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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

incorporating the Transactions of the
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

SUCCESS came to the Baptist World Congress of 1955 in more ways than one. Closing of the accounts revealed a handsome balance of receipts over expenditure. These profits are at the disposal of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, which would have had to bear the loss had the Congress not paid its way. We have pleasure in announcing that at its November meeting the Baptist Union Council approved a grant from the Congress surplus to the Baptist Historical Society of £250. Echoing the gratitude which was expressed on the Society's behalf at the time by Mr. Seymour J. Price, we here record our deep appreciation of the Council's action and sincere thanks for a generous gift which will considerably ease the strain on the finances of the Society.

* * * *

For nearly a century it has been popularly believed that the hymn *Rock of Ages* was written in Burrington Coombe while its author, Rev. A. M. Toplady, was sheltering from a thunderstorm in a cleft of the rock there. More recently a story has been added to the effect that the hymn was written on the back of a playing-card, now preserved in America. A life-long student of hymnology, Mr. E. J. Fasham, a Baptist formerly of Birmingham and now of Budleigh Salterton, wrote an article in the *Baptist Quarterly* of April, 1940 (p. 94) proving this fanciful account to be without foundation. Further researches on his part have confirmed him in his opinion. At Burrington Coombe itself Mr. Fasham has found it would be impossible for anyone to shelter in the cleft and that, in

any case, it did not exist in Toplady's time. In the U.S.A. he has ascertained that the existence of the playing-card is quite unknown and the American Hymn Society has told him : " The whole story is apocryphal, if not fantastic." As Mr. Fasham showed in 1940 and in a further article recently contributed to the *Bulletin* of the Hymn Society in this country, the origin of the famous hymn is almost certainly in some words written by Daniel Brevint (Dean of Durham, 1661-1673) which inspired Toplady to compose *Rock of Ages* in the summer of 1775. Mr. Fasham has also established that the hymn was first published in the *Gospel Magazine,* October, 1775.

By his activities in another direction Mr. Fasham has also proved most of the books wrong in connection with the death and burial-place of Matthew Bridges, writer of the hymn *Crown Him with Many Crowns.* Hitherto all the evidence had pointed to Bridges having died and been interred in Quebec. But the discovery of an obituary in *The Times* of 6th October, 1894, sent Mr. Fasham to Sidmouth where, after persistent and extensive inquiries, he eventually traced the grave of the hymn-writer to the garden burial-ground in the Convent of the Assumption. The inscription on the grave-stone reads *Orate pro anima Matthaei Bridges qui annos natus xciv plenus dierum in Christo obdormivit. Die vi Octobris MDCCCXCIV. R.I.P.* Evidently Mr. and Mrs. Bridges were paying guests during the eighteen-nineties in a villa which is now part of the Convent buildings. There, in 1894, Bridges died, and was laid to rest in the Convent's own private cemetery where the graves are mostly those of the Sisters of Mercy. How and where Bridges spent the closing years of his life have been until now a mystery. Thanks to the interest and activity of Mr. Fasham the mystery has at last been solved. We congratulate him on his work in the field of hymnology and hope to hear of other discoveries to which his indefatigable efforts have led him.

* * * *

A new quarterly, the *Journal of Semitic Studies,* published by the Manchester University Press with the support of the Isaac Wolfson Foundation, makes its appearance this month. Of special interest to Baptists is the fact that one of the two editors is Dr. H. H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester. The field of study with which the journal will be concerned is a broad one, and the editors hope to have in its pages articles of linguistic, literary, historical, archaeological and cultural interest. A number of outstanding scholars have promised articles for the early issues. The annual subscription is 32s. or $4.50.

* * * *

From the Second Baptist Church, Detroit, Mich., we recently received a copy of the 48-paged, illustrated special number of its quarterly magazine, *Second Baptist Advocate,* issued to mark the

119th anniversary of the church and the eighth of its pastor, Dr. A. A. Banks. Founded in 1836 by thirteen former slaves, the church —which is associated with the National Baptist Convention, Inc., one of the large Negro Baptist bodies in the U.S.A.—has grown to a membership of 4,800 and, during the last eight years has added an average of 340 new members per annum, while its income in 1954 totalled $92,928. Led by its able and enterprising Pastor and his gifted wife, the church continues to exercise a considerable influence on the life of the city of Detroit. We notice that among its numerous activities the church has a "Credit Union" which enables its members to take out insurances of various kinds and to obtain monetary advances on loan for the purpose of house-purchase, education, travel and new motor cars. Among other items which caught our eye was the phrase "Audited membership, 4,800" and "Courtesy Committee"; we know of churches which would benefit from a Courtesy Committee and whose membership and attendance statistics would show up very differently if they were audited. To this great, influential and thriving Negro Baptist community we send good wishes for a future as flourishing as the past has obviously been.

* * * *

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held, as usual, on the opening day of the Baptist Union Assembly, i.e. Monday, 30th April, 1956. An address will be given by the Rev. M. E. Aubrey, C.H., M.A., D.C.L., LL.D.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

H. D. NORTHFIELD, M.A.,
Warden, St. Andrew's College, Selly Oak, Birmingham.

ERNEST A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.,
Gen. Secretary, Baptist Union of Gt. Britain and Ireland.

J. R. C. PERKIN, B.A., D.Phil.,
Minister-elect, Altrincham.

RUTH SLADE,
Member, Baptist Historical Society.

WILLIAM SPEIRS, M.A., Ph.D.,
Minister, Broadway, Derby.

Reviews by M. E. AUBREY, C.H., LL.D., R. L. CHILD, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., G. W. HUGHES, B.A., B.D., J. I. JONES, M.A., B.D., W. M. S. WEST, D.Theol.

Abraham Booth and some of his Descendants

ABRAHAM BOOTH, minister for thirty-seven years of the Baptist church in Little Prescott Street, Goodman's Fields, died on 27th January, 1806. He was, as pastor, writer and counsellor, one of the outstanding Baptists of his day. When Booth passed away, the Minute Book of the church he had served so long and faithfully, referred to him as "the truly venerable and revered Mr. Abraham Booth." There is plenty of contemporary evidence that that was how he was generally regarded. "Such a degree of majesty attended him, plain as he was in exterior, that if he sat down with you but a few minutes, you could not help feeling that you had a prince or a great man in the house." This was the tribute of William Newman, afterwards first President of Stepney College.

Born at Blackwell in Derbyshire in 1734, and brought up at Annesley Woodhouse in Nottinghamshire, Booth became in his teens a stocking-weaver and had a wife and family before he knew anything of the theory of English grammar. He owed his conversion to the Barton preachers and, soon after, began to preach among the General Baptists. When about thirty years of age, however, he was mastered by the Calvinist doctrines of God's sovereignty and electing grace and transferred his loyalty to the Particular Baptists. His book, *The Reign of Grace,* published in 1768, was a remarkable *tour de force.* Its contents were given first as sermons at Sutton Ashfield, then in Nottingham and Chesterfield, where he regularly conducted services. He was encouraged to venture into print by Henry Venn, the evangelical vicar of Huddersfield. The book quickly gained him fame and was largely responsible for his call to London. Once there, Booth gave himself to intense study, making himself one of the most learned Baptists of his day.

Details about Booth, his personality and his work, may be found most conveniently in E. F. Kevan's valuable history of *London's Oldest Baptist Church* (Kingsgate Press, 1933). The *Baptist Quarterly* published, in January, 1931, an interesting letter written by Booth to his brother, Robert, in 1800, and in October, 1938, reprinted the introductory discourse given by W. N. Clark at Booth's ordination at Goodman's Fields in 1769. There are several

Booth letters in the Isaac Mann Collection, now in the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth, including an important and characteristic one written to Andrew Fuller in 1795. These two strong, self-taught men did not always find it easy to agree. Booth gave outstanding service to the Particular Baptist Fund, to the London Baptist Education Society (out of which came Stepney College), to the cause of Sunday Schools, to the Baptist Missionary Society, and to the early campaign against the slave-trade. As a Baptist apologist and a champion of strict communion, he exercised widespread influence for a generation or more, though one can understand how young William (later General) Booth, considering entry to the Congregational ministry in the middle of the nineteenth century and given the *Reign of Grace* to study, flung it across the room after reading thirty or forty pages.

The terjubilee of Abraham Booth's death may serve as the occasion for the printing of his Will and for a few notes on his family. Booth's wife, née Elizabeth Bowmar, died two or three years before her husband. They had seven children: Abraham, Alice, Isaac, Robert, Ann, Sarah and Rebecca. All of them were remembered in his Will, made eleven months before his death and now in the keeping of Regent's Park College. The text of the Will is as follows:

> I ABRAHAM BOOTH protestant dissenting minister in the parish St. Mary Whitechapel London reflecting on the uncertainty of Life do make this my last will and testament in manner and form following Being firmly persuaded that those doctrines which have constituted the grand subject of my public Ministry for a long course of years are divine Truths being deeply sensible that all I have and all I am are the Lords and entirely at his disposal and being completely satisfied that his dominion is perfectly wise and righteous I in the anticipation of my departing moment cheerfully commend my immortal Spirit into his hands in expectation of everlasting Life as the Gift of Sovereign Grace thro' the mediation of Jesus Christ and my Body I resign to the care of providence in the silent Grave with a pleasing hope of its being raised again at the last day in a state of perpetual vigour beauty and Glory. In regard to the measure of temporal property with which the bounty of providence has indulged me my will is that as soon as convenient after my decease all my debts and funeral Expenses be punctually discharged I order that my four Stocking frames my own publications then on sale together with the Copyright if not already alienated and my Library be all sold as to distribution of my property I order it to be as follows that is to say to my son Abraham Booth and to my daughter Alice Stevenson I give twenty pounds apiece for Mourning To my Son Isaac Booth I give one hundred pounds To my Son Robert Booth I give all my wearing apparel my plate my pocket Watch and three hundred pounds 5 p. cent Navy Annuities. I give to my daughter Ann Booth spinster one half of my household furniture of my Linen and of my China together with four hundred pounds 5 p. cent Navy Annuities I give to each of my daughters Sarah Grainger and Rebecca Robinson two hundred and fifty pounds sterling To my grandaughter Elizabeth Parkin I give one hundred and fifty pounds 5 p. cent Navy Annuities To my Grand-

daughter Mary Lee Wightman I give one hundred and fifty pounds of the same Annuities to bear Interest from the second quarter day after my decease but neither the principal nor the interest to be payable until she arrive at the age of twenty-four years complete I give to the deacons for the time being of the Church of Christ over which I have so long had the pastoral oversight and from which I have received numerous tokens of the most affectionate regard five pounds sterling to be distributed at their discretion among the poor Members of the said Church which trifling bequest I order to be paid by my Executors hereafter named within the space of three months of my decease I nominate and appoint my Sons Abraham and Isaac Booth the EXECUTORS of this my last Will and Testament to whom jointly considered I give eight hundred pounds 3 p. cent Stock of the year 1726 together with the remaining and unappropriated Moiety of my Household furniture of my Linen and of my China finally I order and appoint my Son Robert Booth and my daughter Ann Booth Spinster to be jointly and equally my Residuary Legatees.
Abrm Booth Signed sealed published and declared by the Testator as his last Will and Testament Feb 27 1805 in the presence of
Eady Booth Jacob Booth

Booth's generosity is mentioned by several of his friends. It is apparent that he had prospered during his long ministry, as did many of his congregation, to judge by their munificent gifts to Baptist causes. His books must have brought him a considerable income for they had a large circulation during his lifetime. He had apparently kept his stocking-frames, renting them to his brother, Robert, who remained in Kirkby Woodhouse, for some of Booth's letters acknowledge the receipt of small annual payments. The Will shows that Booth had acquired £1,000 in 5% Navy Annuities, £800 in 3% Stock (1726) and that he expected his estate to yield at least another £700 apart from his furniture and plate.

Of Booth's eldest son, named after him, the writer knows nothing, though he appears in some of the early list of subscribers to the B.M.S. and was in business at one time in Newgate Street The eldest daughter, Alice, was " adopted " by the wealthy daughter of Mr. Leader Cox, at one time a deacon at Little Prescott Street. In due course she married a Mr. Stevenson and had several children, one of whom, Mary, married Dr. Edward Steane, secretary of the Baptist Union from 1835 to 1882.

Isaac Booth (1761-1840) was well known in his day in Baptist circles. Apprenticed in 1775 to an ironmonger, he later became a cashier in the Bank of England. He was in membership with the church in Mare Street, Hackney, in the formation of which his father had taken the lead in 1798. Isaac Booth married one of his cousins, Eady, who as a small child worked an elaborate sampler map, now in the writer's possession. Isaac and Eady Booth had eight children. One son, another Isaac, emigrated to Australia. Another, Jacob, left two sons, one of whom went to America, the other remaining in this country with issue. A daughter, Eady

(1805-48) married George Futvoye and emigrated to Canada. In the *Baptist Quarterly* for 1941 there was printed an interesting letter she sent to her mother from Quebec. Another of Isaac Booth's daughters, Elizabeth (1812-89), married Thomas Horatio Harris and had twelve children, one of whom, Booth Harris (1839-1912), of Woodford, left many descendants, one of his grandsons being the Rev. Stephen Booth Harris, now Congregational minister at Bury St. Edmunds. Yet another of Isaac's daughters, Rebekah (1819-68) married William Overbury Purchase, of Romsey, who was associated first with the Baptist church in Bell Street and then with the Abbey Congregational Church. They had three children, all of whom died without issue.

