beatson, pastor at Hull, reported that a situation could be found for him with a watchmaker in that town, a Mr. Cliffe, if terms could be agreed upon, but the £10

[25] Kinghorn mss., 23 November, 1774.
[26] *ibid.*

needed might prove a difficulty. Joseph was in Hull by the end of January, 1780, when his father sent him a variety of comforts and much more advice: Joseph's reply, dated January 25th, is his first recorded piece of writing. A further letter from David, of February 18th, is omitted from Wilkin's biography of Joseph, but it is instructive; addressed to the youth "at Mr. Joseph Denton's, Clock & Watch Maker, Scale Lane, Hull," it contains the usual good advice but refers also to the despatch of "Canne's Bible, Concordance, Greek and Latin Testament, and Watts' Childrens' Hymns," besides articles of clothing. It is a pointer to David's intentions for the boy: nothing was farther from his mind than to make a minister of Joseph, he merely desired him to be well grounded in the faith whatever profession he chose. But in March there followed an ominous letter of advice about medicines: it was the beginning of the end of Joseph's career as a watchmaker, for it was clear that his health was not adequate to the strain of close confinement. Yet he never lost the skill he gained in that short training.

At this very time, Archer Ward wrote to give David a full account of a discovery for the pastorate at Newcastle (March 21st), of which no more is heard, for the Kinghorn correspondence breaks off at this point for nearly a year. When it is resumed Ward again referred to Tuthill Stairs, after wandering at large over the problem of Christ's pre-existence, to say that a settlement of the long vexed problem of the ownership of the premises was in sight. But it is his "P.S." that is important:

> If you shou'd think of Joseph coming to N.C., Mr. Fishwick will talk to you about that matter.

No time was lost, for on Saturday, March 24th, 1781, David wrote to his son "at Mr. Ward's White Lead Works near the Close, Newcastle-upon-Tyne." Joseph had left on the previous Tuesday, going by way of Leeds, where he learned something of the new Baptist church, York, and Durham, at which place he met Fishwick, who directed him on his way.

On April 8th, Joseph sent an account of himself which showed that he was obviously in a much happier frame of mind, enjoying the air and finding a better appetite. His duties were clerical and had nothing to do with the lead, "that seems dangerous." He went on:

> The Company of Mr. Ward at Evenings &c. is very agreeable and Mr. Fishwick seems just cut out for an Instructor.

Ward was "strenous" about "Christ's being the Word from Eternity and not God's eternal son." This roused David to join in the argument, and in reply Ward said on April 8th:

> without a Dout Afflictions is good for us in the present state in the hand of ye Lord, they serve to wean us in some measure from the World which is in itself a blessing tho Diligence is our duty as ye wise man says Riches are not for Ever.

He wants every man to be allowed his own thoughts. As for Joseph, he was pleased with him and promised to look after him.

The correspondence continues with great regularity month after month. Joseph had come home from home, and if his parents betrayed a not unnatural anxiety for the well-being of their only son, he was not without many friends. David continually counselled him against vain wrangling, and advised strict attention to duty, especially as he owed so very much to his masters. Joseph lodged with the Wards: Ward himself he found argumentative about doctrinal matters, Mrs. Ward possessed of a "hasty, fiery disposition." After a month or two she began to grumble at Joseph's expenses, especially his "washing," even hinting that he could leave if he felt he could do better elsewhere; she must have been a cheese-parer indeed to have questioned his extremely moderate expenses, but matters were soon smoothed over.

It was Fishwick who began to attract Joseph more and more as time passed by. Very early he had told Joseph that he "might as well keep his nose out" of the actual lead in the works. He had, according to Joseph, the mildest temper of any man he had ever known, and lent encouragement to his studies of the Greek Testament. Not that Joseph had much time for private study in these early days: his hours were often from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m., which he would not mind, he said, if they did not mean confinement summer and winter alike. The strain began to tell and he kicked against the pricks. Not only that, but for a long time he could not find out for himself what Ward and Fishwick really thought about him. Thereupon David found out by frankly asking for a report: it was very favourable.

Still, by the middle of 1782 it was clear that Joseph was far from satisfied with his lot. David counselled patience, but the situation came to a crisis in June, when Ward and his wife paid a visit to Yorkshire. While they were away, Joseph stayed with the Fishwicks, and though quite happy there, he suddenly announced to his father that he was contemplating a career in the watch and clock business again.

He had kept in practice by doing odd jobs for the firm and friends. Making every effort to dissuade him, David told of Fishwick's first promises to make gradual increases in his wages and to train him so as to fit him for a better situation. At this juncture Ward came to Bishop Burton and the matter was argued out. Both Ward and David counselled patience. Ward thought

that in two or three years' time Joseph would have acquired such a thorough knowledge of the business that he would have a better chance for a good place, but he blamed Fishwick's "swiftness" for Joseph's long hours. David thought long hours by no means evil as they left Satan with few opportunities to act. Joseph acquiesced, but with a sigh. Fishwick showing meantime an increased interest in him, he was perplexed whether to stay with him or return to the Wards when they came back from Yorkshire: he went back, in fact, but almost immediately a change of attitude is discernible. The interview between Ward and his father had evidently had some effect that August.

Joseph began to ask what was the use of his knowledge of "the tongues and arts" and was told by David that they were of little use if not employed for the "public good." This was not lost on Joseph. He found he had now more time for study and had been "put forward" in the counting-house; he was learning shorthand and taking notes of sermons, and even dabbling with Hebrew. This was in September, 1782. He then announced that he proposed to visit Bishop Burton to be baptized. In December he first makes mention of what was to prove yet another decisive influence on his career, the search for a settled minister at Newcastle; application being made to Bristol for such a man, William Pendered was the result. Pendered came, and stayed with Fishwick: very soon he and Joseph were great friends. Joseph became more and more restless; he was clearly wavering about his future career and now asked how much notice was required to terminate his employment in the leadworks. Ward shrewdly declined to give him an answer. Both Fishwick and Ward were "close-mouthed" about him, he told his father. A gift of books from Fishwick aroused David's suspicions that Fishwick, at least, did not intend Joseph always to be employed at the works. Fishwick bought more books at an auction in Durham and Joseph had his share; among Joseph's own bargains was *Poli Synopsis Criticorum*, five massive volumes for twenty-two shillings, obtained by outbidding a bookseller. At this point it seems incredible to the historian that these obvious pointers to the boy's true calling should have meant nothing to him or his father; but so, on the evidence, he must conclude it apparently was.

On April 12th, 1783, Ward sent a favourable account of Joseph's conduct but threw in a hint that his attachment to his studies was carried to "perhaps a fault." He allowed him time off to come to Bishop Burton, however, to be baptized. While there, Joseph had a business note from Fishwick (Ward adding a social note) with quotations for red paint and lead, so on his return early in May he was able to do business for the firm at York and earn thereby part of his expenses. Back at Newcastle he still felt that

his future was not settled—but for a different reason now. What had been said at Bishop Burton will perhaps never be revealed, but all talk henceforward for some months is of Joseph's training for the ministry.

The only question which concerned him, at first, was the choice between Aberdeen and Bristol, but for his elders there was the prior question whether he was ready for training. Pendered was urging him on whole-heartedly, too much so, thought David. The seemingly interminable negotiations over his entry into college are of little concern here, except in so far as Ward and Fishwick played their part. David found much support for his policy of delay: Beatson reminded him, for example, that there was an engagement with Fishwick and Ward which, though only verbal, it was "not well to break," counselled caution, and said that when the engagement ended in March, 1784, then was the time to act freely. Nor was Hopper sanguine. David told his son that education was not everything in a minister's make-up, not even the chief thing. All were agreed that Joseph was in too great a hurry. Even Fishwick seemed to share their views, but he suddenly capitulated so far as to agree that Joseph might, if necessary, leave the firm earlier than March, 1784, possibly so soon as October, 1783.

The effect on Joseph was to stimulate him to gain experience in public speaking: the opportunity he sought was to hand, at the homes of Ward and Fishwick, where, in alternate weeks, prayer meetings were held at which a dozen or eighteen folk, not necessarily members, met from 7.30 to 9 in the evening.[27] One of their number was nominated to "exercise," and the turn often came round to Joseph, Pendered, one suspects, often heavily loading the dice. At his father's suggestion, Joseph set about the task of writing a long essay on "The Promise of Life," and found, like many another student, that the result was easier envisaged than performed. Yet if Joseph with all these ideas and activities tried his utmost to counter all objections to going to college, David told him roundly that there was one argument which was conclusive—he could not afford even the modest £10 required as a minimum for one year's stay at Bristol, and he would not borrow.

> But if the Lord see meet so to do he can open a door even when all seem shut. Therefore I shall leave the matter to his all disposeing hand . . .

