
A table of contents for the *Transactions of Congregational Historical Society* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_congregational-historical-society-1.php

TRANSACTIONS

THE CONGREGATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITOR JOHN H. TAYLOR, B.D.

VOL. XX. NO. 6. OCTOBER 1967

CONTENTS

Editorial

This year's Annual Meeting on 17th May was singularly discouraging. The lecturer was well known and attractive and his paper no disappointment; but the attendance was little over thirty. The reason was not far to seek, for the Assembly of the new Congregational Church in England and Wales made a spot decision at the close of the morning session to continue business in the afternoon, abandoning the scheduled programme. Teething troubles with a new Assembly programme and agenda are inevitable, but the May Meetings will become very much poorer, and less useful and attractive if the subsidiary meetings of groups like ours get pushed aside. As it happened, those who attended our meeting went away refreshed and inspired, which is more than those who went to the business session reported at tea time.

The new law on charities requires our registration, which in turn involves us in adopting a Constitution. The Annual Meeting took this step and we publish our simple Constitution overleaf. Mr. Biggs was thanked for his work in this connection. Mr. Welch was made the new Research Secretary.

CONSTITUTION

WHEREAS the Congregational Historical Society was formed in 1900, when objects were agreed, conditions of membership formulated, and officers appointed,

WHEREAS the Society has continued to function without a break for the same purposes and under similar conditions, but without formal constitution,

IT WAS RESOLVED at the Annual Meeting of the Society held at Westminster Chapel, Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1 on 18th May, 1966, to formulate the Constitution in the following terms :

I. NAME : The Society shall be known as The Congregational Historical Society (hereinafter called 'The Society')

II. MEMBERSHIP :

1. Membership shall be by subscription.
2. There shall be three classes of members :
   a. ordinary members, paying an annual subscription agreed by the Annual General Meeting,
   b. corporate members (Churches, Colleges, Libraries, etc.), paying the same agreed subscription,
   c. life members, paying a sum agreed by the Annual General Meeting in lieu of annual subscriptions.

III. OBJECTS :

The objects of the Society shall be :

1. to encourage interest in and research into the origins and history of Congregational churches and principles,
2. to issue Transactions containing results of such research and articles furthering the aims of the Society,
3. to print and to encourage the printing of MSS and documents, and to publish rare books and tracts,
4. to provide an annual lecture and to encourage the giving of other lectures,
5. to bring together and to maintain a corpus of material bearing on the history of Congregational churches and their ministers.

IV. MEETINGS :

1. Once a year there shall be held an Annual Meeting to which all members are summoned.
2. At that meeting the secretary and treasurer shall present reports for consideration and adoption, officers and members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed, and other appropriate business shall be transacted.

V. OFFICERS : The following officers shall be appointed at the Annual General Meeting :

1. a *President*, who shall preside at the Annual General Meeting, and shall normally serve for five years ;
2. a *Chairman*, who shall preside at meetings of the Executive Committee ;
3. a *Secretary*, who shall keep the minutes of meetings and records of membership, be responsible for correspondence, present an annual report, and generally undertake such duties as normally appertain to such an office ;
4. a *Treasurer*, who shall keep the accounts and arrange for their audit and presentation to the Annual General Meeting, and be responsible for the investment and administration of the funds of the Society ;
5. an *Editor*, who shall be responsible for the publications of the Society ;
6. a *Research Secretary*, who shall be responsible for research projects and enquiries.

VI EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE :

1. Between Annual Meetings the affairs of the Society shall be administered by an Executive Committee.
2. The Committee shall consist of the Officers of the Society *ex officio*, and such number of the members of the Society, normally not exceeding six, as shall be appointed by the Annual General Meeting.
3. The Committee shall have power to fill vacancies among the Officers and in its own membership between Annual General Meetings.
4. Meetings shall be called at such times as are agreed by the Chairman and Secretary.

VII. FINANCE :

1. The Finances of the Society shall be under the general direction of the Executive Committee.
2. It shall be competent to invest Life Subscriptions, special gifts, and accumulated funds in Trustee Securities.
3. Cheques on the account of the Society may be drawn only over the signatures of the Treasurer, and either the Chairman or the Editor.

VIII. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION :

Amendments to the Constitution shall be made only by an Annual General Meeting, notice of intention having been given with the call to the meeting, and by vote of more than one half of the members present and voting.