Abraham Booth's spinster daughter, Ann, died in 1847. She was buried in the grave-yard behind Mare Street Chapel. So also were her brother, Isaac, and his wife, and Isaac's daughters, Martha (1814-47), a spinster, and Sarah, wife of Henry Martin. The original Mare Street Chapel was burned down soon after the death of its famous minister, Francis Augustus Cox. The fine building which replaced it was destroyed by bombs during the last war. The site has now been acquired by the local authorities and a new church has been built recently on a fresh site a little distance away down Well Street. All evidences of these associations with the Booth family will now disappear.

The old burial-ground of the Maze Pond church, where Abraham Booth's body was interred, has also now disappeared. The tablet erected to his memory in Little Prescott Street was, however, taken to Commercial Street, when the church moved there in 1854 and thence, in 1914, to Church Hill, Walthamstow, where "London's oldest Baptist church" still worships. The tablet is to be found on the north wall of the chapel. After eulogizing Booth's virtues "as a man and as a Christian" and speaking of his work as a minister, the inscription concludes:

> "nor will his name, or his writings be forgotten, while Evangelical Truth shall be revered, genius admired or integrity respected."

Though this claims a little too much, Abraham Booth is certain always of a place in Baptist history.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

Congo Protestant Missions and European Powers before 1885

UNTIL the second half of the nineteenth century there was little interest, either secular or religious, in the penetration of the central belt of Africa. The coastal regions were occupied at many points by traders, missionaries, and governments, but it was only a few explorers who had tentatively pushed inland. The great factor which changed this state of affairs was the life and death of David Livingstone, whose eagerness to provide a way by which Christianity and commerce could advance together into the interior led him to undertake his incessant journeyings.

Once the opening-up of the continent had begun, however, there was no lack of interest in Europe. The death of Livingstone was the signal for a surge of enthusiasm from missionary supporters in England for the continuation of his work in Africa, which, together with the public agitation against the slave-trade, led in several parts of East Africa to the planting of British consuls and the supremacy of the British flag. The secular interest in Africa found its focus in the International Geographical Conference called to Brussels in September, 1876, by Leopold II. At this date the chief interest of the king was in the opening-up of East Africa, but here he was forestalled by British missionaries and British influence.

With Stanley's descent of the Congo, however, Leopold realised the importance of the West coast route into the heart of Africa, and gradually began to concentrate his attention on this field. It seemed that he might find scope for his energies in the Congo, for the British Government appeared to have no territorial ambitions there, having refused to take seriously Cameron's action in annexing the Congo basin in 1875,[1] and again displaying no interest when in 1878 Stanley tried to arouse English enthusiasm.

The fact that there were English missionaries in the Congo, however, was bound to attract the attention of Leopold, who could see how the presence of British missionaries in East Africa gave their country a considerable political interest in the region. The impetus to missionary zeal provided by the work of Livingstone had not been confined to East Africa, but, due chiefly to the foresight of one Englishman, eager for the evangelisation of the whole central belt of the continent, an attempt had already been made to enter from the west coast by way of the Congo river.

If the vision and imagination capable of realising the importance of the Congo as a highway into Central Africa, and of inspiring the provision of resources for the practical work of opening up the river, came on the secular side from the King of the Belgians, it was matched on the missionary side by that of Robert Arthington, the miser of Leeds,[2] a man deeply concerned for the evangelisation of the world, and above all of Central Africa. He knew, from correspondence with Lieutenant Grandy,[3] leader of the Royal Geographical Society's West coast Livingstone relief expedition, which had in 1873 tried unsuccessfully to pass the cataracts of the lower Congo, that the latter was convinced of the possibility of taking the Gospel to the upper river, and that the so-called King of Congo, residing at San Salvador, and to a certain extent under Portuguese and Catholic influence, was very ready to receive English missionaries. He knew also of Cameron's surmise that the Luabala was the Congo,[4] and firmly believing that had Cameron passed on down the river from Nyangwe, he would have reached the rapids beyond which Grandy had not penetrated, he approached the Baptist Missionary Society in May, 1877 with an offer of a thousand pounds if they would undertake mission work in the Congo (which was not far from their existing field in the Cameroons). It was the interior, not the coastal regions, that he hoped would be evangelised by way of the Congo river.[5] After consideration of this offer and a subsequent one of fifty pounds for a preliminary exploratory journey, the B.M.S. Committee decided to accept, and in September the *Missionary Herald* announced the new venture, appealing for men and money, the importance of the step taken being shown when on September 17th the *Daily Telegraph* gave the news of Stanley's arrival at the mouth of the Congo.

PIONEERS

In January, 1878 George Grenfell and Thomas Comber of the Cameroons Mission accepted the Committee's commission to undertake a pioneer survey of the lower Congo,[6] and immediately set sail on a journey which took them to the Congo mouth, and eighty-five miles up the river as far as Musuku. They established friendly relations with the chief agent of the Dutch house at Banana, and sent a letter to the king of Congo, informing him that they hoped to pay him an early visit.

The B.M.S. was not the only society interested in the Congo, for in 1877 Henry and Fanny Grattan Guinness called together a small committee to form the Livingstone Inland Mission, as a branch of the East London Institute for Home and Foreign Missions, its object being to enter Africa by the Congo. Hardly had Grenfell and Comber left when in February, 1878 Ström and Craven arrived at Boma as the advance guard of this mission, to be joined after a few

months by Telford and Johnson. In July Grenfell and Comber returned to Banana, sailed up to Musuku, and thence travelled overland to San Salvador, where they were received by the king. From this point they expected to be able to push on to the interior and reach the river above the rapids, and with this idea travelled northeastwards into the Makutu country, reaching Tungwa before being turned back.[7] Without waiting at San Salvador, although pressed by the king to stay, Comber hastened to England for reinforcements.

In July, 1879 he returned with a larger party—John Hartland, Henry Crudgington and Holman Bentley—their aim being to reach the upper river near Stanley Pool. Although cordially welcomed by the king, they decided to press on beyond San Salvador, but were constantly hindered by the suspicious natives of the Makutu country, middlemen who feared that white penetration would hinder their profitable ivory trade between the Pool and San Salvador. In one attempt in the late autumn of 1880 Comber was struck by a bullet and he and Hartland barely escaped with their lives.[8] But while Comber was still hopeful about the southern route, Bentley and Crudgington decided to make an attempt on the Pool along the north bank, since Stanley had opened up the road past the cataracts, to Isangila, and de Brazza, working nominally on behalf of the French Committee of the African International Association created by the Brussels Conference in 1876, was reported to have descended from the Pool by the north bank. In February, 1881 they reached their goal, after a journey of twenty-one days from Vivi. Thus the first object of the mission had been secured.

In their attempt on the Pool the missionaries had of necessity come into contact with the representatives of those European powers whose attention had been drawn to the Congo after Stanley's descent of the river. In January, 1878 King Leopold's emissaries met Stanley at Marseilles, and failed to draw him to Brussels,[10] since he wanted English interest in his scheme for the opening up of the Congo. This was what Leopold feared, for although his designs in the Congo were not yet clarified, he knew that he wanted to be the leader of whatever enterprise was undertaken in the region. Just as the early part of Stanley's journey led to an increase of British missions in East Africa, and where the missionary went the flag so often followed, he feared the same would happen in Congo. He was aware of the B.M.S. enterprise, for at the suggestion of Arthur Kinnaird, Liberal M.P. for Perth, philanthropist and supporter of foreign missions,[11] the secretary, Alfred Henry Baynes, had approached the Belgian minister in London, Baron Solvyns, to tell him of what the Society hoped to do in Congo. Leopold responded with immediate interest,[12] and expressed his desire of becoming a subscriber to the *Missionary Herald*. The October copy of this magazine was perused with considerable attention by Greindle and

Banning, and when the king's interest seemed to have slackened a little after a few months, they were still eager to see the following numbers.[9] Since the A.I.A., under the presidency of Leopold, had promised its help to all religious missions, irrespective of denomination, the B.M.S. was very ready to welcome the interest of the king, particularly as it already anticipated trouble from the claims of the Portuguese to sovereignty over the Congo river, on the ground that this would mean an extension of the slave-trade.[13]

Stanley's campaign to interest England in the Congo, which had been begun by suggestions in his letters to the *Daily Telegraph*, was continued by his propaganda throughout 1878, by articles, public meetings and lectures, especially in the north, where he hoped to arouse a sense of the commercial value of the Congo. The missionary societies seem to have been quite unmoved by the idea of Great Britain taking over the Congo, probably because they were among those who thought that " he put commerce before religion,"[14] and held themselves aloof from Stanley and his methods, not yet realising how much they were to profit by the results of his work.[15] Stanley's use of force was contrasted with the behaviour of Livingstone,[16] his ruthlessness strongly criticised, and while ready to welcome the benevolent interest of the King of the Belgians, missionary enterprise had no desire to support Stanley's campaign to arouse enthusiasm for his plan for Great Britain to take over the Congo and open a road to the Pool.[17]

In an area where politics were to play so important a part, however, the missionaries were to find an attitude of aloofness impossible to maintain, although they were always careful to avoid giving the impression that they were in Congo in the interests of the British Government.[18] Their first visit to San Salvador in the summer of 1878 showed that the king, Pedro V, was under Portuguese influence, for he had been placed on the throne by Portuguese force in 1858, and for seven years after this the Portuguese had occupied a fort near San Salvador.[19] For the Baptist Mission Portuguese influence was synonymous with Catholic influence,[20] although the French Holy Ghost Fathers, established at Ambriz, Mossamedes, and Loanda in 1865, had been obliged by Portuguese hostility to move northwards to settle at Landana in 1873. It was not to Protestant, so much as to foreign, influence that the Portuguese objected. The enthusiasm of Pedro V, however, for the English missionaries to settle with him, led to a decision to make San Salvador the base of the mission, although all the time the real goal was the upper river.

The second expedition thought it wise to study Portuguese on the way out, for since Portuguese was the trade language on the Congo, it would be the first means of communication with the Africans.[21] Pedro V was ready to welcome this expedition, but warned them

that if they wished to "live always" at his capital, they should get leave from the Portuguese Governor at Loanda, or the king might find himself in trouble.[22] Comber accordingly wrote to Loanda, thus giving indirect recognition to the claims of the Portuguese to the Congo region, an act to which the British consul objected.[23] He made unofficial representations, however, to the Governor, on behalf of the Baptist Mission, but the latter, while only too anxious to adopt a tone of protection towards the Congo region, gave religious reasons for affording no assistance to the mission.

It was not long before the Portuguese attempted to strengthen their position in the Congo by means of a missionary expedition to San Salvador. The Holy Ghost Fathers had made an attempt from Landana late in 1879, and the Portuguese authorities were anxious to occupy the field before French influence could strengthen. The British consul was clear about the political aims of the expedition,[24] and feared it might "compel the protestant mission to abandon its labours, hitherto so successfully and peacefully carried on." The three priests who arrived in Loanda in January, 1881 were accompanied by a military and a naval officer, while they brought presents and a letter from the king of Portugal to Pedro V. Grenfell indeed counselled withdrawal from San Salvador on the arrival of the Portuguese, competition being "waste of energy . . . with so much open ground . . ."[25] Such a welcome was received by the others, however, when they returned to San Salvador, that it was decided not to abandon the station, although Pedro V, feeling himself in a delicate position, for some weeks attended neither of the services held in San Salvador.[26]

The French, as well as the Portuguese, were showing interest in the Congo. The expedition of Count Savorgnan de Brazza, undertaken nominally on behalf of the French committee of the A.I.A., was in reality a rival to Stanley's in an attempt to be the first at the Pool. At first Stanley hardly recognised him as a serious rival,[27] but Comber had a shrewd idea of his aims,[28] although neither as yet knew of de Brazza's action in October, 1880 in annexing for France the right shore of Stanley Pool by treaties with Makoko, chief of the Bateke.[29]

It was news of de Brazza's descent of the north bank which confirmed the Baptist missionaries in their resolve to try this route to the Pool, since so many attempts through Makutu had failed.[30] Bentley and Crudgington, successful at last in reaching their goal (February, 1881) discovered what de Brazza had been doing, for on the south bank they met with a hostile reception from Africans brandishing spears and knives. This, they discovered, was the result of de Brazza's visit. One of the coloured soldiers whom he had left to guard the French flag explained that the people had been told that they were Frenchmen now, and if others (meaning Stanley)

came to take away their country these were to be driven away. He apologised for the mistake of the people in thinking that the missionaries were the forerunners of Stanley's expedition.[31] When news of these events reached Europe, it proved embarrassing for the French government to explain them,[32] while Leopold II could point to the good record of all his emissaries in Congo in their contacts with missionaries. Bentley and Crudgington were the first to bring to Stanley the unwelcome news of the planting of the French flag at the Pool, as they returned down the north bank, and as soon as they reached Musuku sent to inform the British consul.[33] When the news of the missionaries' discovery reached Brussels, it caused considerable attention to be paid to French ambitions in Congo,[34] and this check to Leopold's plans led him to define more closely his own territorial ambitions.[35]

For the B.M.S., French influence, like Portuguese, was connected with the Catholic question. As early as November, 1879 the superior of the Holy Ghost mission at Landana had written to Pedro V to warn him against his Protestant visitors.[36] De Brazza had secured the co-operation of the Holy Ghost Fathers for the furtherance of his patriotic ambitions,[37] and in the spring of 1881 Father Augouard was planning to plant a mission at the Pool,[38] an enterprise in which he and de Brazza hoped to be of mutual assistance. The Baptist mission was anxious that, having been successful in penetrating to the Pool, it should not be forestalled in planting a station.