In August Joseph flatly determined that if he did stay at Newcastle, it would be "against his will." Whether by now Ward and Fishwick had tried to teach him more about the business or not, is not clear, but he speaks of "dirty, awkward jobs" to which the

[27] *ibid*, 29 June, 1783.

counting-house was by far to be preferred. Pendered kept up his persistent advocacy, for he and Joseph were more bosom friends than ever. Even the cantankerous Mrs. Ward was converted to the idea that, as he was commanded by her to tell his father, he would " be a P-rs-n very soon."

At this juncture, in September, both Archer Ward and Mrs. Fishwick visited Yorkshire, to be followed in December by Fishwick, and they all, naturally, paid a call on David. Of Joseph's efforts at speaking, Ward said they lacked " brevity," a judgment with which Joseph strongly disagreed when he heard of it. Still David saw no way out for his son : if all else were to his wish, he said, the cost was prohibitive. Meanwhile, at Fishwick's house, and at church, Joseph met " young Mr. Hall from Arnsby " on his way to Aberdeen and was much struck with his composure in the pulpit, envied his powers, and found him, out of the pulpit, " a more facetious companion than could be met with in many a long day."[28] David was not impressed and thought Hall's levity would make him a most unsuitable minister. But in the very letter in which he told of Hall, Joseph apologised for his hasty scribble by saying that it was one o'clock in the morning when he wrote, work having but ceased half an hour before, so " throng " was the firm. Indeed, business was pressing heavily on Joseph's leisure, small as it normally was, by the end of 1783, and he saw that the year was now too " far spent " to do anything about his urgent desire. But David was weakening. Yet one can sympathise with the man who wished to give his son every possible advantage but found that one third of his salary would be required to do so : David was earning no more than £30 a year.

If he were determined, then, not to stay at Newcastle, wrote the old man in December, everything possible would be done to get him into an academy :

> if otherwise, we hope Mr. Fishwick will perform his promise by endeavouring to gett you a better place.

Sending David a frank letter about his son's abilities and prospects, Pendered was able to dispense with the ordinary post and have it delivered "pr favour of Mr. Fishwick," who was visiting Yorkshire. This double visitation from Newcastle marks the beginning of the end : under bombardment from all sides David told Pendered :

> If the Lord design him for that important work his mind seems so much set on, and which Mr. Fishwick and Mr. Ward & yourself as well as some here think there is apparent prospect of, He that made the Mouth can and will, if He call to the work, give a Mouth & Wisdom to speak

[28] *ibid*, November, 1783.

For both Fishwick and Ward were still not perfectly satisfied with Joseph's proficiency in speaking. Joseph himself was more determined than ever:

> As to another year, should I not go to Bristol next year, I should like another situation, as I dont see Im making much out here, only I should not be so opposite (opposed?) to this place as not to wait here 3 months or so untill I saw if anything was likely I could hear of. But as I wish to be at Bristol next entrance I must of consequence leave this place, & as the sooner an Application is made the better, it seems necessary I should go Home when my time is out.[29]

He would spend six months at Bishop Burton at work on "hic, hac, hoc, &c.", wishing to press on and not be "retarded" in Bristol. Even at this point, Ward offered him employment after his time was out, so as to save David expense.

Fishwick called on David on both the 13th and 24th of December. Reporting their long talks together, David gives the impression at first that college was still a hopeless objective for Joseph; he still harps on his inability to bear the cost.

> Upon Consultation with friends I find there voice in General against your going

But, he added:[30]

> Mr. Fishwick Generously proposed to us that if we could bear the expences the first year (which perhaps is all we can do, travelling is so expensive) he would engage if the Lord spared and continued to prosper him for a second year. He thought Mr. W. would for another but as he had not consulted him pirticularly on that head he would not say possitively. And thus the matter must rest till after Mr. F. returns home.

Joseph was sworn to secrecy, but he was not to worry "about giving them warning" as his time was out in March; pessimistic to the last, David added that he could stay on till May, "or even another year."

The crisis had arrived; after a few last flickering doubts and hesitations, few of them Joseph's, it was decided that he should be allowed to go to Bristol. He thereupon drew up an ingenious "Dr. & Cr." account of his prospects for Fishwick's perusal.[31] So that he might stay three years there, Ward promised to give £5 towards his expenses, after one year, and Fishwick promised £10 after two years. Fishwick more than redeemed his promise, for in October, 1786, he sent £20 to Bristol. In a letter of thanks, Joseph referred to him as "the main instrument of giving me these favourable opportunities of improvement."[32] Fishwick called on the Kinghorns at Bishop Burton on October 31st, and told them that he did not intend to let them bear any part of the cost of

[29] *ibid.*, 8 December, 1783.
[30] *ibid.*, 27 December, 1783.
[31] Wilkin, *op. cit.*
[32] *ibid.*, 103.

their son's education; he deemed his generosity "well bestowed." At the break in May-June, 1785, Ward provided him with £5 for his journey home.[33]

PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Joseph's first appointment was at Fairford, and it did not last long. It was soon hinted that it would be better if he left. At this depressing moment, great was his surprise to receive a letter from Caleb Evans, head of Bristol academy, enclosing another which Joseph was astonished to see bore the Norwich postmark. In bewilderment he opened it and found it was a letter, in Fishwick's hand, to Evans, dated January 21st, 1789, recommending the church at Norwich to seek his services! Once again Richard Fishwick had given a decisive turn to his career. It appeared that while he had been staying in Norwich, he had accidentally heard, or incidentally discovered, that the Baptist church there was in need of a minister to replace the young pastor, Dunn, actually a fellow student of Joseph's, who was about to leave them as not quite the type of man they needed. Fishwick had immediately recommended Joseph Kinghorn to their notice.

It is history that Joseph went to Norwich and remained there for the rest of his life. It would have been unnatural if the precious links forged between him and Fishwick had then been entirely broken: they were not, but never again were they so close and strong. Even on his way to Norwich, Joseph met Ward in London (March, 1789) and stayed with him. But the first and most natural weakening, though small, occurred in January, 1790, when Joseph's dismission from Tuthill Stairs took place.

Fishwick was irrepressible. He had told David in January, 1791, that he was glad to have been of use to him and his son, adding that Pendered had left Newcastle, that Shaw was then exercising his gifts and that he had met Ward the week before in London. In March, 1792, he wrote from Newcastle to Joseph desiring to see him there. Evidently Joseph had been the means of introducing to Fishwick, Walkers & Co. his new friends the Wilkins, and business transactions followed. Fishwick sent an account for shot and paint supplied and went on to ask as "*An Act of Charity*" that Joseph would visit Newcastle and supply the pulpit for three weeks. Even without a minister, membership had "been much more upon the Encrease than for some years back" and now had reached a total of about fifty.

> "P.S. I must just intimate to you that my *temporal* concerns have long been very prosperous both here and in London—Mr. Ward I think is likely to spend more of his summer(?) at Derby where we are erecting a White Lead work."

[33] *ibid.*, 37.

He then mentioned his proposal to establish a "seminary in Yorkshire" for the training of men for the Baptist ministry, and his intention to build a new meeting-house at Newcastle, with baptistry, two vestries, school room and library. Joseph being "a little bookish" might advise him about this last item. In reply, Joseph agreed to come, but wanted more details first about the proposed academy: he wished it every success, but pointed out various difficulties such a plan would encounter.

The visit was long postponed, for it appeared later that Fishwick had been called to Scotland on business[34] and afterwards to Leeds, Rotherham, Derby and London. He wrote again to Joseph on June 11th, repeating his invitation. Hartley had disappointed them by declining to settle as their minister, he said; they had no "supply" other than Brother Shaw, but Thomas Langdon of Leeds had applied at Bristol for a young man from Yorkshire, "Mr. Foster." They might lose Shaw, "who is fixed to go to Derby to settle there with Mr. Ward, who is just about leaving London." He advised a sea journey for Joseph, as the expense would be less, though they offered £5, which they hoped would be enough as it had been reported that Joseph was now probably "rich." "However, I may give you an old Book to help to eke out!" Joseph's reply was very cautious, but nevertheless he could announce to his father on June 28th that he was "safe in the Counting House, White Lead Works, Newcastle," and would visit Bishop Burton in about three weeks' time, to give his experiences vica voce. He did, and was back in Norwich on August 5th.

Early in September David reported that Hopper and Mrs. Ward had called on him, followed by Ward and Hopper and their wives: Ward went off to Hull on his way to Nottingham or Derby. In November David had news from Beatson, who had it from Fishwick himself at Hull, that

> Mr. Ward was going to Build a Meeting House at Darby.

Fishwick had a habit of bobbing up unexpectedly. On May 7th, 1793 Joseph wrote to his father:

> Who should come to Norwich on Saturday but Mr Fishwick, quite unexpected but not unwelcome?