SOME CONGREGATIONAL PATHFINDERS IN THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

In the entrance-hall of the former offices of the WCC in Geneva there used to hang half-a-dozen photographs of men who played a creative part in that movement which resulted in a World Council of Churches. There was John R. Mott, J. H. Oldham, William Paton, the Orthodox Archbishop Germanos of Thyateira, the Lutheran Archbishop Nathan Soderblom, William Temple and A. E. Garvie. Only two of these lived to see the launching of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948 but all of them were architects and builders of it. During my days in Geneva I often stood appreciatively before these pictures and many times have I made, or heard the comment : " Dear old Garvie ! " It was with some notion that this lecture might constitute a salute to Garvie and a few others of his generation, that I chose my title.

I still hope it may be delivered and accepted in this spirit. But as I have toyed with this theme I have become aware of a desire to do something more, even though I lack the scholarship and have not been able to guard the time of preparation for such a task. Inadequate as my endeavour must be, I risk wandering within broader dimensions of Christian history. I want to trace some characteristic contributions of Congregationalists to the movement we call ecumenical through the longer story of our churchmanship. For I believe this would be the right way in which to see the role of an A. E. Garvie and his contemporaries. I have a feeling, also, that while enhancing our sense of indebtedness to earlier pathfinders, it may remind us, their successors, of signposts which still point in directions—or even away from some misleading paths—that we do well to heed.

The ecumenical movement. Familiar as the phrase has become, it is still necessary to define the term, or the sense in which it is being used. Garvie's picture is associated with the WCC. He did, in fact, in 1937, as Vice-President of the World Conference on Faith and Order, preside over the session at which the historic decision was taken to create a World Council of Churches in which the Faith and Order movement would continue its work. Ten years earlier Garvie had been Vice-Chairman of the Lausanne Faith and Order Conference and as early as 1914 he had been a member of a small committee, meeting in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey, which began to plan for the organisation which took the name of Faith and Order. Garvie had occupied a

similar position—as the close colleague of Archbishop Soderblom —in the formative years of the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work which constituted the second of the two main strands which were woven into the structure of the World Council of Churches. To a unique degree, therefore, he was involved in laying the foundations of the WCC and determining its character. I shall allude to him again later. Here I will only recall a modest confession of Garvie's that he owed these early opportunities largely to his linguistic ability ; he was often interpreter as well as chairman. He records an early experience in this role when it became clear to him that if he had translated all that a certain speaker said, the conference would have ended in an uproar. He therefore gave the audience what he felt the speaker ought to have said.[1] This experience taught him—he declared—the value in ecumenical relationships of the injunction to be wise as serpents and harmless as doves.

While Garvie was deeply involved in the process which resulted in the WCC, the movement that he served—and that others served long before him—was more than a history of conferences leading to an organisation called the World Council of Churches. What *is* that ecumenical movement ? It is the quickening of the People of Christ to the world-wide range of their obligations and the world-wide scope of their fellowship. It is a movement of the Spirit, exerting its pressures in every age—and through the differing circumstances of the age—upon all who confess and call themselves Christian. It constrains us to recognise and express our solidarity with all who confess the Name that is above every name ; it bids us bear witness to Christ and his Gospel to all, in all the world, who do not know or acknowledge that Name. Within dimensions as wide as the world, the ecumenical movement is evangelistic and unifying. It speaks of mission and unity to the ends of the earth and the end of time.

What has been the relation of historic Congregationalism to this movement ? What paths have its pathfinders trodden ? At the risk of too slight a treatment of so great a theme, I will glance at certain great stages in our story. (1) The classical period of the seventeenth century ; (2) The missionary and evangelical awakening from the close of the eighteenth century through the first half of the nineteenth century ; and (3) The search for organic unity in the latter half of the nineteenth, and first three decades of the twentieth centuries. Obviously this would constitute a better outline for a

[1]cf. A. E. Garvie, *Memories and Meanings of My Life* (1938) p. 196.

series of volumes than for an hour's discourse. I hope, however, there is value in trying to sense the most characteristic role of Congregationalists—the main accent of their witness and concern —in these great epochs of Christian history.