In any case, they had consistently urged that the Congo should be placed under international control, and were no more anxious for the French to obtain exclusive control than for the Portuguese. When Crudgington returned home to confer with the committee in the summer of 1881, to discuss policy after the Pool had been reached, he urged the importance of calling the immediate attention of the Government to the action of the French in Congo, and this was done.[39] It was pointed out that the French had monopolised commerce, and that they would close the region to all others, which would "render useless the work of Stanley for the King of the Belgians and the International Association, for establishing open communication between east and west Africa," and stressing B.M.S. interest that the whole of the Congo river should be open *to all nations*. The F.O. reply was non-committal,[40] for it was not until later that it became seriously alarmed about the intentions of France.

For Leopold, the part played by religious missions in Africa was a factor impossible to ignore. The dispatches of Sir John Kirk, British consul at Zanzibar, sent by the F.O. for his perusal in 1879, 1880 and 1881, because of his known interest in Africa, were alone sufficient to demonstrate to him, had he needed such proof, the

importance of their attitude for the secular power. The A.I.A. stressed from the beginning its readiness to give assistance to all missions, without distinction of denomination, and Leopold was most anxious to uphold his reputation for philanthropic aims by adhering strictly to this programme. Although he might have preferred Catholic missions, he found that he was better able to use English Protestant missions in the Congo than French Catholic ones working in their national interests. Cardinal Lavigerie, whose interest lay in entering Africa from the east, distrusted the A.I.A. as a Protestant and free-thinking enterprise, and memorialised the Propaganda to this effect in January, 1878,[41] offering his Algerian Fathers for the evangelisation of Central Africa. These Leopold knew would be the spearhead of France, as well as of Catholicism, but by April, 1878 Lavigerie had agreed to assist in furthering the king's aims and recruiting Belgian missionaries for the Society of Algiers.[42] In Congo, however, Leopold was not so successful. Stanley, visited in 1879 by Père Carrie, assured him of the sympathy of the A.I.A., but soon discovered that he, like Père Augouard, also of the Holy Ghost Fathers, was in close co-operation with de Brazza,[43] and strongly desired to extend French influence in Congo.

Although very desirous of replacing the French Catholic missionaries in Congo by Belgians—a desire which led eventually to the foundation of the African Seminary at Louvain—Leopold was well aware of the value of a body of religious opinion in England favourable to himself, and provided the missionaries did not oppose the policy of Stanley (with whom they had themselves already found it politic to be on good terms) he was prepared to do his best for them,[44] and showed his interest by presenting a grant of scientific apparatus to the L.I.M. expedition which went out to Congo early in 1880 under McCall, just as he had given a chasuble to the Holy Ghost Fathers at Zanzibar, in an effort to win the favour of the French missionaries for the A.I.A. The L.I.M. were enthusiastic on the subject of the philanthropic society, which, with the king at its head, had commissioned Stanley to open up the Congo.[45]

The B.M.S. had felt some apprehension in case the Catholics might be given prior rights on the road Stanley was constructing to pass the cataracts,[46] but this was unfounded. When Crudgington and Bentley made their attempt on the Pool by the north bank, they kept to Stanley's road as far as Isangila, finding native paths where he took to the river, and were received with great cordiality by Stanley on their return, although Grenfell thought he was rather unwilling for them to make such early use of the route.[47] When Comber and Hartland, having again failed with the Makutu way, tried to overtake the others, however, they were well received by Stanley, whom they came upon dragging his sectional barges along the road, and were given food and advice.[48] Crudgington and

Bentley were impressed with the enthusiasm of Stanley for the work of the civilisation of the Congo region, when they met him on their return from the Pool, with his kindness in taking them down to Isangila in his steamer, and with the good reception they received from the Bateke people, which they attributed in large part to the treatment these had received from Stanley.[49] They found him willing to discuss with them the establishment of the mission at Stanley Pool, urging upon them their need of a small sectional steam sailing launch like his own.[50] It was no wonder that, faced with the prospect of Portuguese and French ambitions, they turned with relief to the promising Association, supposedly international in character, headed by the King of the Belgians, whose motives appeared above suspicion, and whose representative in Congo was so ready to be of assistance to their plans.

THE UPPER RIVER

Throughout this period, both the B.M.S. and the L.I.M. had been far more eager to find a way into the interior than to settle down to evangelistic work near the coast. For both the upper river was the real objective—the goal of what Stanley regarded as a "well-contested dual" between them,[51] and the planting of stations below the Pool was subsidiary work. When Crudgington returned home to confer with the B.M.S. Committee in the summer of 1881, the latter regarded it as "absolutely necessary" to move forward to the Pool. Thanks to the work of Stanley, this now seemed a practical possibility. They decided that his route by the north bank was to be used, intermediate stations at Isangila and Mbw were to be planted, and also a base station on the north-west shore of the Pool at Ibiu. Grenfell was to come to England to superintend the building of a steam launch for use on the upper river, and six new men were to be sent out. Already a Plymouth subscriber had provided the money for a steel sectional boat like that supplied to Stanley, and money came pouring in, for the successful journey to the Pool aroused great enthusiasm among the Society's supporters at home.

It seemed that at last they were ready to advance to the upper river. Their stores could go by Stanley's road to Isangila, and thence, in the *Plymouth,* be taken to Manyanga. Stanley was pushing on from Manyanga to the Pool, and might be expected to keep open that part of the road. It was obvious that they would need some kind of European secular authority over the lower Congo and the Stanley Pool district, or the missionaries could neither penetrate to the interior nor live in peace. There had already been difficulties from the Portuguese at San Salvador and the French at the Pool, and what could be more natural than that, in memorialising Lord Granville on the subject of de Brazza's claims, they should use as an

argument against them that they would "render useless the work of Stanley for the King of the Belgians and the International Association."[52] They had in fact already identified themselves with the work of this Association. Like Livingstone, they had discovered that the pioneer missionary must be geographer, explorer, and philanthropist, and counted themselves fortunate in having found a secular organisation which seemed as though it would take some of this burden from them, and hasten on "the spiritual stage of missionary work" which "has not yet been reached in Congoland."[53]

Throughout 1881 good relations in the field continued between the B.M.S. and the representatives of the King. The missionaries were anxious to establish themselves at the Pool, but travel was slow, and they were glad to receive help from Stanley's agent at Vivi in transporting some of their loads.[54] Another intermediate station was necessary, and by agreement with the local chiefs, a building site was secured at Manyanga, opposite Stanley's depot, where Lieut. Harou had been left in charge. For several months Bentley stayed here alone to build the station. When Crudgington returned from England with the *Plymouth*, the value of Stanley's road was proved, for dragging the sections over it was "a comparatively simple matter."[55]

The L.I.M. proved themselves desirous of being more independent, however. In January, 1882 they paid a flying visit to the Pool, and as a result of comparing the routes by the north and south banks, decided to use the latter.[56] In pointing out that the B.M.S. was willing to use Stanley's road and the protection of his Zanzibaris, Mrs. Guinness explained that the L.I.M. preferred the south route because the mission had no desire to be mixed with armed parties, even though its progress might thus be slower.[57] Stanley had inevitably in the pursuance of his task come up against African resistance, and the old suspicion of him had reappeared. They felt the need of a recognised government, to combat the evils of slavery, and objected to Stanley's work since it was felt to be in the interests of a *commercial* company.[58] The L.I.M. now seemed inclined to support de Brazza, who had promised the Society all the help in his power at the Pool, on the condition that French jurisdiction should be recognised. In actual fact, reliance on French power at the Pool was futile, as Père Augouard found later.[59]

The B.M.S., however, disliking de Brazza's claims on behalf of France, was anxious that they should not be overlooked, and in March, 1882 the acting-secretary sent Lord Granville a copy of the treaty with Makoko, procured by Grenfell, with the remark that this supported the representations made in the preceding June.[60] Thus stirred to interest, the F.O. asked Lord Lyons, Minister at Paris, to find out whether the treaty were genuine, and if so, whether it were

recognised by the French government. A tardy reply came in October to inform the Foreign Secretary that the treaty was indeed genuine, and that the French government intended to examine its clauses with care.[61]

Comber, who had spent several hours with Stanley at Manyanga before the latter's return to Europe, was impressed by his desire to help the mission, and with the fact that he had managed to plant a station at Stanley Pool without a fight, although the people were not yet reconciled to the advent of Europeans, and would burn it if they dared. Stanley had taken a large piece of ground for the A.I.A., but offered the mission the choice of a plot from this land, on which they were to be as free to build as though it had been sold to them, in return for a recognition of the rights of the Association. He wrote in this sense to Braconnier, the lieutenant he had left in charge at Stanley Pool, and Comber knew that if the B.M.S.—whose station at Manyanga would already have been burned had not Lieut. Harou intervened[62]—rejected this offer, the missionaries would be in constant danger. It was a serious matter, however, to identify themselves thus far with the A.I.A.[63]

The risk was taken, for Comber felt that the mission could not lose this chance of securing land at the Pool, thus perhaps allowing the Catholics to precede it there.[64] He and Bentley travelled up to the Pool with a caravan of Stanley's Zanzibaris, finding the people friendly except at one point, for the Zanzibaris, constantly passing by this route, quieted those who were turbulent. The two missionaries were well received by Lieut. Braconnier, to whom they presented Stanley's letter, and on 18 July made a contract with him for the lease of one hectare of ground, to be ratified in Europe.[65]

This contract—the first of its kind—for previously the B.M.S. had made agreements only with native chiefs—naturally attracted careful attention in Brussels and in London, where both Leopold and the B.M.S. Committee preferred to decide themselves the important question of the terms on which the land was to be conceded.[66] The finance sub-committee had many objections to the terms of Comber's contract with the Comité d'Etudes, and dealt with them in a meeting early in November. The annual rent of £150 was accepted, but they wanted the option of the renewal of the contract at the end of the three-year period to rest with the Society alone, for they feared "priestly influences from Belgium" which "might insure our receiving notices to quit." There was a strong objection to article VI,[67] for it was felt wrong to give the Comité d'Etudes exclusive favour, and that missionaries should hold themselves free to give help to all "respectable parties."[68] They objected, too, to the limitation of their freedom of movement by article VIII,[69] for we "must know nothing of rivalry with, nor must we cultivate association with, any secular bodies whatever."

It was therefore resolved to send the Secretary to Brussels to seek the good offices of Stanley in the hope of his influence in the modification of the draft contract. Stanley had left for Spain, but Baynes visited Brussels to meet Strauch, while since Leopold himself had expressed a desire to meet him,[70] he had also an interview with the king, who consented to accept the contract in the form proposed by the B.M.S. secretary. The formal ratification took place on November 24 when Strauch visited London, and the *Missionary Herald* of December, 1882 commented on the graciousness of the King, and the kindness received from all the state officials whom Baynes had met.

Leopold II was glad of the goodwill of the Society, for he was anxious to build up a body of opinion in England favourable to his plans for Congo. The Belgian consul in Manchester, J. F. Hutton, an influential business man, was working hard for this end, and found ready support in the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, which for trade reasons was not anxious to see either France or Portugal strengthened in the Congo region, since both imposed high tariffs. Leopold had good reason to fear that Portuguese claims to the sovereignty of the Congo basin might be recognised by Great Britain. Several years before, Sir Robert Morier, British minister at Lisbon, had suggested that Great Britain should recognise Portuguese claims to the south bank of the Congo, the north bank becoming British, and the river itself being subject to international control. The British government had shown little interest in the suggestion, but discussions on the subject continued intermittently between Great Britain and Portugal. At the end of 1882 Portugal again revived her ancient claims, and suggested that these should be recognised by Great Britain, who seemed likely to agree, urged on by fear of French intentions in west Africa.[71] Difficulties with the Portuguese at San Salvador had already been sufficient to make the missionaries hostile to the negotations which were set on foot, but while the B.M.S. was no more anxious to support France than Portugal, thinking of the difficult position of the American Protestant missionaries in the Gaboon under the French authorities there, the L.I.M. was not of the same opinion.

In November Hutton approached both societies, to inform them that the Manchester Chamber of Commerce had memorialised the F.O. against the de Brazza treaty and the pretentions of Portugal, and had urged the government to take the initiative in trying to get the powers of Europe to leave the territories of the Congo basin neutral—or, in other words, to support Leopold's "international" association. Sir Charles Dilke's reply had been that the Government would be favourable to neutrality, but would take no initiative—England did not want the Congo herself and would not go to war to prevent others getting it, and because of the attitude of France,

England was encouraging Portugal to put forward her claims. Hutton expressed his belief that France and Portugal would come to an understanding that all the territory north of lat. 5°12 should go to France, and that to the south to Portugal. Thus Portugal would hold the lower river; France the upper river and Stanley Pool, and he pointed out how prejudicial to Protestant missionary work this situation would be, remarking that "no doubt your society would take immediate action."[72]

Mrs. Guinness approached the B.M.S. on the matter, wondering whether the two societies should send a joint deputation to Dilke, or whether it would be preferable to leave the matter alone. Characterising the present state of affairs as "practically anarchy" she gave her opinion that "French annexation would be better than no government, *by far*. As H.M.G. do not mean to do anything themselves, it seems the best we can hope for."[73]

The B.M.S. had a closer connection with King Leopold's enterprise, however, and had no wish to work for French annexation. The *Peace,* the B.M.S. steam launch destined for the upper river, whose construction Grenfell had returned to England to supervise, had been inspected by Hutton's brother on behalf of the King of the Belgians, and Hutton, Leopold's consul, had sent some bales of cloth from his mill to help in the expense of carrying the steamer up river. Thus they would have nothing but approval for the way in which the *Times* supported Stanley against de Brazza, using as one of its arguments to encourage the goodwill of Englishmen towards Stanley and the Sovereign he represented in Congo, the fact that English missionaries were taking advantage of the facilities afforded by Stanley's pioneering work.[74] Joseph Tritton, treasurer of the Society, was eager to lay the case against France before the London Chamber of Commerce,[75] and likewise the B.M.S. was ready to use its influence to support Jacob Bright on the questions relating to British commercial interests in Congo, which he asked in the Commons on 27 and 28 November.[76] The agitation was successful, in spite of Baron Solvyn's scepticism.[77]

RUTH SLADE

(To be Concluded)

NOTES

[1] Cornet, R. J., *Katanga,* Bruxelles, 1946, pp. 16-17.
[2] Chirgwin, A. M., *Arthington's Million,* London, 1935.
[3] Cornet, R. J., *Maniema,* Bruxelles, 1952, p. 48.
[4] Cameron, V. L., *Across Africa,* London, 1876.
[5] The text of his letter appears in Bentley, W. H., *Pioneering on the Congo,* London, 1900, Vol. I, pp. 58-9.
[6] Fullerton, W. Y., *The Christ of the Congo River,* London, 1928, p. 27.
[7] Fullerton, *op. cit.,* p. 32.