In letters of September and October of the same year, David mentions that Mr. and Mrs. Ward, along with Mr. Hopper, came to Bishop Burton, while Fishwick was at Scarborough. "Thus they trip about."

> Mr. Ward is I understand a principle person in building a meeting house at Derby wc. is now going fast forward.

What is curious is, that Joseph, in his replies, displays the most casual interest in these matters, unlike his previous concern.

[34] Kinghorn mss., May 28, 1792.

By June of 1795, David was lamenting that

> all our correspondence from the North is intirely dropt . . . We seem dead to them and they to us

and news meanwhile becomes more plentiful about the disturbed state of the church at Hull. But just then, to give the lie to his despair, the Wards suddenly arrived, in July, at Bishop Burton, with William Shaw. On the 18th, Mrs. Ward's "mother Eliz. Authorson died." Ward himself

> is very well in health and Mrs. W. looks exceedingly well, but is sore stript up as she says and short of breath and very dull of hearing . . . she says there are many ministers come to their house at Darby but none she would be more glad to see than you and us. Mr. W. has built a meetinghouse 12 yards by 14 within at Derby.

He went to Hornsey for a week's holiday.

In January, 1796, David learned that the new chapel at Derby was "but poorly attended," which he thought must have been "very discouraging," as doubtless it was. In fact, it was but the first of a series of misfortunes for Ward, relieved only by one pleasant interlude before the inevitable end. The Wards came to Bishop Burton in August: Ward himself had been ill at Newcastle and was soon off to Scarborough; his wife remained behind, still suffering from shortness of breath and hardness of hearing. Riches may be counterbalanced by miseries, is David's comment. She died in December.

> Mrs. Ward has finished her course on Monday last, 26 (wrote David to Joseph on December 31st) & left her share of a close & the old house her father lives in to sister Mary Johnson, out of which 15£ each to be paid to her other 3 sisters, viz. Pendered, Shaw & Merit. Mr. Ward has sent her will to S.G. (regson) & has ordered 5£ to be given to your mother for Mourning, to M. Johnson & (hannah Merit the same . . .

A cynically jovial letter from a laconic friend of the Kinghorns, O. Kirkbride followed on April 5th, 1797, which shed further light on these domestic affairs; mentioning Mrs. Ward's death, he adds that Mrs. Fishwick had also died "the 25 Ulto."

> I do not think either of the Gent. n will be long cast down wh Grief. However the former I understand begins to think of what God said at the beginning, "it is not good for Man to be *alone*," & intends shortly to take to himself a Helpmeet—Perhaps Miss H—r, whom I dare say you know very well.

Kirkbride was right: in June David wrote to his son:[35]

> Perhaps I need not tell you that A. Ward, esq. was married at Nottingham to Miss Hopper, daughter of the Revd. Richard Hopper, on May 25 . . . The new couple set off for Matlock . . . with 2 maids & a footman so we are told. Thus Lead is turned into Gold and flies abroad. The Ladies Maid is now the Lady.

[35] In May he had also told Joseph of the burning down of the Derby Lead Works only a few days before the marriage.

Ward had quickly disposed of his late wife's clothing among her sisters,

> so Nancy will not have to wear any of *her* Cloaths who once so haughtily dominered over her.

Joseph, who must have known far more about the lady's haughtiness than his father, had nothing to say about her, in reply, but he waived aside all David's sarcasm about Ward himself:

> There are many things in Mr. Ward I like very much & the more I have seen of this world the more on the whole I have thought well of him. I shall be highly pleased that the evening of his days are more comfortable than the former part. Marrying is with him a *safe* experiment: he cannot jump out of the frying pan into the fire. I am glad God has prospered him in the World. I have no objections whatever to his being A. Ward, esqr., nor any to 2 maids & a footman on an expedition to Matlock. The World is worth nothing without it be enjoyed. Let a man partake of the fruit of his labor, it is the gift of God. Yet I own I think the difference in age an objection & tho the match may terminate well, & I hope it will, yet it cannot be praised for its prudence.

His father disagreed with this last judgment:

> Mr. Ward is about 53, 28 Sepr. next, and Divine providence has favoured him with a large portion of worldly goods, but no offspring. I think he could *not do* better than wed one of 31, by whom there is at least a probability of enjoying some posterity.

He went on to say that Ward had always been mindful of poor relatives and happy to befriend them, nevertheless if he had children of his own he might restrain his liberality (though it was hoped he would not) as he had been very liberal in some cases, "instance his donation to the fund."

In August, David heard that Ward was

> young again . . . so a young wife puts spirits into the aged . . . After all, I do not think he will ever again have good health, the Lead having tainted the inside, its effect is not soon removed.

He was right this time. The visits to Bishop Burton ceased henceforth, and the old friends saw one another no more. At the same time came news from Kirkbride of Hull, in his usual light-hearted style:

> Fishwick is reported to be upon the point of marriage with a servant that has been with him many years. I do not now recollect her name, but Pendered knew her well & said when he heard of it he always thought such a thing probable in the event of Mrs. F.'s death. You will have seen in the papers that his daughter was lately married to Geo. Gibson, *esq.*: *re,* whom I do not know but probably you do as I understand he is related to Mr. F.—& has been connected with Miss F. for *many years.* She must have been a *forward* chick as I apprehend she is not *now* more than 21 or 2!

David supplied more details in October: the new Mrs. Fishwick

was a niece of Whitfield, Ursula Grey, who had been Fishwick's servant for many years, and the couple had been married at Hamsterley. Fishwick did not cease to move around, and in April was at Hull, advising the church that Richards of Lynn, one of Joseph's friends, was "moveable." Hull was sorely troubled about its pastorate at that time and was looking for a minister to replace Pendered, who had not failed to maintain his reputation as a storm-centre.

After resolving the question of memorials to his wives at Bishop Burton, Ward apparently ceased to communicate directly with David: he kept in touch with his old friend Simon Gregson, however, and in January, 1798, asked him to see David about the possibility of Joseph visiting Derby for a month or two, as they were without pastor. David doubted it, but left the matter to Joseph's consideration: Joseph was in two minds, for it was a request very difficult to refuse, coming from an old friend. Time passed by and no personal invitation came from Ward to Joseph. David had the opportunity to record only one more piece of information about Ward before he left Bishop Burton for Norwich in July, 1799, having quarrelled with his flock. This was to the following effect, in January, 1799:

> Mr. K(irkbride) has sold the ship of which he had a share, it went by his name. Mr .Ward had 900£ in it, for his share he received 1,000 Guineas: we are told W. has made his will & setled 300£ per annum on Mrs. W. Wealth flows in like a sea, or this could not have been done; he never could have done it by farming.

Ward's death in 1800 finally severed a thirty years' friendship.

Fishwick had still a great deal of life left in him. As has been seen, he retired from the Walker Company in 1799; but in 1801 there is news that[36]

> Mr. Fishwick's new Iron Works in the Neighbourhood of Scarbro' has proved very encouraging to Mr. Hague, as at the present they are enlarging the Meeting, and I am told the expence is discharged as they go on.

David's successor at Bishop Burton had soon fallen out with his deacons, but once again Fishwick was on the spot and lured him to Newcastle:

> I must say (wrote this same correspondent) that I am rather surprised that Mr. F—k should patronise Mr. C., and that he should be so acceptable at Newcastle, as it is too obvious that he is very deficient as a real pastoral Character. A young man of the name of Shaw has been over from N— & who when there is a lodger in his house, he represents him as a very light irreverent man.

[36] Kinghorn mss., letter of W. Skinn, Beverley, September, 1801. Hague was pastor at Scarborough.

Mordaunt Cracherode, the man referred to, lasted next to no time at Newcastle.

Fishwick's project for an academy had come to nothing, so far as is known, but he did not therefore cease to lend his aid to poor students. Having taken a fancy to William Ward, baptized at Hull by Pendered, he sent him at his own expense for tuition by Dr. Fawcett at Ewood Hall in 1796[37]; this Ward, the famous missionary, was no relation to Fishwick's partner, so the incident is no doubt further evidence of Fishwick's genial temper, as he had quarrelled with Pendered in the meantime. An academy did make a start, in 1804, but under different auspices, and it still flourishes in its second abode at Rawdon: incidentally it was proposed that Joseph Kinghorn should become tutor in this new college, and strong efforts were made by Langdon of Leeds (whom Joseph had consulted about Fishwick's scheme on his way to Newcastle in 1792) to secure his services. They were courteously refused, as were later overtures of a similar kind from London.

From July, 1799 onwards, personal contact between the Kinghorns and their Northern friends ceased, but correspondence with Newcastle was suddenly renewed between Hawkins, church secretary at Norwich, and Michael Atkinson, a local Baptist, for a brief period in 1803, on business matters. The latter gave personal tittle-tattle to Joseph and made references to the cause at Tuthill Stairs, from which it appeared that Hassell, like his predecessor Pendered, had left Newcastle after a difference with Fishwick; one Hoyle had succeeded and left in disgrace and a hurry; then Cracherode came and likewise fell out with Fishwick straightway. Almost nothing more is to be gleaned about the remaining quarter of a century of life still to be run by this ubiquitous and purposeful gentleman.