(1) At first it may seem somewhat paradoxical to speak of the ecumenical movement in conjunction with the events of our classical period. If *ecumenical* signifies a movement towards wholeness, world-wide unity and comprehension, surely seventeenth century Congregationalism illustrates the reverse of this. It was the period when great divisions within the community of Christians, notably those made more radical by the Reformation, became accentuated. Were we not born in disunity and separation ? Was not this even an *anti*-ecumenical period ? To assume that the answer to this is Yes is, of course, to be content with a very superficial reading of history ; it is to miss the meaning of Reformation and even the purpose of Separatism. For the real end of Reformation is the right-ordering of the Church *universal*, and the concern of the great separatists—more often than not, reluctant separatists—has been fidelity to principles without which there can be no universal Church which is true to the nature of the Gospel. I here attempt no elaboration of this : I simply re-assert what is too often overlooked even in some allegedly 'ecumenical conversations' today. Reformers and their heirs broke the unity of the Church, it is assumed. There were minor justifications for their behaviour. 'The Church' might have handled them more wisely and given less cause for offence. But all this is past and the wanderers may return. Their ecumenical movement is to move back home. So far, even the main outcome of Vatican Council II —for all the precious incidental consequences of a 'change of climate' and even the valour of reformers within the Roman Catholic Church — scarcely takes us beyond this. In this situation the pathfinders of the seventeenth century would still, I believe, point to the fundamental questions : 'What sort of Church is being unified ? To what Gospel, to what understanding of God, the world, and grace, must a universal Church testify in its order as well as its faith, in all its life and work ? ' What we have also to make more than ever clear is that these questions press upon us within a concern for the whole Church and for the wholeness of the Church, a concern for the unity of Christ's people in the 'true nature of a Gospel Church'. That phrase of John Owen reminds us of one of the pathfinders who, even amidst the sharpness of controversy and strife, thought of himself as a Catholic

Christian and believed that thanks to God's 'singular care and power' the separated churches, 'like so many ships, launched singly and sailing apart in the vast ocean of these tumultuating times', were found 'to have steered their course by the same chart and to have been bound for one and the same Port."[2] Again he wrote : 'Let men say . . . what they please or can to the contrary, I am no schismatic.'

> Whilst I have any comfortable persuasion, on grounds infallible, that I hold the head, and that I am by faith a member of the mystical body of Christ; whilst I make profession of all the necessary saving truths of the Gospel; . . . whilst I labour to exercise faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ and love toward all the saints, I do keep the unity which is of the appointment of Christ.[3]

Of course, in a period when, as an issue of life and death, what mattered was the defence of dissent and the justification for separation, it is not to be expected that the dominating emphasis would be upon the wholeness of the Church. In the circumstances of the time it is not surprising that the dissidence of dissent should find expression, or that the question of the nature of the Church and the purity of the Gospel and its life, should be a question which loomed larger than the matter of its visible unity. It is the more significant, therefore, that even in such circumstances, there were those who never lost sight of the need to give expression in spirit and behaviour to the unity of all Christians in Christ. Listen again to John Owen :

> It is the universal, collective body of them that profess the Gospel throughout the world which we own as the catholic church of Christ. Whatever share we are forced to bear in differences with or divisions from the members of this church, . . . as it is a continual sorrow and trouble unto us, so we acknowledge it to be our duty to endeavour after the strictest communion with them in all spiritual things that the gospel doth require, or whereof our condition in this world is capable.
>
> In the meantime, were Christians duly instructed how many lesser differences, in mind, judgment and practice, are really consistent with the nature, ends and genuine fruit of the unity that Christ requires among them, it would

[2]Introduction to *The Savoy Declaration.*
[3]*Of Schism* (1657), quoted by James Moffatt, *The Golden Book of John Owen* (1904), p. 102.

> undoubtedly prevail with them so to manage themselves in their differences by mutual forbearance and condescension in their love, as not to contract the guilt of being disturbers or breakers of it.[4]

Of all these reconciling pathfinders, I suppose none is more appealing than Richard Baxter who, though not strictly a Congregationalist, represents a catholic independency which has left its own distinctive mark upon our tradition. The term by which he preferred to be known was that of a 'Catholick Christian'. Failing this, he said, 'You could not have trulier called me than an Episcopal-Presbyterian-Independent'. His famous Associations of ministers — Conformist and Non-conformist, Independents, Presbyterians, Episcopalians — were more than 'ministers' fraternals'. They were endeavours to maintain or re-establish the unity of Christ's people across the doctrinal and political divisions of the age. Of the four contending parties, when 'controversies about Church government were in most men's mouths and made the greatest noise', each one, he said,

> had some truths in peculiar which the other overlooked or took little notice of, and each one had their proper mistakes which gave advantage to their adversaries, though all of them had so much truth in common among them as would have made these kingdoms happy if it had been unanimously and soberly reduced to practice by prudent and charitable men . . .