[8] Johnston, Sir H. H., *George Grenfell and the Congo*, London, 1908, pp. 94-5.

[9] Greindle to Banning, 28 Dec. 1877 and 26 Jan. 1878, Banning papers, 36. Archives Générales du Royaume.

[10] Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[11] A. Kinnaird to Dr. Underhill, 10 Nov. 1877. B.M.S. Archives.

[12] "His Majesty wants to know all about Mr. Grenfell's mission. He thanks the society for the first instalment of the documents, which he has perused with the greatest interest." Solvyns to Baynes, 7 Dec. 1877. B.M.S.

[13] *Missionary Herald*, Dec. 1877. This followed the lead of *The Freeman*, the official organ of the Baptist denomination, which expressed anxiety over the Portuguese claims, fearing Catholic influence, and welcoming the decision of the British Government to send a gunboat to the river. 2 Nov. 1877.

[14] Dorothy Stanley, *Autobiography of H. M. Stanley*, London, 1909, p. 334.

[15] "We have not been among the blind admirers of Mr. Stanley's policy." *Freeman*, 26 April, 1878.

[16] *Freeman*, 2 Nov. 1877.

[17] "One thing the Continentals, especially the Germans, have determined on—that England shall not be allowed to annex the newly discovered region. And they are right. The Congo should not be annexed to any nation, but should be free to all." *Freeman*, 26 April, 1878.

[18] "The other white man, M. de Brazza, had given him (a chief living near Stanley Pool) a flag before leaving; he hoped that we should do the same. We could not be rash in the distribution of English flags, so we gave him a square of red cloth." Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 342.

[19] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 142.

[20] "The Portuguese officials . . . under the influence of the Catholic authorities of St. Paul de Loanda . . . will do their best to stop the expedition." *Freeman*, 2 Nov. 1877.

[21] *Bentley*, op. cit., I, p. 136.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[23] It is "certainly irregular, taking into consideration the geographical position of the Congo, trying to place himself under the protection of the Governor-General of Angola, and only addressing H.M. Consul incidentally." Hunt to Salisbury, 20 Aug. 1879. F.O. 63/1087.

[24] ". . . it will probably be the means of obtaining the consent of the king and people to a military occupation by the Portuguese." Cohen to Granville, 10 Dec. 1880. F.O. 84/1566.

[25] Grenfell to Baynes, 23 Jan. 1881. B.M.S.

[26] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 379.

[27] Stanley, H. M., *The Congo and the Founding of its Free State*, London, 1885, pp. 231-4.

[28] Comber to Baynes, 21 Feb. 1881. B.M.S.

[29] Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[30] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 298.

[31] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 355.

[32] "Sanford . . . a vu de Lesseps . . . il lui a parlé avec regret de l'affaire du renvoi du missionnaire anglais du Stanley Pool et du drapeau. M. de Lesseps paraissait assez monté, il a déclaré que les francais respectaient les stations, que l'on n'avait pas renvoyé le missionnaire . . ." Leopold to Strauch, 21 Aug. 1881. Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. Strauch papers.

[33] Crudgington to Cohen, 14 April, 1881. F.O. 84/1801.

[34] J. S. Lumley to Granville, 7 May, 1881. F.O. 84/1508.

[35] Thomson, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-9.

[36] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 160-1.

[37] Storme, M. B., "Leopold II, les missions du Congo et la fondation du seminaire africain de Louvain," in *Zaire*, Jan. 1952, p. 14.

[38] Grenfell to Baynes, 30 April, 1881. B.M.S.

[39] Baynes to Granville, 25 June, 1881. F.O. 84/1801.

[40] "Lord Granville has not sufficient information to allow him to pronounce definitely on Count de Brazza's proceedings." 11 Aug. 1881. F.O. 84/1801.

[41] Storme, *op. cit.*, p. 6; Oliver, R., *The Missionary Factor in East Africa*, London, 1952, p. 47.

[42] Storme, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

[44] "Les missionnaires qui vont au Congo sont venus me prier de chercher a établir de bons rapports entre Stanley et eux et .. . je me suis montré disposé à l'essayer dans le cas oú les missionnaires de leur côté voudraient à titre de réciprocité se montrer déférents pour ce que Stanley pourrait leur demander." Leopold to Strauch, 17 Aug. 1879.

[45] "What an unspeakable cause of gratitude! . . . without any expense or trouble to the missionary societies, this expedition, it may be hoped, will open the road up which the missionaries may follow with comparative ease." *Regions Beyond*, Nov. 1879.

[46] Baynes to the Committee, March, 1880. B.M.S.

[47] "Mr. Sparhawk (left in charge of Vivi station by Stanley) seemed vexed at the idea of the route being traversed before it was 'thrown open' —he seemed to echo the sentiments of his chief. I said our society's movements could not possibly interfere with the projects of the expedition: he said the first party to get up would secure the best ground for a station, very sharply." Grenfell to Baynes, 7 Feb. 1881. B.M.S.

[48] Comber to Baynes, 21 Feb. 1881. B.M.S.

[49] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 365.

[50] *B.M.S. Minutes*, 21 June, 1881.

[51] Stanley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 496.

[52] Baynes to Granville, 25 June, 1881. F.O. 84/1801.

[53] *Regions Beyond*, Feb. 1881.

[54] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 385.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 410.

[56] *Regions Beyond*, May, 1882.

[57] Mrs. H. G. Guinness, *Toiling On*, 1881-82. London, 1882, p. 202.

[58] The Comité d'etudes, du Haut-Congo, created in December, 1878, was indeed a company which aimed at the future commercial exploitation of Congo. Although dissolved at the end of 1879, to allow Leopold to take full control of the Congo enterprise, and to pursue his political ends, he continued to use the name until the end of 1882, when the term "Association Internationale du Congo" took its place. The missionaries continued to refer to the A.I.A., or use the names indiscriminately.

[59] Storme, M. B., *Evangelisatiepogingen in de Binnerlanden van Afrika gerunde de XIX^e eeuw.* Bruxelles, 1951, p. 573, n.1.

[60] E. B. Underhill to Granville, 23 March, 1882. F.O. 84/1802.

[61] Lord Lyons to Granville, 25 Oct. 1882. F.O. 84/1804.

[62] Bentley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 429.

[63] "Are we to be protected by the 'fort' and perhaps partly identified with the A.I.A.? Or are we to run the risk of settling among the people who, for some long time, will not understand us or our mission?" Comber to Baynes, 4 July, 1882. B.M.S.

The matter was soon decided. On 7 July he wrote: "Bentley and I go up tomorrow to Stanley Pool to secure our ground."

[64] Comber to Baynes, 24 July, 1882. B.M.S.

[65] A copy of this contract is found in the *B.M.S. Minutes*, 21 Nov. 1882.

[66] " Vous ferez bien d'écrire a celui de nos agents que la chose concerne peut-être et à Londres et à Hanssens, qu'à moins qu'un accord soit intervenu avec les missionnaires anglais, on tâchera d'y arriver ici et de fixer ici les conditions auxquelles nous pourrons leur laisser le terrain." P.S. I, 118 Leopold to Strauch, 16 Aug. 1882. Min. des Aff. Et. Strauch papers.

[67] " They engage not to give any intelligence, help, or assistance in their trading projects to other parties or expeditions, which would come into the country for trading purposes."

[68] In a notebook copy of this contract, Comber added that Braconnier had declared that this clause did not prevent the missionaries showing hospitality. Tervueren, 50, 47, 175.

[69] In consideration of the facilities granted . . . the missionaries engage not to get ahead of our party on the upper Congo. If in the future they follow our expedition up the river, they shall not be allowed without the consent of the gentlemen of the expedition to settle in any part of the river or interior, whether belonging to the Comité or not, the longitude of which shall be above our last established station."

[70] Leopold II to Strauch, 16 Nov. 1882. Strauch papers. Min. des Aff. Et.

[71] Crowe, S. E., *The Berlin West Africa Conference,* London, 1942, pp. 16-17.

[72] Hutton to Baynes, 18 Nov. 1882. B.M.S.

[73] Fanny Guinness to Baynes, 20 Nov. 1882. B.M.S.

[74] *Times,* 21 Oct. 1882.

[75] Tritton was interested in the Congo both as treasurer of the society, and from the point of view of a trader. In April, 1884 he led a deputation to the F.O. protesting against the ratification of the Portuguese treaty on account of the high tariffs imposed in Portuguese colonies. This double interest in the Congo helps to explain why so many missionary enthusiasts in England were so eager to support Leopold's two-sided philanthropy—he aimed at suppressing the slave-trade, but also at opening the Congo to the trade of all nations. v. J. Stengers, " La place de Leopold II dans l'histoire de la colonisation." *La Nouvelle Clio,* IX, Oct. 1950, p. 528. B.M.S. Tritton to Baynes, 27 Nov. 1882.

[76] Hutton to Baynes, 27 Nov. 1882. B.M.S.

[77] " On aurait tort de faire le moindre fond sur des sympathies et des influences qui se sont agitées ici, à Manchester et ailleurs, en vue de placer sous l'egide anglaise les interêts de l'enterprise. Les influences sont absolument inefficaces, et l'agitation qu'elles ont cherché a produire n'a eu d'autre resultat que celui d'agacer et d'irriter . . . il est inutile d'invoquer une protection qui ne nous sera pas accordée." Solvyns to Lambermont, 2 Dec. 1882. A.I.C., I, 71. Min. des. Aff. Et.

An Old Scotch Baptist Church

SOME time ago, a manuscript fell into the hands of the writer's father, then treasurer of Bristo Baptist Church, Queensferry Road, Edinburgh. Written in a fine hand, it is entitled, "Some Reminiscences of the Old Baptist Church, Pleasance," by James Williamson, and was found in the houses which he gives as his address about 1830. As his dates are about 1818—the 1890s, this find may be reckoned as providential.

Like many such works, this one is badly dated and, apart from one or two outstanding occasions, describes personal memories rather than the factual material of historians. When, however, in an appreciation of his spiritual elders, the author declares his certainty of their apostolic calling as being as unquestionable as his knowledge that "Queen Victoria succeeded William IV," we are taken into a strangely remote past.

As there is no new light thrown upon matters of fact in this booklet, we can turn to the standard histories of the Scotch Baptist church. There was a certain amount of Baptist influence in Scotland during the occupation by Cromwell. Essentially, however, it was an English influence, and therefore unpopular. It did not survive the withdrawal of the Protectorate troops in 1660. Yet all was not lost, for in the years of trouble that came with the Restoration, not only did Presbyterianism have to search its soul anew; there was at least one professor of Baptist principles in Lady Craigie Wallace, and some of the State records show concern not only with the Covenanting unrest, but also with the "sneaking sect of the Anabaptists."

By the time of James Williamson, "Scotch" Baptist churches were in existence. Note the description "Scotch"; the movement now felt itself to be native. The first church is always reckoned as that of Keiss, in Caithness, founded by the laird, Sir William Sinclair of Dunbeath, but that church did not have the influence that one might have expected. The real beginning of the Scotch Baptist church came from the famous question asked of Archibald M'Lean, the Glasgow printer, by Robert Carmichael, the ex-minister of an Anti-burgher section of the Secession church who became a "Glasite." Thus far had the heart-searchings of the church in Scotland gone. As has often been said, the church in Scotland, for all its many disruptions, has strangely remained Presbyterian. But it had gone a long way towards the conclusion that it must be free of state control, self-determining, and indeed, a body of believers. As in modern times, this question became associated with the question of Baptism. Carmichael asked M'Lean what he thought of Baptism, with the result that in 1765 they formed a church, meeting,

oddly enough, in the (still extant) Hammermen's Hall, Edinburgh, where John Craig and Knox had laboured for the cause of reform.

Archibald M'Lean was dead not so long before the young James Williamson began to be "walked" from Leith up the "Duke's Walk" to the church in the Pleasance which the Baptist community in Edinburgh had built in 1811, after finding other accommodation too small for their growing influence and numbers. M'Lean's name is not actually mentioned in the Reminiscences, but Mr. Braidwood, one of his colleagues, is remembered as "an old man with a brown wig . . . ascending the pulpit stair with a spenser above his coat," perhaps on the last occasion when he preached. Henry David Inglis, advocate, and grandson of Colonel Gardiner who fell at the Battle of Prestonpans, is also recalled, and he may be cited as representing the distinguished men who came into the Baptist church in the 1770s. There were many prosperous businessmen in membership, of whom James remarks that while they delighted in hymns that referred to this life as a barren and howling wilderness, they sometimes made pretty little Edens of their homes, what with their nice gardens and all. There were also some distinguished artists to come forth from this fellowship, like David Scott, John and Gourlay Steel, Robert Scott Lauder and James Eckford Lauder, but the roll of members suggests that there were also many of the artisan class in the fellowship. To this class James Williamson's parents probably belonged.