Ward and Fishwick were self-made men in an age of self-help, men therefore of energy and self-confidence, the kind of men whose virtues, once so highly extolled by Samuel Smiles, have latterly been less highly regarded. Certainly they were men of their day, of an age which, whatever its demerits, made England rich and great. They never deserted the church of their early choice. They stood by it when membership of a Baptist church was certainly not the road to social or political honour or dignity. In the nineteenth century the Baptists were destined to play no inconsiderable part in the formation of the Nonconformist Conscience: what would they have been able to do without the support of men like Fishwick and Ward, or without the scholarship and advocacy of the men they patronised, like Joseph Kinghorn?

FRANK BECKWITH.

[37] J. C. Marshman, *The Story of Carey, Marshman & Ward* (1864), p. 43.

The Religious Beliefs of the Levellers

THE emergence of the Levellers began the most determined attempt in English history to give political expression to the doctrines of Law and of man which had characterised the Dissenting groups. In opposition to the Presbyterians and also, after the army debates at Putney had attempted to draw up a new form of government for England, expressed in "The Agreement of the People," to the Cromwellian party, they sought to translate the belief in man's spiritual liberty, a presupposition of Dissenting thought, into the assertion that all members of the state share equal rights and responsibilities. As the Separatists had maintained that members of the Church were subject to the same Law of God, so the Levellers held that all in the Commonwealth owe equal obedience to the Law of Nature and of the state. They attempted to establish politically a view of the individual's relationship with his society which had already found ecclesiastical expression in the gathered churches of the Nonconforming groups. Thus the movement cannot be properly understood except as it is seen in the setting of the religious life of the period, and to examine the social and political views of its leaders, without first considering their theological convictions, is to fail to appreciate the source and inspiration of their beliefs and actions.

Though most of the leaders of the Baptists and Independents dissociated themselves from the Levellers, many of whom found it impossible to subscribe to the theological beliefs expressed in the Confessions of the Dissenters, yet the Levellers are a Christian movement and seek to give expression to the teaching of Jesus, though, as M. A. Gibb in *John Lilburne the Leveller* (1947) points out, they looked for perfectionism in history and watered down the eschatological teaching of Christianity. William Walwyn, writing on behalf of John Lilburne, Richard Overton and Thomas Prince, leaders of the movement, who, individually or collectively, are responsible for the majority of the Leveller Tracts, says, in 1649:—

> "Whereas its said, we are Atheists and Antiscripturalists, we preofesse that we believe there is one eternall and omnipotent God, the Father and Preserver of all things in the world. To whose will and directions, written first in our hearts, and afterwards in his blessed Word, we ought to square our actions and conversations. And though we are not so strict upon the formall and Ceremonial part of his service, the method, manner, and personall injunction being not

> so clearly made out unto us, nor the necessary requities which his Officers and Ministers ought to be furnished withall as yet appearing to some of us in any that pretend thereunto: yet for the manifestation of God's love in Christ, it is clearly assented unto by us: and the practicall and most reall part of Religion is as readily submitted unto by us, as being, in our apprehensions, the most eminent and the most excellent in the world, and as preceeding from no other but that God, who is Goodnesse itself: and we humbly desire his Goodnesse daily more and more to conform our hearts to a willing and sincere obedience thereunto."[1]

Walwyn, by birth the grandson of a Bishop of Hereford and by occupation a member of the Company of Merchant Adventurers, had taken the Parliamentary side during the Civil War, but had, by 1646, lost his earlier hope that the Long Parliament would usher in an age of liberty and peace and had thrown in his lot with the Levellers, among whom he soon became prominent, even drawing up the Leveller Petition of March, 1647. In 1649 he was the subject of an attack from a number of Baptists led by William Kiffin, who, in the pamphlet, *Walwins Wiles,* charge him with atheism. In answer to this charge a friend of Walwyn tries to explain the antagonism which the sects felt for him and writes:

> "The true ground of this bitternesse of spirit against him may well be supposed to be, because he cannot associate with them into a Church-way, upon their grounds; as not knowing any persons to be so qualified as Ministers of the Gospel ought to be . . . In the mean time he approves Congregational Assemblies for instructing the people, and for the consideration and right understanding of the Scriptures; as also for making every man in love with true piety and virtue, and to loath whatever is evil: but . . . he can no more approve the Divine Authority and Saintship of the Independent Pastours then of others before them: and reckons that they are such but in pretence and show only."[2]

In the same year Walwyn, also in answer to *Walwins Wiles,* holds that the neglect by the Dissenting Churches of the essential and practical part of the Christian religion, which is to show charity to all, for all Christians are under an infinite obligation of love and thankfulness to God, is an ingratitude that astonishes him.[3] Yet, in earlier years Walwyn's relationship with the sects, particularly the Baptists, had been cordial. In 1646 he writes:

> "There is not anything I have observed that hath prevailed with me to disclaim the publike ministry, or the parochial congregations and I have yet some hopes to see them reduced into such a condition, as that all things thereunto belonging may, without difficulty, be justi-

[1] "A Manifestation from Lieutenant Col. John Lilburn, Mr. William Walwyn, Mr. Thomas Prince, and Mr. Richard Overton (now Prisoners in the Tower of London) and others, commonly (though unjustly) styled Levellers" 1649. Printed in Wolfe, Don M. *Leveller Manifestoes,* 1944 p. 393.."

[2] B. N. *The Charity of Churchmen,* 1649.

[3] Walwyn, William. *The Fountain of Slaunder Discovered,* 1649 p. 1

> fied: but though I am not in fellowship with those good people you call sectaries, yet I joyn heart and hand with them in any thing I judge to be right, and tending to the publike good: and love them as heartily as those that are one with me in judgement."[4]

In answer to Edwards *Gangrena*, he speaks of the Dissenting Groups as those, "who from the beginning of these our troubles have continually, without repining, contributed their fleece for clothing, and their limbs and lives for nourishment, and strength, to preserve, not only their own liberties but the just liberties of this nation."[5] Thus, Walwyn's sympathies with the Independents and Baptists is occasioned by his anticlericalism and by his political sympathies and, as first the Presbyterians and then the Independents assume power, so he becomes less favourably disposed towards them.

Walwyn accepts the belief, that is characteristic of the Puritan attitude to ecclesiastical matters, holding that the Word of God is the only unerring rule for the ministry and worship of the Church, for, whereas the best reformed Church in the world may be at fault, the Biblical pattern of the Church is the very mind of God. Yet he is greatly concerned with the problem of interpretation, a problem which the early Puritans and Separatists did not recognise to exist, believing the meaning of the Scriptures to be self-evident. He holds that Word of God can be interpreted only by the individual conscience, for no external authority is competent to impose on anyone anything that pertains to the world of the spirit. He was himself conscious of a religious vocation, which he sought to express in terms of human and divine love. His view of religion is epitomised in his words addressed to Thomas Edwards:

> "O that truth and this my plain dealing might beget or awaken Conscience in you, and provoke you to cast off the works of darkness, and to put on the armour of light, and henceforth to walk honestly, and not in strife and envying, but to walk in love as Christ hath loved: nor is it meet you should esteeme your self a Christian, untill you find your soul possessed with the spirit of true Christian love, which doth no evil to his neighbour, and therefore is the fulfilling of the Law."[6]

The relationship between these theological views and the social problems of the day is developed by Walwyn in *The Power of Love*. In this work he condemns inequality of wealth, but adds that the communism of the early Church was voluntary, not coercive and so, could be introduced only by universal assent. Walwyn believed that, in all matters, disciples of Christ must be known by their love.