Again, he writes : 'I apprehend it a matter of great necessity to imprint true Catholicism upon the minds of Christians, it being a most lamentable thing to observe how few Christians in the world there be that fall not into one sect or another and wrong the common interest of Christianity . . . '. But alas, he had to say : 'while we wrangle here in the dark we are dying and passing to the world that will decide all our controversies'. Then he added: 'the safest passage thither is by peaceable holiness.'[5]

What made such a man a dissenter, a man who cared beyond most others for the unity of Catholic Christians ? It was because, pathfinder to unity as he sought to be, he knew there were some roads over which it would have to be written—for the Gospel's sake, for the sake of the truth about the Church—NO ENTRY. These were roads on which a particular liturgical attire—so to speak—was made compulsory ; or to traverse which the imprimatur of a bishop was made essential. Baxter had been episcopally

[4] *A Discourse concerning Evangelical Love, Church Peace, and Unity* (1672) Moffatt, *op. cit.*, pp. 103f.

[5] cf. *Autobiography.*

ordained and he favoured what he called ' the primitive episcopate.' He was not opposed to the use of a Book of Common Prayer. But, to quote Geoffrey Nuttall's summary of the matter, ' . . . . to a Church established on terms intended to exclude, he could not conform '.[6] He was, in fact, offered a bishopric, but he was convinced that Anglicanism, as it had become, had so distorted the office and spiritual significance of the bishop, that to accept it would—as he said—' disable me from an effectual promoting of the Church's peace '.[7]

Out of this classical period, then, there emerge pathfinders who, amidst all the agonies of separation, agonized also for the unity of Christ's people. They nevertheless saw that the question of truth about the nature of the Church was inseparable from the attainment of its wholeness. And within this question of truth was the conviction that if within the ordering of the Church there was an element, an office, a claim to authority, which finally conditioned or determined the sphere of grace, this was a denial of the true nature of a Gospel Church and a hindrance to its ultimate unity. I shall return to this at later points in this lecture. I now glance at that second great period, from the end of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth—the best years of ' the great century ' of missionary and evangelical enterprise.

I am inclined to think that it was no accident that the first two great missionary organizations to be born in the eighteenth century were led by men—and mainly supported by churches—in the Independent tradition : the Baptist Missionary Society in 1792 and the London Missionary Society in 1795. It is not my purpose to retell this familiar story, even in summary. I simply affirm, for example, that the famous ' fundamental principle ' of the LMS—which Van Dusen takes as the starting point of the modern ecumenical movement—was and is congenial to Congregationalists on grounds which belong to our conception of the essence of the Church. David Bogue's funeral sermon on the Death of Bigotry proved, alas, to be a bit premature, but his instinct was sound ; and Alexander Waugh's perspectives were right when he made his appeal :

> Art thou, my brother, inclined to approve of that particular form of church order which is known by the name of Episcopal, or Independent, or Presbyterian ? We invite thee to come and assist us with thy countenance, thy counsel, thy

[6]sf. *Richard Baxter* (1965).
[7]cf. *Autobiography.*

> prayers, and a reasonable measure of thy substance, while we are employed in sending the word of life, the oracles of God, to the heathen, and assuredly all the Episcopacy, all the Independency and all the Presbyterianism that he hath put into them. The Word of Life, this good, this perfect gift, which hath come down from the Father of Lights . . . forms the central, uniting point of our exertions.[8]