When it is remembered that the period which we have been describing was the heyday of Sir Walter Scott (who, incidentally, had no use for Dissent) it will be seen that James Williamson looks back to an early childhood coloured by national greatness to which the place of his Sunday pilgrimages had contributed not a little. It is therefore interesting to observe how this genius expressed itself, and the construction of the Pleasance church, which is reproduced in plan in the Reminiscences, is a striking illustration. This church was built to the Baptist idea of what a church should be, as indeed, its two successors, in Bristo Place and in Queensferry Road, have also been built. The first believers had been baptized in the Water of Leith, and the church contained not only an open baptistry—which the present church also boasts—but an open baptistry in an open-air court lying between the church and the "love feast" room. The love-feast room remained a tradition also in the subsequent buildings. Its origin lay in its necessity as a meeting place where families from far away could eat their mid-day meal between the forenoon and afternoon sessions. The present writer remembers stories of similar meals in the Bristo buildings, where the love feast consisted of good Scotch broth. Today, with the progress of transport and the changed tradition of "morning and evening" rather than "morning and afternoon" services, the love-feast lives on in

the familiar and pleasant habits of Bristonians to linger after service-time. In the new buildings, a special "Crush-hall" was provided for the purpose.

The actual layout of the church also expressed the Baptist idea of worship. It consisted of two parts, separated by an aisle that ran crossways from one side of the room to the other. Forwards of this aisle was the sanctuary, to which partakers of the Lord's Supper moved at the time of the "Ordinance" (a word much favoured by Scotch Baptists.) Others who remained to look on—including James and his father, who were not then members and therefore not invited to what was a "closed" table—were nevertheless invited to remain and watch. Few did; which is a fact not perhaps astonishing when we recall that the morning service had lasted from 10 a.m. till nearly one o'clock and the afternoon service from 2 p.m. till after 3 p.m., the only break being the time of the love-feast, or, in James' case, an occasional walk down the "Duke's Walk" to buy baps and a drink of milk. Sunday trading and Sunday public-houses were then the order of the day, as Mr. Williamson remarks.

The pulpit consisted of two tiers. The pulpit proper was the sort of rostrum familiar enough still, reached by a little stairway. Here sat the elders or pastors who conducted the service. Below them sat the precentors, and on ground level facing the congregation, the deacons. It seems to have been customary for three of each office to be present; but that could not always have been so, as the church roll appended to the Reminiscences mentions only two elders, William Braidwood and William Peddie. There were, however, the proper number of seven deacons and three precentors. The office of elder and pastor appears to have been, in practice, interchangeable, whether the incumbent were actually trained for the ministry, like Mr. Peddie, or engaged in another profession, like Mr. Inglis and many others. This slightly blurred distinction between elder and pastor is characteristic of Scotch Baptist practice, and has tendencies that remain still. The situation arose from the paucity of trained ministers in many of the districts to which the cause spread, so that the best qualified of the fellowship became the natural leaders without, however, being financially able to give up lay professions. But if the eldership and pastorate were blurred, that joint office stood out above others. For example, only elders and deacons were addressed as Mr. So-and-So. All others, and especially the precentors, were addressed as plain John and William, although the ordinary members might be called Brother So-and-So. More important, however, was the relationship of the elder or pastor to the conduct of the Communion service. In 1810 and again in 1834, the Baptist witness struck a rock of controversy on the question whether the Ordinance could be proceeded with in the absence of pastor or elder.

Another characteristic of the old church was the emphasis and practice of emblematic reference. The elements of the ordinance were, of course, called "emblems"; but there were many others, some deliberate, as for example, candlesticks, others again incidental. Mr. Williamson refers to his childish thought that the window cords, with their red intertwining strands, symbolised divine protection. The writer recalls a sermon in the old Bristo—the new Bristo to Mr. Williamson—which dwelt upon the emblematic significance of the open cross-beams of that building. This interpretation of divine signs derived from the literal interpretation of the Bible which was current to Scotch Baptist theology, which, as Mr. Williamson shrewdly remarks, could lead to many problems of practice. One matter, however, was clearly accepted. The Scriptures were read as they came, including such passages as those referring to the origins of Moab and Ammon and the details of levitical purification. The women of the congregation were stout defenders of this strange custom, declaring that Moses himself read all the Law in the ears of the women and the little ones. (*Joshua* viii. 35.)

The lengthy services were due to the number of "exhortations" which were given from, as it were, "the floor" of the house. These were in addition to the formal sermon "by one of the pastors," and were apparently extempore utterances. This lay contribution has passed from Scottish Baptist practice, although the deacons usually offer the prayers of thanksgiving at the Communion service. Mr. Williamson records that very seldom was there a pause in the exhortations; perhaps, on the contrary, some over-readiness, for there was a ruling formulated by Mr. M'Lean himself, that in the event of more than one brother offering exhortation, the presiding pastor should say which should exhort. Apparently, therefore, one of the pastors held a sort of presidency in the services, probably conducting it and himself contributing a prayer and a prepared address.

The teaching was almost exclusively doctrinal; and the divinity of Christ was so emphasised that His humanity seemed almost a disguise. A favourite question to candidates for membership was on this theme, since Presbyterians were credited with the heterodox view of Christ as "the eternal Son of God," whereas Scotch Baptists held that He was the "Son of the eternal God." Mr. M'Lean had expressed himself forcefully on the subject, and his views were accepted as dogma. "Practical pursuits," says Mr. Williamson, "whether Missionary, Social, or Benevolent, were not much considered." Local affairs were not ignored, but were used, like the "emblems," to point to the divine Hand. The great fires which raged in Edinburgh in November, 1824, occasioned much homiletic head-shaking against the Edinburgh musical festival of that year, when Handel's *Messiah*, Haydn's *Creation* and other oratorios had

been sung. Mr. Williamson is slightly sceptical of this argument from cause to effect, but he was himself passionately fond of music, and might be prejudiced.

St. Paul, of course, played a large part in the thought of the Scotch Baptists, perhaps supplying the basis of their Christian conduct. There was a fruitful denunciation of dress extravagance, including an insistence upon dress according to social status. This was a common enough theme in Scotland since the Reformation. Baptists avoided public office. One of the precentors declined the post of music teacher in George Heriot's Hospital (i.e. school) when he knew that he would have to lead the praise in an Established church on Founder's day. A Mr. Philip, schoolmaster, gave up his private school to teach in the Edinburgh jail at a time when the first attempts were being made to re-educate juvenile criminals; but Mr. Philip was regarded as doing something shady. Marriage, of course, was strictly "in the Lord."

Mr. Williamson, writing his recollections of things past as he watched his generation depart one by one, had many anecdotes to add. There was "the daft laddie" whose mischievous cronies told him to "gang into the kirk and gie a great roar." But the outstanding memory was of the "Break-up" of November 30th, 1834. His mother was a devoted member of the church and went to the decisive meeting. It lasted on and on, and James went down several times to see what was happening. When she did come home, she was in tears, saying that the church was divided. It was indeed divided. Next Sunday James and his younger sister, partisans of the liberal view, returned to the Pleasance church. His mother and elder sister went with the true-blue stalwarts into the wilderness. This adherence to principle cannot pass unnoticed by us. It divided families without loosening their loyalty to the practice of worship. The minority formed a new church elsewhere in the city.

But the heart seemed to have been taken out of the Pleasance church. Within a few months they, too, vacated the building and worshipped in hired rooms until a new building was erected in Bristo Place. It was a wise action, for in the new premises much of the old hurt was healed and the church moved towards unprecedented influence, gathering at one time a membership of 600 and giving birth to many subsidiary causes both in Edinburgh and, especially, in the north-west Highlands. It is a curious fact that memories of the old Pleasance church did not seem to linger on as have the memories of the Bristo church. The name Bristo has been incorporated in the newer buildings, but the Pleasance church was allowed very largely to be forgotten. Perhaps the memory of the "break-up" was too poignant, and the church felt impelled to make a new start, forgetting the unhappy things that lay behind.

WILLIAM SPEIRS

The Inspiration of the Bible*

ONE of the major problems in the Christian church today is that of assigning a place to the Scriptures. The practice of consistent private Bible reading is not so widespread now as it was thirty years ago, and the Scriptures are not unjustly described as the "neglected weapon" of the Church. There are signs, however, that the younger generation has a different approach and is prepared to take the Bible more seriously, but this implies that the Christian teacher and minister will face more and harder questions than before. The old-fashioned answers will no longer satisfy, as any Sunday School teacher could tell. Therefore we must face frankly certain searching questions about the Bible and endeavour to answer them in modern terms. Is the Bible inspired? Is the Bible any different from other religious books? Can we say that the Bible is the Word of God? Can we feel genuine doubt about one passage without begging the question for the whole of the Bible? And so on.

In a recent book Dr. Horton Davies has some penetrating things to say about the use of the Bible in the Church. He quotes Chillingworth's well-known saying: "The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of the Protestants," and goes on to say that we should probably want to amend the dictum to say the Bible is the basis of the religion of the Protestants. The whole of Dr. Davies' book shows how badly the Bible has fared at the hands of its users, even in our own time.[1] In and to such a world as this, what is the relevance of the Bible? To set the question against its background, we glance briefly at the way the Bible has been handled and interpreted in previous ages.

It may well be that the Jews before our Lord's time had a doctrine of verbal inspiration and complete infallibility for their Scriptures—our Old Testament. Paul himself may have subscribed to this view. Justin Martyr in the second century believed that God had raised up holy and inspired men to produce the works of the New Testament. Origen, in the third century, is noted for his allegorisation of Scripture. His three levels of meaning—Literal, Moral and Mystic—meant that he could read almost anything into a given text. From the fourth century onwards one can see the gradual increase of the power of the Church, which finally became

* Being the substance of two lectures on the same subject delivered at the first conference of ex-students of the Baptist Student Federation.

[1] See especially the concluding words of the section on biblical exegesis on page 82 of *Christian Deviations*.

the ultimate court of appeal, over both Scripture and tradition. The Reformers changed this emphasis and established Scripture once more as a final authority and as its own interpreter. Luther's main appeal was to Scripture, but he did not teach verbal inspiration. The touchstone by which he judged the books of the canon was "whether they proclaim Christ or not." Calvin accepted this criterion of exposition, but held the theory of an infallible Bible.

Of course, the advent of Biblical criticism has changed the scene considerably and altered the whole approach to any Biblical question. But modern criticism is not so modern as some would have us believe. About 250 A.D. Dionysius of Alexandria urged against the view that the Apostle John wrote *Revelation,* and Origen (born in 186) replied to the plain question "who wrote *Hebrews?*" with the equally plain answer, "God knows." In fact, the allegory by which we remember Origen's view of the Old Testament was a step away from absolute literalism. Professor Dodd says: "When the gospel according to St. Matthew uses the story of Jonah as a symbol of the resurrection from the dead, it is not very far from the original intention of the myth."[2] It was Luther who said: "The Scriptures are the crib wherein Christ is laid," and Emil Brunner added: "Biblical criticism is nothing but the act by which we recognise that the crib is not Christ."

Having made that sketchy reference to the background of our approach to the question of the inspiration of the Bible, we must now address ourselves more properly to the subject. It would seem on consideration of this theme, that it is almost impossible to answer the question, "Is the Bible inspired?" in the way we ought to answer as students. We need the question reframing so that we can make our primary effort on the academic level and then place the result in the setting of the devotional use of the Bible. As the question stands the personal and individual view of the Bible would have to come in at the start, so we may take the liberty to change the question very slightly. We shall assume that the answer to the question, "Is the Bible inspired?" is "Yes," and then try to say how that is so, or why we think it is so. In order to clear the ground before us we must dispose of four unlawful solutions to the question. All four have ardent advocates, but their prevalence retards rather than advances the true understanding of the Bible.

The first is that of *Verbal Infallibility or Plenary Inspiration,* or whatever title its advocates give it to make it a little more intellectually respectable. This is the idea that the Scriptures are perfect in every sense, that they cannot err in what they teach, and that every word recorded as coming from the mouth of our Lord must necessarily have been spoken by Him. Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, commenting on this view of the Bible, compares it with the view of

[2] *The Bible Today,* p. 17.

the Eucharist known as Transubstantiation, adding that both are not merely untenable—they are irrelevant.[3] Certainly there are contradictions and difficulties enough in Scripture without our adding to them by such theories. The part played by men in the writing of the various books cannot be overlooked. St. Paul certainly did not regard himself as a pen in the hand of the Holy Spirit. In fact, in 1 *Corinthians,* he is at pains to distinguish divine commands from his own views, but attributes the latter to the guidance of the Spirit. As Principal Cunliffe-Jones has said : " The guidance of the Holy Spirit does not come to a passive mind, but is a supernatural enrichment of an active one."[4]

The second unlawful approach is that of *Unbridled Allegory.* This is a delicate subject, because the Bible uses allegory and some passages can best be interpreted by this means. But it must be controlled and the Bible taken at its face value where this is possible. The *Song of Songs* is a collection of love poems, and no amount of special pleading will make it anything else, least of all a foreshadowing of the relation between Christ and His Church. The book of *Revelation* deals a lot in symbolism, but it must be remembered that it is the symbolism of the first and second centuries, not the twentieth. The beast with the number 666 is Nero, not the Pope, not Napoleon, not Hitler, not even one of the modern form-critics. Where the Bible speaks plainly we must take the plain meaning, and where it speaks in metaphors we must remember their limitations.