Richard Overton, another Leveller leader, spent his early years

[4] Walwyn, W. *A Whisper in the Ear of Mr. Thomas Edwards*, 1646 p. 1.
[5] Walwyn, W. *An Antidote Against Master Edwards*, 1646, p. 2.
[6] Walwyn, W. *A Whisper in the Ear of Mr. Thomas Edwards*, p. 8.

in Holland, where he came in contact with Anabaptist and Baptist views. It is almost certain that he is the R.O. whose views are expressed in the title, *Mans Mortallitie or a Treatise wherein tis proved, both Theologically and Phylosophically that whole man (as a rational Creature) is a Compound wholy mortall, contrary to that common distinction of soule and body: And that the present going of the soule into Heaven or Hell is a meer Fiction: And that at the Resurrection is the beginning of our immortality, and then actuall Condemnation and Salvation, and not before* (1643). This work was heartily condemned at the time, especially by the Presbyterians of London. Yet Overton's contribution to the religious thought of his age does not lie within this strange work in which M. A. Gibb finds "evidence of a crude materialism in the scientific and biological discussion upon which Overton has embarked in his ambitious venture": rather should he be remembered for his attempt to reconcile his religious beliefs with his own rational outlook. The Law of God and of Nature is, for him, that which is essentially reasonable for, he writes, "Reason is the life of the Law."[7] He develops this view when he says:

> "All formes of Lawes and Governments may fall and passe away; but right Reason (the foundation of all justice and mercy to the creature) shall and will endure for ever; it is that by which in all our Actions wee must stand or fall, be justified or condemned; for neither Morality nor Divinity amongst men can or may transgress the limits of right reason . . . God is not a God of irrationality, and madnesse or tyranny: Therefore all his communications are reasonable and just, and what is so, is of God."[8]

Man is granted by God, natural and inalienable rights. All men are born, he believes, to "like propriety, liberty and freedom," and must be granted opportunity in the world to enjoy these innate rights.[9] By 1649 Overton's attitude towards the sects has hardened into antagonism and when he reports that he has heard that "those painted Sepulchers of Independency" desire a treaty with the Levellers, he advises his friends, "touch pitch, and you shall be defiled, have nothing to do with them."[10]

The religious beliefs of John Lilburne, described by Dr. Schenk as "the most popular and most turbulent of the Leveller leaders," were nearer to those of the Baptists and Independents than were those of Walwyn and Overton. In his early years in London he had contact with the London Baptists and William Kiffin supplied the foreword to his *The Christian Mans Triall*, which he published in 1641. He tells us that while an apprentice in the wool trade

[7] Overton, R., *A Defiance Against all Arbitrary Usupations*, 1646 p. 6.
[8] Overton, R., *An Appeale from the Degenerate Representative Body*, 1647 (*Levellier Manifestees*, p. 158).
[9] Vide Overton, R., *An Arrow Against all Tyrants*, 1646.
[10] Overton, R., *The Baiting of the Great Bull of Bashan*, 1649, p. 6.

he used to spend his time reading the Bible and *The Book of Martyrs,* together with the works of Luther, Calvin, Beza, Cartwright, Perkins, Molin, Burton, and Roger. This list of works enables us to appreciate the Puritanical setting of Lilburne's views. In 1646 he says of himself :

> " The Lord being an almighty God, is able to bring to passe his owne determinions and counsels by his owne way and means, and in his owne due time, and he, in his wisdome hath so ordered it, that I, his poore servant should be counted worthy by him to have the honour and dignitie bestowed on me for to suffer for his cause and glory and to beare witnesse to the purity of his truth, and to oppose his grand and capital enemies, namely the man of sin and his chiefe servants and confederates, the Bishops, and their Priests and Deacons, who have for many hundred years together buried the truth and the wayes of God in oblivion, and trodden underfoot the holy citie and true Church of God."[11]

Speaking of the Church itself, Lilburne uses the language that typifies the Puritan movement; Jesus is the only Priest, Prophet, King and Lawgiver of His Church and he holds, as against those who regarded the order and ministry of the Church as things indifferent that, " Jesus is as faithful in his house as Moses was in his Law."[12] In his work, *Rash Oathes Unwarrantable* (1647), he asks whether there can be any greater treason which can be committed by man than to disclaim the Law of Christ in ecclesiastical matters and to swear to follow any Pope, King or Parliament, as supreme governer in matters ecclesiastical or spiritual. These were views acceptable to the Dissenting group and Edwards could speak of him in *Gangrena* as " the darling of the sectaries." In theological matters, Lilburne's background was different from that of Overton and Walwyn. He was nurtured in the faith of the Calvinist, receiving in the early years of his protest the support of William Kiffin, the Baptist, and John Goodwin, the Independent, yet he, like the Puritans, as William Haller points out, finds a sense of freedom, rather than an experience of condemnation, in the doctrine of election. On the other hand, Overton and Walwyn reject utterly this doctrine and belong to a more humanistic tradition, finding it impossible to reconcile predestination with their view of man's natural freedom.

It is, of course, difficult to obtain direct evidence as to the religious beliefs of the rank and file of the Leveller Movement, but the language of the anonymous tracts and broadsheets, the petitions and agreements and, in particular, the debates of the Army at Putney, contain a terminology which was essentially that of the Sects. Many Baptists and Independents joined them and

[11] Lilburne, J., *Innocency and Truth Justified,* 1646, p. 1.
[12] Lilburne, J., *An Answer to Nine Arguments Written by T.B.* n.d., p. 7.

others supported the movement with moral and financial aid. Yet, by 1649, events alienated the sects from the Levellers. The author of the work, *The Vanitie of the Present Churches, and Uncertainty of their Preaching Discovered* (1649), a writer who is highly commended in *Walwyn's Just Defence*, writes of the Presbyterians and the Independents:

> "it were much better for the Common wealth that all mens mindes were set at Liberty from these entanglements that so there might be an end of weangling about shaddows: for if men were once free from this bondage, they would by reading the Scriptures . . . soone come to be able to understand the intent and substantial scope thereof, and become substantiall Christians."[13]

He holds that the essential mark of the true Church is that there, "the very word of God is infallibly preached," and claims that neither the Independents nor other religious bodies in England exhibit that mark.[14] Prof. Woodhouse holds that the aims of the Levellers are secular,[15] yet this is true only in a limited sense. Their view of the state, and consequent desire to reform it, spring from a view of Natural Law which demands a religious setting. In the tract, *Vox Plebis* (1646), we read:

> "That Republique which would keep it selfe from ruine, is above all other things to keep their Religion uncorrupted and their Lawes from violation. For as true Religion is the tie of the Conscience to obedience and observation of just Lawes (especially such as have their foundation in Divine Authority) so are good Lawes the civill sanctions or sinewes of a Common wealth, that bind all the members thereof together, by the execution of justice and piety, in a perpetual bond of peace and tranquility, so that, if either Religion be neglected, or the Lawes violated, the ruine of that Common wealth must needes be neere."

In 1649 Lilburne still holds that the true end of his political agitation is, "to knit the hearts together of all ingenuous men, in every faction or interest, that had but the least spark of a desire to do unto their neighbours as they would be done unto: Which Law is not only the prime Law of Nature, but also the strict command of the Law and Gospel."[16]

The whole of Leveller thought is dominated by their view of Law, and in this they show themselves the heirs of the traditions of the Separatists and Dissenters. In all political matters they are anxious that the positive Law of England shall reflect the moral Law of Nature, though, unlike many of the Sects, they do not identify this Law with the Mosaic Code, while readily acknowledg-

[13] Haller, W. and Davies, G., *The Leveller Tracts*, 1944, p. 271.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 255.
[15] Vide *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 14.
[16] Lilburne, J., *An Impeachment of High Treason Against Oliver Cromwell*, 1649, p. 21.

ing that it has its origin in the divine Will. This is well illustrated in *Vox Plebis*.

> "As touching the liberty of our persons: That is founded not only in Divine Law, but in Nature also: and so protected by the municipall and known Lawes of this Kingdom. For as God created every man free in Adam, so by nature are all alike freemen born; and are since made free in grace by Christ: no guilt of the father being of sufficiency to deprive the child of this freedom. And although there was that wicked and unchristian-like custome of villany introduced by the Norman Conquerour, yet was it but a violent usurpation upon the Law of our Creation, Nature, and the ancient Lawes of this Kingdome, and is now, since the clearer light of the Gospel hath shined forth, by a necessary harmony of humane society, quite abolished, as a thing odious to God and man in this our Christian Common wealth."

All human affairs are subject to these three Laws, and by them every man is made responsible for advancing the good and happiness of the whole community and for preventing the growth of tyranny within the state, in place of true Christian magistracy. Every man is by Nature free, and all these Laws grant him, when this liberty is endangered, the right to use, "the most violent remedy at hand, light it where it will, or upon whom it will," for, the proposed "Agreement of the People," drawn up in 1647, holds "it is a firme Law and radicall principle in Nature, engraven in the tables of the heart by the finger of God in creation for every living, moving thing, wherein there is the breath of life, to defend, preserve, award and deliver it selfe from all things hurtfull, destructive and obnoctious thereto, to the utmost of its power."[17] In this way, men who believed, with most Christian men in England at that time, that magistracy is God's ordinance, justified their attack upon the government of England and, particularly, on Oliver Cromwell.

The Leveller view, both of magistracy and the Church, is most clearly seen as we examine their beliefs concerning the relationship that should prevail between Church and state. They insist that the inward man, the life of the spirit, can never be made subject to human ordinance, but that in this realm God reigns alone. Walwyn uses words that might well be mistaken for the confession of a Baptist of the period: "God only persuades the heart: compulsion and enforcement may make a confused mass of dissembling hypocrites, not a Congregation of believers."[18] After describing the nature of the new supreme Authority they would set up in England, the "Agreement of the People" makes it clear that they will not grant to that authority the power to make or continue in force any law which seeks to compel men in matters of faith and

[17] *An Appeale From the Degenerate Representative Body* (*Leveller Manifestoes*, p. 159.)