Thirdly, we reject the *Piecemeal Method,* which snatches a few texts from their contexts and uses them to support wild theories which are clearly contrary to the general teaching of Scripture. In this way one can make even St. Paul subscribe to most of the known heresies. As early as the second century Marcion rejected the Old Testament altogether because he could not make it fit in with his conception of New Testament teaching. But soon he was forced to more stringent measures to smooth out the difficulties, and eventually he retained only an expurgated edition of the Third Gospel and seven epistles. There are many Christians today who are virtual Marcionites. Well may Dr. Rowley write : " To impart a sounder view of the Old Testament has seemed to some a harder task than to banish the Old Testament from the Bible."[5] The practice of using only certain parts of the Bible is more deeply ingrained in our Christian life than we think. The writer has kept a note of the texts used by writers of sermons in the *Expository Times* for the past three years. There are certain passages where the references are thick, while whole books have not received a mention, much less have been used for texts.

[3] *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit,* p. 171.
[4] *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation,* p. 98.
[5] *Relevance of the Bible,* p. 77.

Finally, we reject the view that the Bible is inspired *because it is Inspiring.* Philosophically, this view is untenable. A book is not necessarily inspired if it is inspiring; a book may be inspiring because it is inspired, or for several other reasons. Neither is it adequate to substitute a theory of inspired men for an inspired book. This latter approach has a large element of truth in it, but the answer it provides is too easy, and avoids some of the most difficult problems. As J. K. Mozley has said: "Our concern with the Bible is with its content, not with its authors." And: "The doctrine of inspiration is the assertion of the divine character of the Bible."[6]

Space does not allow us to examine the two comparatively late Biblical references to Scripture in 2 *Tim.* iii. 16 and 2 *Peter* i. 20 and 21. Both seem to regard Scripture as inspired and binding for Christian life and doctrine.

LITERATURE AND HISTORY

As we now seek to say something about how we believe the Bible to be inspired we shall start a long way out from our goal and work slowly back towards it. We take our first stand in the realm of literature and make the assertion that the Bible is part of the *Literature of the Ages.* As an example of literature the Bible stands high. Its pictures are painted on a large canvas; its situations are real and typical; its language is noble and its thought profound. Whether we read the stately prose of the 1611 version or appreciate the Greek of *Luke* or 1 *Peter* or whether we read the stories of fierce battles and terrible prophets or read the parables as examples of how to write short stories, makes little difference. As literature the Bible ranks among the best. But this statement leaves the Bible in the realms of Shakespeare, Milton or even some of the modern dramatists, who seem to be increasingly aware of the important part the spiritual plays in the life and well-being of man.

The Bible is concerned with God and man and the relationship between them. It begins with the creation of the world and closes with the end of the world. Its problems are moral and religious; its people are spiritual beings. So we can take our second step with confidence and say that the Bible is *Religious Literature.* In this category new canons of criticism apply; new elements will be looked for in the writing; new attention will be paid to the claims to historicity. Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson wrote: "If we read the Bible only as a human book, we shall lose something that no other book can give; if we read it simply as a divine oracle we shall never understand it aright."[7] But we soon notice that there are differences between the Bible and other religious books. Primarily it is not concerned with man's search for God, or what laws must prevail if

[6] *The Christian Faith,* ed. Matthews, pp. 58 and 61.
[7] *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit,* p. 161.

man will please God, but with God's great love and power shown to men in mighty acts and with the effect of the rule and love of God on the lives of men. The Bible is quiet about its own claims, which is more than can be said for the Koran. In Christianity it is not the book which is sent down, devoid of contradictions, but Jesus Christ, full of grace and truth. Remembrance of this fact will keep our perspective free from the taint of bibliolatry.

Often we hear it said that all religious books are the same, they say the same things and point in the same direction, and so on. It has even been said that Jesus taught nothing new, but that all His teaching is found elsewhere. The answer to that argument may be found in two sentences; one from C. S. Lewis, "Really great teachers never do produce new moralities. It is the quacks and the cranks who do that" (*Christian Behaviour,* p. 16). The other answer is given by Professor A. M. Hunter, "The work of the great artist is not to manufacture new paints, but with old ones to produce great pictures" (*Design for Life,* p. 22).

We go on to assert another major fact about the Bible which helps to distinguish it from other religious writings. It is *historical* in the best sense. It deals with real situations, discusses real events, and often adds penetrating interpretation. Dr. Wheeler Robinson, maligned by some in our denomination today who do not try to understand what he was trying to do, and to whose studies of inspiration and prophetic consciousness modern scholarship owes so much, saw a close link between inspiration and historicity. For him the inspiration of the prophets as men lay behind their oracles. Behind the literature is the history, and within the history are the men who are inspired. (cf. *Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit,* p. 162f.).

The patriarchs of the Old Testament were real men, despite the fact that the writers sometimes exaggerate some of their achievements or overlook their weaknesses. The prophets were historical enough; one does not need to be particularly religious to give credence to the fact that they really lived and spoke. The stern denunciations of Amos; the fine sympathy of Hosea; the transparent humanity of Jeremiah; the priestly inclinations of Ezekiel; the lofty theology of first Isaiah or the penetrating insight of second Isaiah—these mark the men as real as if they were here today and showed those same characteristics.

It is not necessary in these days to argue for the historicity of our Lord as a person. We may still wish that certain types of Christians would do justice to His humanity, but few now doubt that He once lived.. The gospels have come out well from the hundred years' searching criticism to which they have been subjected. The reception given to Graves and Podro's *Nazarene Gospel Restored,* by a long series of reviewers, even excluding Dr. Rowley's

scathing attack in the *Manchester Guardian,* shows that the age of fanciful reconstructions of the life and ministry of our Lord has passed, and one may take leave to think that many other reviewers would have said what Dr. Rowley said had they as much courage and as great a reputation.

Professor Alan Richardson has observed that in the fixing of the canon of Scripture the Church acknowledged the historicity of the Gospel. There can be no other gospel than that which has once been lived out by Christ on this earth, so the Scriptures cannot be added too. The Church is not the creator of the Gospel, but the servant of it. Historical events stand behind both. The Church is bound by Scripture to be faithful to the apostolic witness, once delivered.[8]

So we may safely add to our assessment of the Bible the word historical, but it must be clearly understood what we mean by that. We are not making a claim that the Bible is a history book. It is in a sense, but we do not wish to press that point, for it is not a history book in the modern sense of the term. The German word translated "salvation history" (Heilgeschichte) is nearest to the sense we want. It is a book written from a certain standpoint, the standpoint of one who sees the world as a huge stage where God performs His great epic of mankind. Men play their parts, and God performs mighty acts, sometimes unmistakably, sometimes by a combination of events which require the eye of faith to perceive the hand of God. The last word in this section may go to Principal Cunliffe-Jones, who says: "The Bible is history preaching. We must take it seriously in both aspects and see how they influence one another."[9]

UNIQUENESS

This fact of historicity, linking up with what has been said earlier of the favourable position of the Bible when compared with other religious literature gives us good reason to assert the *Uniqueness* of the Bible. Brunner makes this his starting-point for his section on the Bible in *Our Faith.* He says: "No one will dispute the assertion that the Bible is a unique book" (p. 16). The primary reason for this is that it deals with a unique Person, a unique God and a unique community. It can be left to each of us to fill in the detail at this point—the amazing number of persons who possess a Bible, the huge figures for its yearly sale, the sacrifices men have made to preserve it, the labour devoted to the study of it today, and so on.

The next point also goes to show the uniqueness of the Bible, but can be put in a separate section because of its importance and comprehensive nature. When one is trying to put down in cold academic terms some facts about the inspiration of the Bible one

[8] *Christian Apologetics,* p. 210.
[9] *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation,* p. 108.

cannot leave out the question of *Subject Matter*. How closely the two are related can be seen in the following brief extract from Dr. Bicknell's standard work on the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, "the quality of inspiration corresponds to the nature of the truth revealed" (p. 174). Thus there can be an "inspired" scientific document; there can be an "inspired" poem or piece of descriptive prose or an "inspired" work of art. If one follows Bicknell here one presumably sees inspiration as a sort of element of genius, and this view makes the inspiration of a piece of work dependent on the inspiration of the author and nothing else. In fact Dr. Bicknell does take this view later in his work. But one inference from this concept is plain—that if the nature of revealed truth is divine, then the quality of the inspiration will be at once supremely good and influential on the lives of men. This is no doubt the point where Dr. Bicknell himself would tread most surely, for on the same page as the quotation above he says: "There can be no book to supersede the Bible, because there can be no revelation to supersede Christ."

Now we have used the word, and are committed—*Revelation*—that is one of the briefest ways of saying what the subject matter of the Bible is. We have already seen that primarily the Bible records God's search for man and dealings with him. God takes the initiative, and that accounts for the comparative dearth of material in the Bible to suit the man who undertakes a long and involved search for God. Far more in keeping with the theme of the Bible is the text: "The Lord is nigh to all them that call upon him, to all that call upon him in truth."

But again we must guard ourselves with a distinction: the Bible is a record of God's revelation, but is not the revelation itself. It records God's dealings with men and how God's plan has worked through all the ages. Yet if we use the idea of Professor Dodd, we can say that the Bible is not revelation, neither is it merely a history of revelation, but history *as* revelation. It is history with a new element in it, an element which controls it, an element which is divine.[10]

Involved in this question of revelation is another factor: that of prophetic consciousness. The writers of the various Old Testament and New Testament documents saw God's hand and will in history and the events of their own time. But was that by a stroke of genius, by divine inspiration, or by the action of God in using a consecrated mind? That is the question Dr. Harold Knight has in mind when he prefaces a very profound discussion of prophetic consciousness with the words: "What is the metaphysical character of the prophet's knowledge of God?"[11]

[10] *The Bible Today*, Chapter V.

[11] *Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness*, Part II, p. 109f.

If we wish to know something about revelation we cannot do better than to glance at the main outline of Dr. Knight's argument. First he comes down boldly on the side of the modern scholars in answer to the question: "What do you mean by saying that God spoke to the prophets?" when he says: "The older view, that revelation consists in the divine impartation of transcendent truth undiscoverable by unaided human reason, can no longer be maintained. It contradicts our general understanding of the nature of God and man, and the relations that obtain between them" (109-110). He argues that this older view of inspiration (he means the idea that the writers were passive instruments of the Holy Spirit) implies a handling of the personality of man quite contrary to what God intends. Dr. Knight puts our statement about God seeking man in more academic terms. Revelation is "the transforming self-disclosing of the ultimate personal Reality to the personal spirit of man" (110). This is one of Dr. Wheeler Robinson's salient points; that revelation is always "Spirit to spirit" with the capital "S" coming first. Dr. Knight goes so far in this direction as to commit himself to the statement that Hebrew theology denies that man has the inherent spiritual capacity to find out God.

But we make a grave error if we suppose that revelation is purely objective, for anything purely objective could not be appreciated by us, as we only notice the things that are relevant to us, i.e. the subjective aspects. This is no doubt what Dr. Knight has in mind when he says: "There is no word of God which is not also a word of man, the achievement of his earnest spiritual wrestlings" (112). The inter-action of the human mind with the self-revealing Other is the hallmark of revelational knowledge. In other words the basis of the prophetic consciousness is not speculative but experiential. Its authority is spiritual and intrinsic, wins its own recognition, cannot be argued or demonstrated, yet must always be open to the judgment of human minds.

Ultimately we come to the point at which we see that Christ Himself is the one perfect revelation of God; He is a "self-disclosure of the ultimate personal reality"; He is a manifestation of a "self-revealing Other"; He is very God made man, come to earth, come to suffer, to serve, to die and to be raised. J. K. Mozley sums it up when he says: "The Bible to Christianity is not the same as the Koran to Islam, or as the book of Joseph Smith is to the church of the Latter Day Saints. Christianity is not the religion of a book in any sense that could imply that the book is itself the revelation."[12]

J. R. C. PERKIN

(To be concluded)

[12] *The Christian Faith, ed. Matthews*, p. 51.

The Problem of Episcopacy

THE honest Christian, in his age-long, painful endeavour to discover the truth about God's dealings with mankind, must always distinguish between theological dogma and historical fact. So much of the Christian faith is founded upon actual events in history attested by reliable witnesses, and glimpsed, however dimly, by succeeding generations, that prayerful speculation about the meaning of these events is inevitable. Where the results of such speculation have been crystallised into Articles of Faith accepted by the majority of the faithful throughout the ages, the witness of the latter impels us to acceptance, though honesty, even here, would also interpose caution. But where the problem is one of a particular ecclesiastical institution, however founded, however sanctioned by the consensus of the saints, any honest man will demand an even closer scrutiny. A thing is not true because it is old.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his famous Cambridge sermon of 3rd November, 1946, appealed to non-episcopal churches to "take episcopacy into their system." But episcopacy does not appear in the New Testament as one of the facts accompanying the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It is, as all respectable scholars would agree, a subsequent phenomenon.[1] Through the centuries up to the Reformation, it was the dominant system by which the Church was governed, although from time to time we find evidence that it not only varied a great deal within itself, but also that sundry small dissentient bodies managed to subsist without bishops. After the Reformation, a great section of the Church broke away from episcopacy *inter multa alia*. At present, among the non-Roman churches, the probability is that episcopalians are in the minority.