[18] Walwyn, W., *A Whisper in the Eare of Mr. Thomas Edwards*, p. 5.

religion, but that all men should be allowed to follow their consciences in the exercise of worship without molestation or persecution. Lilburne points out that many of the sects, and he refers particularly to the Presbyterians, desired toleration when they were themselves persecuted, but having seized power for themselves, are prepared to grant that same toleration to no others. If a magistrate has a legal right to judge affairs concerning a man's conscience, then it was wrong, on the part of all Protestants to condemn Mary and her Parliament for burning those whom they conscientiously considered to be heretics.[19] In 1649 the Levellers say of their idea of reformation:

> "It is intended that the Christian Religion be held forth and recommended as the publike profession in this Nation (which we desire may, by the grace of God be reformed to the greatest purity in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, according to the Word of God). The instructing of the People whereunto in a publike way (so it be not compulsive) as also the maintaining of able teachers for that end, and for the confutation or discovery of Heresie, Errour and whatever is contrary to sound Doctrine, is allowed to be provided for by our Representatives; the maintenance of which teachers may be out of a publike Treasury, and wee desire not by tithes, provided that Popery or Prelacy be not held forth as the publike way or profession in this nation."[20]

This represents the attitude of the majority of the Levellers towards this matter, though they differed in their view of the limits to be set to religious liberty. While many follow the Army in believing that there were dangers in allowing Prelatists and Papists to hold state office, there were others who would offer to all the right to believe and practice what they would, in peace. Particularly significant in this connection is the tract, *No Papist nor Presbyterian,* which proposed the abolition of all disabilities that were suffered by either Nonconformist or Papist. The great problem of the Levellers was to resolve the tension between their belief that magistracy is a secular ordinance and that therefore there can be no intimate relationship between Church and state, and their, commonly held, assumption that human society being the creation of God, its government must assume certain responsibilities that are, by their very nature, religious.

D. MERVYN HIMBURY.

[19] Vide Lilburne, J., *The Oppressed Mans Oppression Declared,* 1646, p. 34.

[20] *A Petition from His Excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax* (*Leveller Manifestoes* p. 348.)

What Baptists Stand For

IT must be a great satisfaction to all Baptists, not to mention the author and the publishers, that a second edition of Mr. Henry Cook's book, *What Baptists Stand For*,[1] is required. This edition is substantially the same as the first, apart from some omissions and a little restatement.

The new edition is most welcome as a further illustration of the continuous and progressive exposition of the Baptist faith by leading Baptists. Mr. Cook deals with four principal themes: Scripture, The Church, Baptism, Liberty. The book is to be warmly commended, and the comments which follow, even when they are critical, are meant to be compliments and complements to an already serviceable book.

Would that it had been one page longer! It is no other than the first page of the book which is really missing. Such a page would then have been devoted to the first thing for which Baptists stand. That first thing is: The Priority of Worship. Of course when it did not come on the first page, it was a comfort to me to think that a consideration of our Baptist ideals of worship would appear in Mr. Cook's second section on the Church, but it did not come. On that first but missing page, it would have been so good to read some such token statement as: "Baptists in fellowship with all Christians of all generations and of all lands stand for the priority of Christian worship."

Of course one page would not have been enough, for there is a great need among us that the distinctive evangelical values of Baptist ideas of worship should be set forth. Mr. Cook frequently employs the phrase "fellowship with Christ," and this is a fundamental description of the Christocentric character of the believers' life, but it is to be supplemented by the thought of the worship of God as fundamental and prior. New Testament precept, Baptist practice and a theology of evangelism all point to the priority of worship.

Mr. Cook's first section has a heart-warming title: "The Supremacy of Scripture," but there is an ambiguity in the treatment which should be cleared up. The author often refers to Scripture, but the context shows that he generally means the New Testament. In fact Mr. Cook rarely mentions the Old Testament, though his treatment of the New Testament is adequate to his purpose. It is a pity that he makes no attempt to discuss the Baptist attitude to the Old Testament, for this is really the crux of the problem of Scripture for Baptists. We Baptists need to

[1] Carey Kingsgate Press, 8s. 6d.

ponder the fact that it was Jesus who raised the Old Testament to the level of Christian scripture.

The next section on "The Nature of the Church" is a sound and stimulating statement of our Baptist belief, which will greatly help and illustrate Baptist apologetic. My appreciation of this section is however tempered by the fact that the second great omission of the book occurs here. Mr. Cook rightly refers to Jesus and Jeremiah's new covenant, emphasises the part that covenant plays in the thinking of Baptist fathers who took their churchmanship seriously, and even quotes a covenant statement from Robert Browne. All this was most promising, but then came the disappointment, for in his exposition of our churchmanship Mr. Cook fails to relate the covenant idea to our church life. Covenant, old and new, holds the Bible together, and covenant, for Moses and Jeremiah, for Jesus and the Apostles, holds the people of God together. For our Baptist fathers, including William Carey, covenant was the cement of their spiritual enterprises. What holds the Bible together holds the Church together, and this is the gist of our Free Church position over against other claims that Episcopacy is the norm of the Church. Mr. Cook's omission reflects Baptist neglect of the idea of the covenanted community, and "gathered" is a poor substitute.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Cook quotes (p. 37) with apparent approval the dictum that "The Church is the Extension of the Incarnation." Such a phrase, based on a metaphor, theologically dubious as extending that metaphor away from the original intention of the metaphor, and religiously objectionable as infringing the uniqueness of the Incarnation, is a phrase that is not welcome in a book of Baptist belief.

Within this same section of his book Mr. Cook expounds the "Priesthood of all Believers" as the priesthood of each believer, which is of course perfectly correct. We Baptists believe in the priesthood of each believer. Our author, however, makes no effort to deal with the accusation levelled against us that Free Churchmen have not understood this doctrine, because the priesthood of each believer is only the minimum meaning of the doctrine. The priesthood of all believers, we are told, means the priesthood of the corporate body of believers acting together, acting corporately in covenant towards God, to each other and to mankind. Here is a fruitful field for further investigation, because the relevant Biblical passages undoubtedly point to the corporate and individual aspects of the priesthood of all believers.

Mr. Cook regretfully comes to the conclusion that Baptists will have to abandon the word "ordinance" in favour of the imported "sacraments," on the ground that "ordinance" does not do justice

to what is involved in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. A little study will show that "ordinance" represents several Hebrew and Greek words of rich diversity of meaning. These words point to the divine Author of the ordinances, to the divine grace given in the ordinances, and are used to describe the elements of worship, especially remembrance (in the Biblical and not modern meaning of that word), and refer to the Passover which is closely related to the Lord's Supper. In short, "ordinance" does everything that "sacrament" does and more. Perhaps those who favour the word imported from pagan thought will tell us what it is that "sacrament" does in the Church that "ordinance" does not do in the Bible?

In his third section devoted to Baptism, Mr. Cook places us all in his debt with his clear and forthright exposition. It is also very satisfactory that he begins to strengthen the weak point of Baptist theology of Baptism. It will be apparent to all how Baptist apologetic has failed to relate Jesus' Baptism to ours. Indeed a leading Baptist once told me that Jesus' Baptism was of course "a delayed adolescent experience!" Few would take such a view, but there is also little sign in the published expositions that Baptists think of Baptism as a "re-presentation of Christ's own Baptism and its application to each convert" (Lampe). Mr. Cook makes an effort to see His Baptism and ours as one whole, and the development of this approach will bring rich reward to our point of view. Jesus asked for His Baptism: so must we.

In a review in this journal of the first edition of this book, Dr. Payne addressed pertinent questions to our author, and in particular asked him to justify the view that it was our Lord's intention to found ordinances. We should all agree today that that was our Lord's intention, and this represents another fruitful line for Baptist exegesis. The late revered Principal Wheeler Robinson coined the phrase "Prophetic Symbolism" to describe those symbolic actions whereby the prophets of the Old Testament dramatically illustrated their message and their mission. Prophetic symbolism would be inadequate to describe what our Lord did in His Baptism and at the Last Supper, but "Dominical Symbolism" would be adequate as showing the continuity with the prophets and yet preserving the uniqueness of our Lord's actions. The Dominical symbols of His Baptism and His Supper would then be the means of a new line of Baptist exposition, whereby His Baptism was related to ours, just the Last Supper is related to our observance of the Lord's Supper.