On what grounds then did the Archbishop make his appeal? Partly upon the "Lambeth quadrilateral," one of whose cornerposts is the "threefold ministry" of bishops, priests and deacons. Partly also, although this is generally understood rather than openly avowed, on the grounds that the various Anglican churches would find it impossible to unite with any non-episcopal body. Since the above pronouncement was made, long, elaborate and painful negotiations have been carried on year after year. It cannot be denied that progress has been slow, and that the rank and file of church members on both sides have little information about the situation, and little interest in it. We seem to have stuck. In the question of inter-communion with the Church of South India, some of whose ministers are still non-episcopally ordained, we Free Churchmen cannot be wholly disinterested. The Church of England must, of course, settle its own affairs, but if we are asked to accept "episcopacy" it must at least be made clear to us what is involved. Is it a divinely authorised institution, of the very *esse* (being) of the

[1] In New Testament bishop = presbyter or elder. *Tit.* i. 7-9, etc., and similar passages are later interpolations.

Church itself, or is it something, which has been blessed throughout the ages, which it might be expedient to adopt in present circumstances, but which is intrinsically no better than any other institution of similar honour and antiquity?

Seven scholars associated with Westcott House, Cambridge, have written a book[2] in which the thesis is advanced that episcopacy is neither of these—that it is of the *plene esse* of the Church; that the Church cannot "express the plenitude of its being as the one Body of Christ" without it. Various arguments are advanced purporting to give the proof of this from "Bible, tradition and reason." One of the writers, indeed, is inclined to leave history out of account: "The fundamental conception of the episcopate for which we are contending is not, in itself, a matter of history but of theology" (p. 22). A considerable part of the book, however, is taken up with arguments from the Fathers, both ancient and post-Reformation. A brief reference must be made to this later, but from our point of view the apologetic built up round certain New Testament references is more important. Amid much that is unexceptionable one cannot escape a suspicion of special pleading.

To give only one example, the Apostolic Ministry is "distinguished from the mere (sic) preaching of the apostolic gospel and from mere pastoral oversight" (p. 117, referring to *Eph.* iv. 11). It is pointed out, quite correctly, that church orders—we should prefer to say the varying Spirit-given functions of Christians—"do not constitute the Church but . . . minister to it." It is then stated that the "historic episcopates embodies a special form of the ministry. It will be shown that through it the apostolic ministry is continued and the unity of the faith built up." But a precisely similar argument might be used in support of a prophetic ministry or a ministry of evangelists, pastors and teachers, for they are all mentioned in the same verse and are all distinctly indicated as fulfilling the function of "building up the Body of Christ" in the succeeding verse. If any priority is given to the apostles it is one of place only: there is neither here nor elsewhere in the New Testament any indication that the apostles were regarded as possessing, in virtue of their 'office,' a superior infusion of Grace or greater usefulness than anyone else. In fact, the unpremeditated witness of the historical narratives and the artless greetings at the end of the Epistles give rise to a completely opposite conclusion—compare Stephen and Philip who were *not* "Apostles," and Andronicus and Junius (*Romans* xvi. 7) who, most surprisingly, were.

Nor is the argument from history, which follows in the next section, any more convincing. As a specimen we may select the quotation from (the then) Professor Ramsey on page 118: "As guardian of teaching, as an organ in the Body's continual Life of

[2] *The Historic Episcopate*—Seven Essays edited by Kenneth M. Carey.

Grace—the Bishop sets forth the Gospel of God." What bishop? Any and every bishop? Or only those bishops who have actually done so in the eyes of God and man? Only those who have been witnessed to by the Spirit through their 'fruit,' which has obviously been His 'fruit' also? Concerning the pretensions of any other bishop or collection of bishops whatever, we must register our objection. The Catholic Church supports us in this, for more than one Council of Bishops has been anathematized as heretical and its canons declared null and void.

If we look for the working of the Spirit in individual lives it would be hard to maintain the thesis that the "historic episcopate" has contained in its ranks a larger number of saints, inspired Church leaders, evangelists or scholars than any other category of Christians. But can it be argued that, apart from individuals, the *institution* has been, in any peculiar sense, the instrument of Providence in history? There is no need to delve very deeply into the records of the past in order to discover that, somewhere or other, in every century without exception, episcopacy has been the instrument in some places of tyranny, of oppression, or corruption, of avarice and of the devil. The scandals of the first century are exceeded by those of the second, and neither, perhaps, amount to very much. But in the third and fourth century and onwards, the abuse of the episcopate, the misuse of the prestige and power it conferred, has been what we should expect if we regard it as a human invention used by sinners. Such abuse is overruled by God, but there is nothing in episcopacy to distinguish it from any other institution which may be similarly abused and similarly regulated by the Divine Power. It is of no avail to rejoin "corruptio optimi pessima," for we have no *proof* that this was the best possible means of protecting the Church from the assaults of the heathen or propagating the Gospel in, say, the Dark Ages. We know that it was expedient—a quality which it shares with many other similar phenomena. The claims put forward on its behalf, in so far as they require any specific Divine sanction or unique 'validity' fail, then, before the bar of history. What, according to a certain ecclesiastical or theological dogma, *must* have happened, has, in fact, *not* happened, and there is no appeal from such evidence.

Nor, on the other hand, can it be shown that any other form of Church government (apart from transient sectarian notions) has been any less successful over the whole range of its exercise in place and time, or any less an instrument of God's purpose.

The conclusion is inescapable, that neither the Word of God in Scripture nor the experience of the Church in history afford any support for the claims put forward for the 'historic episcopate,' even in so reasonable and temperately-written a book as the one referred to above.

Yet one of the most valuable ingredients of our Free Church heritage is the liberty we possess, which enables, or should enable, us, to "prove all things" and "hold fast to that which is good," even if it be unfamiliar. Stubborn prejudices, each surrounded by its ingenious system of rationalizations, are surely the most insuperable of all obstacles in the way of Church Unity. We clearly see the mote in our brother's eye, but must ever watch and pray so that the Spirit may remove, at whatever cost, the beam in our own. The manifest abuses of the past should not induce in us an unwavering hostility to new proposals brought forward in the vastly different circumstances of the present.

For as an expedient or, even more, as an instrument of God's purpose in and through His Church, episcopacy has proved its value over and over again. In many situations the bishop has proved to be, not indeed the source of unique authority which the advocates of a 'high' doctrine of Apostolic Succession would have him be, but a God-inspired leader and a true preserver of the historic Faith. In the far corners of the earth, among comparatively undeveloped peoples, the episcopal form of Church government has proved its worth a thousand times. Even at the present day, the Church, faced with so many and formidable hostile combinations, may be well advised to make use of this well-tried institution.

To those who believe that it is the Will of God that a greater measure of Church unity should be attained, and that our present condition of disunity is sinful and stands in the way of a true Revival, the question of "bishop or no bishop" becomes one of urgent practical importance. It is clear, as remarked above, that the Church of England will never unite in any real sense with *any* non-episcopal body. Yet without the Church of England we cannot conceive a great united advance to make England once more a predominantly Christian nation. If we really want this to happen, we must, therefore, like our Congregational brethren in South India, find out what kind of episcopacy we are expected to accept. At present the Church of England herself does not know. The book we have been discussing is an attempt to enable her to discover her own mind on the matter. Is it not time that we made up our minds also? It appears to the writer that South India has shown us a good example. We may accept episcopacy without thereby being obliged to believe in any theory about it. We may accept it in the hope that, in time, we, together with the authors of *The Historic Episcopate,* may find it to belong "to the full stature of the Church" of Christ. And we may believe, especially after the experience of the Church of South India, that it may prove to be God's will for His divided and ineffective Church in this country.

H. D. NORTHFIELD

Reviews

Rivals of the Christian Faith, by L. H. Marshall. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 12s. 6d.).

Those who spend a good deal of their time reading critiques of the various philosophical schools will not find this book excitingly original. But if one is looking for a book to introduce to the intelligent Christian who is bothered by the challenge of Scientific Humanism and Marxist Communism, here it is. The "rivals" of the Christian Faith turn out to be Greek Rationalism, Roman Stoicism, Scientific Humanism and Russian Communism. The relevance of the last two topics to the modern scene is obvious. But what interest can the modern believer have in the first two? This becomes clear with the unfolding of Dr. Marshall's thesis.

His starting-point is the categorical imperative. "Transcendental constraint" is the author's term. He describes it as "a constraint to be true and not false, kind and not cruel, generous and not selfish, considerate of others and not self-centred and self-absorbed, pure and not licentious, brave and not cowardly." This constraint, Dr. Marshall claims, only makes sense "if there is a holy God, a personal God in whom we live and move and have our being." All other explanations fail. And that is why the author finds these rivals so completely inadequate. Greek Rationalism seemed to assume that man's supreme function was to serve the state. It separated the life of man from God. Besides, death was regarded as the extinction of all moral and spiritual values. Roman Stoicism, while it "struck some great notes" and wrought a certain amount of good, was untrue to human nature in completely suppressing the emotional life. Moreover, this creed was one that issued in a sense of the futility of life. In Stoicism the nerve of moral life is cut, Marshall thinks, because there is no personal God.

The critique of Scientific Humanism is particularly interesting and gives as clear a statement of the Christian reaction to this school as could be found anywhere. The one fault with this section, perhaps, is that there is an overdose of quotation from other writers. The author obviously has the feeling that these other people have said what needs to be said and in a way that cannot be bettered. The net result is that this section tends to become an anthology. This, of course, has its value, but one could have wished that this had become grist for the author's mill and been re-presented in a somewhat more original fashion. The assessment of Russian Communism carries the same features of clarity with fewer lengthy quotations.

In the final section on The Christian Answer, Marshall maintains that in bringing man face to face with a Moral Demand, Christianity reveals the high possibilities of human nature. But the

strength of the moral appeal of Christianity is that "it comes to us in and through a Person." "The initiative in the remaking of personality cannot come from within the personality that is to be re-made." Against this background is shown the absolute necessity of a conviction of sin and the relevance of Christ's Cross and passion. It is the Cross which brings to man "Reconciliation" (the restoration of a fellowship that has been disturbed) and "Redemption" (the process of freeing us from sin's power and dominion). Thus, from the starting-point of the "Transcendent Constraint" Marshall proceeds to present a full-orbed gospel. This section contains many memorable sentences and breathes the intensity of a preacher.

That the book is the work of a teacher and exponent rather than an original thinker does not mitigate our sense of loss that this man is no longer with us. The really choice memoir by Rev. Henry Bonser makes us realise that the kind of mind Marshall possessed was not just the product of good training and a love of learning. There was a moral quality about it that caused him to emerge from the bitter controversy at McMaster a vindicated man. The book-production calls for a word of special praise for our Carey Kingsgate Press.

J. ITHEL JONES.

The Protestant Tradition, by J. S. Whale. (Cambridge University Press, 21s.).

A new book from the learned and vigorous pen of Dr. Whale is quite an event, especially as fourteen years have elapsed since his *Christian Doctrine* appeared and the work is of the calibre of this present volume. In these important pages a new and searching examination of the three main elements of early Protestantism is presented and, against this background, a number of modern issues are discussed.

Part I deals with the creative genius, Luther, showing that his reforming work was rooted in his rediscovery of biblical religion and his evangelical experience and that his most distinctive insights were often expressed in paradoxes. The major part of this section is devoted to explaining five of these—law and gospel, justification by faith, the believing sinner's assurance (*simul peccator et justus*), the divine gift and its ethical obligations (*Gabe* and *Aufgabe*), the Calling and the Church.

Next Dr. Whale turns his penetrating gaze upon the great systematiser, Calvin, whose historical significance lies largely in his having perceived that "the great need of the sixteenth century was a positive ecclesiastical polity." Calvin's biblical and theocentric doctrine and his view of the Church as an organised, disciplined community are discussed.

Part III, where Dr. Whale treats "The Sect Type," is in some respects less satisfying than the rest of the book. It depends rather too much on Professor Roland Bainton in its discussion of the Reformation left-wing and is consequently led to the dubious choice of David Joris as a typical Anabaptist. Nine pages or so on Montanism seem somewhat intrusive. All the same there is an admirable and illuminating study of the three enduring principles—personal, voluntary, spiritual—which give a certain unity to the sectarian multiplicity.

In the fourth part Dr. Whale turns to modern issues. Religious tolerance and intolerance in the totalitarian climate of our time are discussed and we are left in no doubt as to Dr. Whale's views on the "ecclesiastical arrogance" and priestly pretensions of Romanism. The conflict between Church and State is next considered. Calvin is shown to have succeeded, where Luther failed, in asserting the Crown Rights of the Redeemer in His Church. Alarmed by the "frightful menace of the purely secular State, and of the national irreligion which it fosters," Dr. Whale sees in the ecumenical movement the greatest opportunity of resolving many of the difficulties of this problem. This leads him to his final chapter, in which he points out that, far from having begun with Protestantism, disunion is as old as Christianity itself, and that the crucial issue in ecumenical discussion is the nature of the Church which, in turn, is bound up with Christology. While Dr. Whale confesses his love for the "sect-type," realises that "for a living Church men will pay the price even of sectarianism," and acknowledges that today "when the omnicompetent police-state either standardises or liquidates the non-conforming individual," what the free world owes to the sects is incalculable, he is, nevertheless, firmly convinced that for the Protestant tradition the ecumenical issue is supreme in the twentieth century. In this important and absorbing volume all Dr. Whale's gifts, particularly of scholarship, interpretation and mastery of phrase, are displayed, and it should be read and pondered by Baptists no less than all other Protestants.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

The Birth of Modern Education: The Contribution of the Dissenting Academies 1660-1800, by J. W. Ashley Smith. (Independent Press, 19s. 6d.).

It is the sub-title of this book which both reveals its true nature and indicates its special interest for readers of the *Baptist Quarterly*. Mr. Ashley Smith sets out to describe and discuss the Curricula of the Dissenting Academies during the years 1660-1800. These dates are not arbitrary but represent the period from the closing of the Universities to Dissenters to the founding of London University free from religious tests. It must be understood that only a minority of

the Academies dealt with in this book was solely concerned with ministerial training, and that the *raison d'être* of the Academies was to provide "higher education" for those barred from the Universities. Mr. Smith's method of approach is to classify the Academies according to the pattern of Curricula followed by their Tutors. Thus after the Introductory Chapter, Chapter II deals with Tutors trained at Oxford or Cambridge and who instituted in their Academies a similar Curriculum to that in force at those Universities. It is instructive to be told first of all exactly what was taught in the Universities of the seventeenth century and to see this pattern reflected to a greater or less extent in the Dissenting Academies. Chapter III deals with Tutors without English University training but who continued the traditional education. Among these is one Baptist, John Davisson of Trowbridge, about whom our own Baptist histories are relatively silent. As might be expected Baptist contributions figure chiefly in Chapter IV which covers Tutors constructing their own Curricula. Naturally it is the Bristol Academy which figures largely in this chapter with the great succession of Tutors beginning with Bernard Foskett, Andrew Gifford, Hugh Evans and Caleb Evans. There is certainly much of interest to all Baptists in this section, especially as the curriculum of Bristol College in those days is set out in detail. The conclusion will be encouraging and gratifying to all Baptists and especially to Bristol men, for Mr. Ashley Smith writes: ". . . Bristol Baptist College . . . must be placed alongside orthodox academies of the Congregationalists as a demonstration that higher education of the best quality need not necessarily lead to heterodox theology." There are, however, in this section one or two errors which require to be noted. Firstly, Caleb Evans was the son of Hugh Evans, not the nephew as Mr. Smith suggests, also John Fawcett was never on the staff of Bristol Baptist College, although it seems that he was invited to go to Bristol. Mr. Smith states that none of the educational efforts of John Fawcett, John Sutcliff, Dan Taylor and others continued into the twentieth century. This may be strictly true, but no mention is made of the fact that John Fawcett was one of the leading spirits in the founding of Horton Academy—now, of course, Rawdon College. But these are minor blemishes in a most illuminating book which fills a gap in our knowledge of the Dissenters' contribution to Education.

John Bunyan, by Roger Sharrock. (Hutchinson's University Library, 8s. 6d.).

This book is in the English Literature Series of Hutchinson's University Library and must be judged in the light of its stated intention, namely, "To furnish a general introduction to Bunyan's work which incorporates the findings of modern scholarship." Mr. Sharrock has achieved this aim admirably, though it is clear that

the author is more at home with the works of Bunyan than with the church tradition in which Bunyan stood. The book opens with a chapter on Puritan England, which although adequate is not always strictly accurate. For example, it is by no means certain that "the English Baptists owe little or nothing to continental influence," and the date given for the beginning of the Particular Baptists, 1616, is the date of the founding of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church of Congregational Separatists, not the date of the founding of the first Particular Baptist church, which was some time between 1632 and 1638. Again, is it right to call the sectaries the "wild men of the Puritan movement"? The second chapter describes the life of a sectary. This is a capable summary of Bunyan's life except that it unaccountably omits any reference to his Baptism. Then follow chapters on *Grace Abounding, Pilgrim's Progress,* Part I, *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman, The Holy War,* and *Pilgrim's Progress,* Part II. Here Mr. Sharrock is very much at home and deals most clearly and capably with these writings, his chapter on *The Holy War* being especially good. Although the author deals only with the main works of John Bunyan, it is clear that he is well versed in all the lesser known works. No one reading these chapters can fail to find them helpful in the understanding of what Bunyan seeks to say. When we are looking for an introduction to Bunyan and his works, then this indeed is it.

Mr. Pepys and Nonconformity, by A. G. Matthews. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.).

This collection of essays takes its title from the first and longest of them. In it Mr. Matthews has set himself to extract and explain for us in a most readable style the references to Nonconformity in the famous diary. We learn that Pepys was not without sympathy for them, and indeed are reminded that he was brought up on the Puritan wing of the Establishment. He speaks of the observance of the Lord's day and was shocked to see the Queen and her ladies playing cards on that day and he himself usually read prayers to his household on Sunday nights. He apparently liked listening to preaching and on occasions heards the Puritans preach. Pepys was a sermon taster and on one occasion he comments: "A dull, flat presbyter preached," and of the Spittal sermon, preached before the Lord Mayor and the Bluecoat body, he notes that "being a Presbyterian one it was so long that after about an hour of it we went away." Yet on August 17th, 1672, the diary records: "Up very early, this being the last Sunday that the Presbyterians are to preach, unless they read the new Common Prayer and renounce the Covenant, and so I had a mind to hear Dr. Bates's farewell sermon." Pepys queued up for an hour and managed to crowd into the gallery of St. Dunstan in the West. The sermon he approved of as very

good and by one o'clock he was back again in the gallery and he "stood in a crowd and did exceeding sweat all the time." It is a pity that Samuel has left for us no comment upon Baptists!

The second essay deals with "Puritans in the Letters of Lady Dorothy Osborne." Here again these letters provide an interesting commentary on the times and of the most eminent of Presbyterian preachers, Stephen Marshall, she comments: "His sermons were 'Enterlarded with the prittyest od phrases that I had the most adoe to look soberly. . . .'." The third essay deals with Lord Wharton, who founded the Bible Charity which still bears his name, and who was known as the Good Lord Wharton, and his much less commendable sons, who seemed to have led their tutors a pretty dance. The final chapter is a helpful discussion on the Puritans at prayer. Altogether a most pleasing book, often amusing and always informative.

W. MORRIS WEST.

With Freedom Fired, by Graham W. Hughes. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 8s. 6d.).

Religious Freedom in Spain, by John D. Hughey, Jr. (Carey Kingsgates Press, 15s.).

The Carey Kingsgate Press has done well to produce almost simultaneously two very readable books of real interest and value on religious liberty. In days when millions of people appear to regard "security" as of higher worth than freedom and "solidarity" is rated above individual moral responsibility, it is good to be reminded that liberty of conscience, worship and witness are fundamental human rights on which historically other freedoms have been established.

Mr. Graham Hughes, in a clear and forceful style, retells the story of Robert Robinson of Cambridge. He has made a skilful selection from a mass of materials and brings vividly before us an outstanding Baptist and Free Church leader of the eighteenth century. It is a pity that Robinson, who was Robert Hall's immediate predecessor as minister of St. Andrew's Street Church, should be known to most of us only as the writer of *Come, Thou Fount of every blessing* and *Mighty God, while angels bless Thee,* for he was a man of immense erudition and in his day one of the doughtiest champions of religious liberty and equality and of the right of private judgment. He was contemporaneous with Cowper and overlapped Wordsworth and Byron. It is hard to recapture the passionate love of freedom that burned in their verse as they followed a trail blazed by Milton. The Separatists and Puritans had rated liberty far above security and at a great price had demanded, in the name of religion, freedom of speech and writing and denied

all claims of Church and State to impose uniformity and shackle conscience and truth. What they would have thought and said of churches which acquiesce in the monopoly by government-controlled agencies of such means of education and propaganda as television, or the prohibition of free discussion of subjects of wide interest and importance by its use pending their debate in Parliament, can only be imagined. Rarely are voices raised nowadays even in the Free Churches against men being "sent to Coventry" by their workmates because they obey their consciences and prefer to carry out agreements rather than take part in unofficial strikes.

So it is timely and refreshing to be reminded of a man who had no doubt where he stood. Robinson's learning, clear thinking and powerful utterance gave him an immense influence far beyond the town and university of Cambridge. Mr. Hughes has rightly stressed his devotion to the cause of emancipating religion from the thrall of rulers and hierarchies, his emphasis on the proper place of reason and his assertion of private judgment as "a right inherent, held immediately of the God of nature, the property and dignity of mankind." He fought for the repeal of laws that shut doors to any who refused to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, for religious equality and for the abolition of the slave trade. He outdistanced his contemporaries by working for the establishment of a Dissenters' college in Cambridge. Much else will be found in the story to stimulate ministers and eager young readers. Though the end of it is clouded with infirmity, doubt and misunderstanding, nothing can take from us the picture of a lofty and luminous, but very human, personality, worth of a high place in the gallery of heroes of our Free Church tradition. The measure of the achievement of Robert Robinson and those who fought with him can be judged if we contrast the liberty (not even yet complete) which we enjoy in Britain with conditions in other lands.

Dr. John D. Hughey, Jr. describes the situation in Spain with the authority of a historical scholar who has himself lived there and worked among Spanish Baptists. His book is an expansion of a thesis which gained him a doctorate at Columbia University; no mean achievement. He is now Professor of Church History in the international Baptist Seminary at Rüschlikon-Zürich. His narrative is fully documented and is the fruit of much research and wide reading. Theses, as a rule, are terrifyingly dull, but this is a notable exception. It is lucid and really enjoyable to read, not less because it sometimes slips into a phrase that falls harshly on English ears, as when he renders "stimulated" or "encouraged" by "given a boost." One reader, at any rate, will be glad to read any other book that comes from such a vigorous hand.

The whole study is an impressive contribution to Christian History. While it constitutes a massive indictment of the Roman

Church and its leaders, clerical and lay, in Spain it is written objectively and without malice. The account of the struggle for liberty goes back to the Inquisition and further. Its progress is traced through monarchies, republic and the dictator's regime. It is inevitably in some ways a disappointing story, but the end is not yet. Some day Spain will escape from the sixteenth century and freedom will be built on firmer foundations than were the short-lived enactments of separation of Church and State and a period of generous toleration. Some of the accounts of persecution are grim though temperate and numerous well-authenticated incidents of recent interference with Protestants and their worship are given. Letters and statements by Roman ecclesiastics from the Pope downward are freely quoted, so that no doubt can remain of the official attitude of that Church with its insistence on the "Catholic" state and "Catholic" unity. The glaring misuse of the word "Catholic" as applied to a church could not be better illustrated.

Perhaps the most illuminating and valuable part of the book for the general reader is in the admirable summaries of debates in the Cortes on the subject of religious liberty. The case for and against national unity on a basis of religious uniformity, as seen through Spanish eyes, is well displayed, and Dr. Hughey almost leans over backward in his determination to be objective and fair. But the unprejudiced reader will surely have no trouble in reaching his verdict. Romanism still claims on its own principles to protect itself where it is strong by suppression, and where it is weak to claim on Protestants' principles the rights it would deny to them.

M. E. AUBREY.

Royal Priesthood, by T. F. Torrance. (Oliver & Boyd, 9s.).

This essay ranks as No. 3 in the series of "Occasional Papers" which are being issued by the *Scottish Journal of Theology,* and is intended as a contribution to discussions which were initiated on the Biblical doctrine of the Church and Ministry by the World Conference on Faith and Order in 1952. In the first chapter, Professor Torrance discusses the Old Testament notion of Priesthood, and shows the transformation which Jesus effected in this as in other Old Testament concepts, and the consequences for Christian worship. The succeeding chapters deal with the position of the Church as the Body of Christ, and her responsibility today for participating in the continuing priestly ministry of her Living Head. This Priesthood of the Church has reference primarily to the whole Body, and Professor Torrance rightly deplores the unchristian individualism which often lurks under the phrase "priesthood of all believers." But the church's priesthood is exercised secondarily through a regular ministry given to the church by Christ and duly ordained for His service. In a final chapter, the author discusses the

place of the Episcopate in this "institutional priesthood," and comments upon its relationship in particular to the Scottish concept of the Presbytery or "Corporate Episcopacy."

The discussion is characteristically related by Professor Torrance at every stage to the teaching of the Bible, and it is well adapted to provoke further study of the kind so much to be desired in the interests both of the unity of the Christian Church and of her task in the world. It it to be wished that room could have been found for a somewhat fuller treatment of the idea referred to on pages 16f. that, for the Christian Church, priestly service connotes not only liturgical actions, but the dedication of all life in the service of love. (Cf. 2 *Cor.* ix. 12 and *Rom.* xii. 1). Here is the point at which the lay ministries of Christian men *and women* come into their own, and ours is an age in which that lesson needs to be fully learned and applied.

The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, by J. K. S. Reid. (Oliver & Boyd, 5s.).

This booklet (No. 4 of the useful series of "Occasional papers" issued by the *Scottish Journal of Theology*), offers for wider circulation three lectures which were delivered at a recent Swanwick Theological Conference. The treatment is necessarily slight, but Professor Reid succeeds in giving a clear and helpful summary of the issues involved in this controversial subject, and the choice that faces Christians today. His conclusion can hardly be disputed: "Some kind of agreement has in fact been reached about the facts presented in the biblical records—but it is, alas! not much more than an agreement that the facts are ambiguous. . . . There cannot be said to be any one interpretation of the facts that commands even the consent of a great majority" (p. 31).

Professor Reid's own view is very similar to that of Dr. T. W. Manson inasmuch as he would ascribe "apostolicity" in the full sense to the Church as a whole, charged as it is to witness to the reality of the Living Christ, who is "the primary Minister." He makes, however, the interesting suggestion that what gave to St. Paul's ministry, in particular, its apostolic quality was the fact that if (as Professor Reid supposes) St. Paul never saw Jesus in the flesh, his apostleship testified to a "new and hitherto unwitnessed quality" in the resurrected Jesus, viz. His power to commission those unacquainted with His earthly ministry. With St. Paul's testimony "the full story has now been told of 'all that Jesus began both to do and teach'." Thus we must say that while the apostles can and do have successors, they are not successors in the primary sense: "the original witness had been made and no one can or need do it over again."

R. L. CHILD.