In view of all this it is a matter of regret that Mr. Cook did not decide to devote a separate section to the Lord's Supper, and this really is the third omission of his book. The present sections

naturally suggest to a non-Baptist that Baptists attach more importance to Baptism than to the Lord's Supper, and this is not true. It is also a wise precaution for Baptists to be seen to devote as much attention and thought to the one ordinance as to the other, for if the Messiah sought a part in Baptism, we too are granted a share at Messiah's Table. Besides Baptists have something distinctive to say to the Christian Church concerning *both* ordinances.

Mr. Cook is at his best in the fourth section: "The Principle of Liberty." He writes eloquently and with persuasiveness. He shows also a far greater readiness to accept the Anabaptists as our forerunners than is usually the case. Such a discussion as Mr. Cook's, of course, leaves the way open for the consideration of the application of the idea of liberty to conceptions like planned economies and Trade Unions.

There is also a fourth great omission in the book. There really should be a section devoted to the zeal of the Baptists in missionary enterprise and their great achievements in that field. Various paragraphs through the book are not adequate, and our missionary enterprise, like the covenant idea, is not even listed in the Index.

Despite the comments above, Mr. Cook has made an important contribution, and it is worthy of serious study and sincere commendation. Criticisms are justified precisely because the book is intended to be an exposition of our position, and as such a guide to non-Baptists concerning our faith and order. A third edition should take account of the above-mentioned serious omissions. The book is clearly and attractively written. Exegesis is sound and the exposition is practical and convincing. One cannot read the book without rejoicing in one's status as a Baptist and in our Baptist faith.

Lastly, reference must be made to the discussion concerning the Ministry, and Baptist ministers will be interested to see what Mr. Cook has to say about Dr. Dakin's definition of a Baptist Minister, as a person in pastoral charge of a Baptist church. Setting the Dakin and Cook views side by side and considering them in the light of the New Testament evidence, it is highly instructive to observe Dr. Dakin's emphasis upon what is really a priestly view of the Baptist ministry by reference to the local church, and to compare Mr. Cook's view on a prophetic view of the ministry as more widely embracing, as obtains in the New Testament. To leave Bristol College for a University Chair seemed to be something like leaving the Ministry, but experience shows that that is not so. The churches still call me to preach and to counsel, to conduct the ordinances, and thus they establish me in the ministry they claim from me.

G. HENTON DAVIES.

Reviews

The Unity of the Bible, by H. H. Rowley. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 15s.)

The C.K. Press has done us good service in publishing these Whitley lectures by Dr. Rowley. After a long period in which the main emphasis of Biblical studies was upon the diversity of the books of the Bible, we find the main stress today on the underlying unity, without which, as the author says, no satisfactory Biblical Theology is possible. Full justice is done to the diversity, but in it there is seen a process of development—no merely human discovery and development, but "the unity of the Divine revelation given in the context of history and through the medium of human personality." Dr. Rowley finds the uniqueness of the Divine revelation in the fact that it is mediated through a complex of personal and impersonal factors.

As he traces the lines of development, Dr. Rowley has many sound things to say—and many misconceptions to correct—on such matters as the relation of the prophets to the cultus and the significance of sacrifice in Hebrew religion.

Not the least valuable and timely part of the book is the treatment of the relation of Old and New Testaments as one of mutual necessity. The lines of development from the one to the other are clearly shown. Much of the Old Testament is taken for granted in the New—it is an indispensable background for it. But it is no mere continuity. Just as in the Old itself, part of the development consists in the superseding of certain elements in teaching and practice, so the most significant bond of unity between the two Testaments is, paradoxically, often in the fundamental differences.

In the New Testament we have the fulfilment of hopes which were never realised in the Old. In this connection the author says many valuable things, and his chapters on "The Fulfilment of Promise" and "The Cross" are most instructive. Of very practical value, too, is the connection of the Christian sacraments with the main theme of the book. Dr. Rowley shows how the Biblical principles which he has been affirming are illuminating for the understanding of both Baptism and Holy Communion.

Dr. Rowley has once again placed us deeply in his debt. The work is of the quality which we have come to expect from him, and it is richly documented with his usual erudition. Here is scholarship wedded to a warm faith.

W. S. DAVIES.

Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, by Ronald S. Wallace. (Oliver and Boyd, 18s.)

More Calvin! The day will come when we shall get a critical estimate of Calvin's theology from the modern point of view. But that day is not yet. We are still at the stage of exposition aiming at making clear what Calvin taught. This book is another of this kind. Its purpose is to say what Calvin taught on the great theme of Revelation involving a study of his doctrine of the Word and the sacraments, and incidentally his view of the Church—to quote the jacket, "a clarification of the doctrines which lie behind the traditional Reformed Church practice." The writer limits himself to the one theme. In doing so he gains the advantage of being able to write a comparatively short book and to achieve a clarity of exposition which is valuable. On the other hand he has to leave out such themes as justification by faith, election and predestination, though of course he is aware that these ideas lie behind the doctrine of the Word and Sacraments.

The author quotes Calvin's actual words to a great extent—frequently giving the Latin or French in footnotes which conveniently are placed at the bottom of the pages. The quotations are mostly from Calvin's Commentaries. This makes the book the more valuable. The author must have spent much time in reading the numerous and voluminous commentaries, and the selection of quotations from them is admirable. So far as I can judge, the commentaries do not at any point modify the teaching of the final edition of the Institutes, but it is good to have that teaching confirmed and further illustrated by passages from the Commentaries.

The theme of course is vital—not only for an understanding of the Reformed theology but also for an appreciation of much of the theology of today. Barth and Brunner have made "the Word of God" one of the categories of modern theological thinking, and both go back to Calvin. On Calvin's idea of the Word rests his views of preaching, of the status of the ministry, of the two sacraments, and of the Church. All these are vital issues in the thought of today, and Calvin has something really important to say on every one of these subjects. Calvin raises the right issues and on each has something to say which can become the starting point for modern thinking. Is that why there is so much interest in him?

Incidentally we Baptists need very much to clarify our minds on these very issues as indeed the discussions on inter-communion have shown. At one period in our history a large section of our denomination was greatly influenced by Calvin's teaching. But how far did this go? Was it solely his doctrine of election and

predestination that our fathers imbibed? Did they ever accept his view of the necessity of an ordained ministry? They certainly never accepted his teaching about the "flesh of Christ" in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, nor his views on infant baptism. There is clearly room for research by some Baptist scholar on this line.

Meanwhile it would be very good if our ministers were to take this book and work steadily through it, bringing a critical mind to bear on Calvin's teaching at every point. A man might well spend a year on it. At the end of the year he would find himself greatly enriched theologically. I regard the book as of great importance. It is a very scholarly piece of work—well done and well produced. No student of Calvin will ignore it.

A. DAKIN.

Companion to Congregational Praise, edited by K. L. Parry, with notes on the music by Erik Routley. (Independent Press, 30s.)

The publication of *Congregational Praise* (noticed in our April, 1952 issue) was an event of some importance for others beside Congregationalists. Now—largely the work of those two notable hymnologists, Rev. K. L. Parry and Dr. Erik Routley—comes this handsome volume which makes the recent Baptist counterpart look, in appearance at any rate, like a poor relation. For every hymn and tune in *Congregational Praise,* historical and explanatory notes are supplied, while biographical notes are provided on every author and composer; a treasury of interesting, scholarly information. In addition there are special articles on the names of hymn-tunes, Bach chorales, Welsh hymn-tunes, metrical psalms and kindred themes. Miss Elsie Spriggs contributes a useful three pages on children's hymns in which she rightly protests against making children sing so many nature hymns and thus having God presented to them "as a celestial zoo man." This is not all, for there is a brief but comprehensive account by Rev. A. G. Matthews of the history of hymnody, with a chapter by the late Dr. A. J. Grieve (to whose memory we Baptists who knew him would wish to pay grateful tribute) outlining the development of hymnody among the Congregationalists. Various lists and indeces add to the value of the book. If it be true that to praise God well is more important than to do anything else, the editors are to be congratulated upon producing a work which is in every respect so excellent and which, if rightly and widely used, will richly contribute to the worthy praise of the Most High God.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

A Baptist Bibliography, Section BIN-BZ, edited by Edward C. Starr. (American Baptist Historical Society, 1953).

The third section is now to hand of the monumental Baptist bibliography to which attention was called in our issues of April, 1948 and April, 1953. Three hundred and forty-five duplicated pages make up this section. Among entries of special interest to British Baptists are the lists of the publications of Isaiah Birt, W. H. Black, Carey Bonner, Abraham Booth, F. W. Boreham, John Brine, Charles Brown and John Bunyan. An introductory note to the last of these reads: "We consider Bunyan 'an irregular Baptist.' Most important biographies of him are listed. Only those of his writings are listed which have a Baptist editor or a Baptist publisher." The entries number 117. For Charles Morton Birrell read Charles *Mitchell* Birrell. The care with which this work is being prepared is illustrated by the inclusion in this section of recent works by our friends, Mr. Walter Bottoms and Mr. Percy Bushill. All our Baptist libraries should secure a copy of this important publication.

Proceedings of the Seventh International Congregational Council, edited by Ralph F. G. Calder. (Independent Press Ltd., 15s.)

Though paper covered, this is an excellently printed and produced record of the meetings of the International Congregational Council held in St. Andrews, Scotland, in June, 1953, and contains much of interest and value to others besides Congregationalists. Some of the addresses are inevitably of an ephemeral kind, but there are also weighty pronouncements by scholars like Dr. Lovell Cocks, contrasting views of the standing of councils and synods within the Independent tradition by able protagonists like Dr. Douglas Horton and Dr. Russell Stafford, and informative discussions of the present ecclesiastical situation. The message to the Churches shows modern Congregationalism as eager for church unity but determined not to relinquish the customary open invitation to the Lord's Supper and the ordination of women to the ministry. The International Congregational Council is differently organised from the Baptist World Alliance, the constituency being very much smaller. The Council consists of 235 members, 75 members from the constituent churches of the United States, 75 from the British Isles and 75 from other constituent churches, with an Executive Committee consisting of the Officers and 18 members. The meeting in St. Andrews was attended by a number of associate delegates and accredited visitors.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Supreme Authority, by Norval Geldenhuys. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 10s. 6d.)

This book, as the sub-title tells, is a study of the authority of the Lord, His disciples and the New Testament. There is much careful and conscientious work in the gathering of relevant passages in the New Testament. The ultimate conclusion, in the writer's own words, is that "in accepting the authority of the New Testament we are bowing before His (our Lord's) authority and not to a book as such." With that conclusion it is difficult to disagree, but one feels that Mr. Geldenhuys has gone a long way round to this conclusion. The authority of Christ is something more, something richer and deeper, than can be asserted by the accumulation of many texts. As to the authority of the apostles, the author seeks to show that an absolute authority was transmitted by our Lord to the original apostles—and later to Paul—which covered the establishment of the Church and was the guarantee of the canon of the New Testament. And this authority the apostles did not hesitate to claim for themselves. Mr. Geldenhuys has surely exaggerated the situation. Honoured as the apostles were for their nearness to the Lord and as the missionaries of the Gospel, one feels that the author goes beyond the evidence of *Acts* and the Epistles and anticipates later estimates of the official position of the apostolate.

Young People's Hebrew History, by Louis Wallis. (Philosophical Library, New York, $2.50.)

The Approach to the Old Testament, by G. Henton Davies. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 1s. 6d.)

Both these little volumes approach the problem of the Old Testament from the "critical" side, but their results are considerably different.

Mr. Willis seeks to free the Old Testament from what he calls the "academic ban." This he does with a thoroughgoing evolutionary view of the growth of Hebrew religion. While he has sound things to say about development in belief and about the influence of economic conditions upon the life of Israel, he seems to see only a "development from within," and it is not easy to see wherein is the uniqueness which he claims for it. The period of the settlement in Canaan, which constitutes the main part of the book, is a sort of matrix for the great prophets from whom stems the plant of Hebrew monotheism. But how odd to read even so short an account of Israel without even a reference to Moses!

The other work is the inaugural lecture from the new Chair of

Old Testament Studies in Durham. Professor Henton Davies emphasises the necessity to see the Old Testament in its international context. To begin, however, from the circumference, as do some schools of Old Testament study, is to be in danger of missing one's way and losing the significant features of the Old Testament. The alternative method of beginning at the centre and working outwards is excellently illustrated by the story of the Settlement in Canaan, a transition from one mode of life to another. This process has many parallels, but the Old Testament is distinctive in offering an interpretation of the transition in terms of faith. Mr. Davies faces the same factors as Mr. Wallis, the development and the influence of economic conditions, but in contrast he can use such words as these: "Moses returns to his rightful place as the Founder of Israel and the prophets find theirs not as pioneers but as reformers within the Mosaic achievement." From Mr. Wallis one gets no sense of a real revelation. Mr. Davies's lecture draws the two Testaments together with an emphasis on the Covenant conception which gives us a vastly different view.

W. S. DAVIES.

The Old Testament and Present-Day Preaching, by Sydney Myers. (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.)

With the intention of helping more particularly non-collegiate ministers and lay preachers the author, who acknowledges his indebtedness to Wheeler Robinson and whose conviction is that preaching today should be "solidly Biblical, determinedly doctrinal," here reproduces in revised form three lectures he has given to ministers and students. His purpose is to draw attention to the gems of truth which preachers may mine from the Old Testament, and to the great themes there dealt with which ought to be preached upon more than they are. All who preach will find in this useful, well-written little book wise and stimulating guidance and many helpful sermon-suggestions. Its circulation should help to effect a much-needed improvement in present-day preaching.

The Pitt Minion Reference Bible. (Cambridge University Press, 60s.)

For those who prefer, in their Bibles, an appearance worthy of the contents, here is an edition which is in every way attractive. The text is the Authorised Version and the full list of twenty-nine styles, including editions with Concordance, coloured illustrations

and various supplementary material, ranges in price from 13s. 6d. to 67s. 6d. This particular volume has morocco binding, with overlapping covers and leather lining, India paper and a clear, dignified type which is a modified version of Times New Roman. In addition, there is the new "Bold Figure Reference" system which, by giving the reference material by means of black numbers in the central reference column, does away with the conventional, distracting letters and figures in the text and so makes for easier reading with a no less efficient reference system. There are also maps and a long and useful list of words with their pronunciation. Seeing this Bible, no-one will dispute the publishers' claim that it is "clear to read, beautiful to look at and convenient to handle." A splendid example of British craftsmanship, it would make an ideal gift.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

The Climax of the Ages, by F. A. Tatford. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 15s.)

Dr. Tatford has written a popular though careful commentary on the prophecies of Daniel. The introduction is brief and the author rightly accepts the unity of the book, even though many Old Testament scholars would disagree. He believes that Daniel was a contemporary of Jeremiah and Ezekiel and not of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that the prophecies in Daniel relate to the days of Antiochus and also to the period following the second advent when the church has been removed from the earth. It is only fair to the author to say that he does not obtrude this unfortunate theory until late in the book, chapters 11 and 14f. Otherwise the exegesis is in the main helpful, for Dr. Tatford shows good knowledge of the works of previous commentators, not all of one school, and enlivens his exposition by quotations and illustrations. The book also contains an appendix on "The Chronology of Daniel 1 : 1," by Mr. F. F. Bruce, of Sheffield University.

G. HENTON DAVIES.

Helping the Lay Preacher, by John Wilding. (Independent Press, 6s.)

This is a practical and wise, comprehensive and helpful little book which we heartily recommend to lay preachers and theological students; and not a few ministers would get many helpful hints from a reading of it. It is very good value for money, and achieves the aim of the writer in getting down to the level of the beginner and dealing with elementary and fundamental matters. Mr. Wilding generously passes on many varied suggestions for

sermons and children's addresses. We were surprised that he made no reference to the Revised Standard Version, much to be preferred to the Revised Version which he advocates.

The Way Ahead, by Wilfred Winterton. (Rush & Warwick, 1s. 6d.)

There are some important facts in this book which we wish were more widely known—if they were there would be more temperance advocates, and more active opponents to the brewers. Mr. Winterton rather spoils his writing by a tendency too much to blame those who do not think entirely like himself. He does not appear to appreciate that the decreased interest in the temperance movement may have other causes than personal intemperance or social apathy. We hope this book will be widely read.

God's Workmanship, by Oswald Chambers. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 7s. 6d.)

This book consists of over fifty short devotional studies or sermonettes. There seems to be no particular order in the arrangement of them. The language and thought is sometimes a little obscure, but there are many deep insights into Christian truth in this book, and much to stimulate both the mind and heart of the thoughtful Christian. L. J. MOON.

A Layman in the Ministry and *More Sermons of a Layman*, by Bernard Lord Manning. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d. each.)

Many will be grateful for the re-issue of these sermons and addresses, not least those of the generation which was too young to know Manning personally and to whom he is already something of a legendary figure. In these volumes we meet, primarily, Manning the expository preacher rather than the redoubtable Free Churchman of *Essays in Orthodox Dissent* or the scholar of *The Protestant Dissenting Deputies*. Yet the whole of the man went into his preaching—the prophetic note, mental power, humour, directness of utterance, the confidence of deep Christian conviction. It is no idle hope expressed in the preface to *A Layman in the Ministry* that many will be strengthened by that faith in Jesus and the Resurrection which was Manning's life. Apart from the sermons it contains, *A Layman in the Ministry* ought to be very widely read for the address entitled "Effectual Preaching" and for "A Charge to the Church at its Minister's Ordination." And one may leave the matter there, for those who get that volume will certainly want the second. G. W. RUSLING.