All the Episcopacy, all the Independency and all the Presbyterianism which he hath put into his Word. Unfortunately, Waugh didn't say how much that was and this nice point has for many decades provided the Faith and Order movement with an unfinished exercise. Waugh and his fellow-pathfinders were not contending that this was unimportant. They *were* contending—for they had realized it in faith and obedience—that such questions were subordinate ; subordinate to the fact of our given unity in the Spirit, subordinate to our response to the driving force of the Spirit which sends Christ's witnesses to the ends of the earth. In crossing the frontiers of mission there are given experiences which create the unity which otherwise we seek in vain. It was for this reason—not because of secondary factors or occasions, such as economy in man-power, avoiding overlapping, or even removing the 'scandal' of disunity—that organic unity between Presbyterians and Congregationalists was achieved fifty years ago in India and forty years ago in China, and that South India has confronted us with the practicability of union on a basis which includes episcopal as well as congregational and presbyterian elements. I want here to stress what I think has received too little recognition in recent years, namely, that the radical modification of the episcopate which characterizes the Church of South India was largely due to the influence, the pressure—to what was often regarded as stubbornness—on the part of Congregational missionaries and Indian leaders nurtured in our tradition. There were times when original sin seemed more potent in this than any original theology, but over the long period a considerable theological contribution to the discussion of episcopacy was made by Congregationalists. In particular, it was Vernon Bartlet who did more than any other theologian outside India to influence the scheme of union as finally adopted. The result is, I believe, a conception of the episcopate and of its place in the wholeness of the Church which Baxter may have been glad to accept—so much

[8] *Four Sermons Preached in London at the Third General Meeting of The Missionary Society* (1797).

so that the Church of England is still *out* of communion with the Church of South India and still—through successive Lambeth Conferences—urges its children elsewhere not to follow the CSI pattern.

The modern missionary movement gave us pathfinders who, in various parts of the world, have opened the way to unities achieved in mission. They would say still, I believe, that *only* in this missionary obedience can the unity that Christ wills be discerned and fulfilled. They may well go further and contend that achieved unities in the structural or institutional life of the Church will only remain instruments of the unity of the Spirit so long as mission—the Church's responsibility and privilege to witness to the ends of the earth—remains primary. If even a Church of South India ceases to put this first its structural unity will break.

I want now to put alongside this brief allusion to the missionary awakening of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries a similarly brief reflection upon the evangelical movement in its somewhat later phase towards the middle of the nineteenth century.

In 1845 there was published a volume called *Essays on Christian Union* to which eight authors contributed. Of these, two were Congregationalists—John Angell James of Carrs Lane, Birmingham, and Ralph Wardlaw of the Glasgow Church which later became known as Elgin Place. Both these names are linked with that of David Bogue who, though he never served abroad, was one of the most powerful of the founding-fathers of the London Missionary Society and founder of the Academy at Gosport which was the nursery of a great company of missionaries. Bogue was instrumental in the conversion of the Haldane brothers—Robert and James—the founders of Scottish Congregationalism, and it was the Haldanes who fired Ralph Wardlaw's evangelistic passion. John Angell James was a student at Bogue's Academy and held a Haldane Scholarship there. All these men belonged to those interlocking movements out of which emerged the London Missionary Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, anti-slavery movements and an immense range of Christian benevolences. In the volume to which I have referred, *Essays on Christian Union,* John Angell James cried :

> Why cannot we be one ? Is there no means to be devised by which we can come nearer to each other ? . . . Shall the infidel ever point the finger of scorn to the Church of Christ, possessed and rent and torn by the unclean spirit of sectarianism ? . . . What we want is a formal, visible union

> of parties . . . of which not only our own hearts shall be conscious . . . but which shall be apparent to others . . .

I have quoted James' words, eliminating rotundities which separate most of these words from one another. The man who could preach a memorized sermon lasting two hours, with only a pause to suck an orange mid-way, was not content with one version of a rhetorical question. But I must quote more fully one of his arguments for giving a lead to Christian unity in England :

> Our national greatness gives extraordinary publicity to our conduct and weight to our example . . . With a population of 18 million, a commerce whose sails whiten every sea and lands its merchandise on every shore ; great in learning, science and the arts ; terrible in power and generous in spirit, she is feared by many, envied by more and respected by all . . . How much therefore is it to be desiderated that such a nation should set an example to all others of Christian union ? From what country on earth will such a lesson go forth as from this ? It seems our very calling. Providence has placed us on this pinnacle for this . . . How high and sacred an honour would it be if we could say to all the bigoted and intolerant nations of the globe Look on us . . . How blessed a report would it be to go forth from hence that in England, free England, great and mighty England, the different denominations of professing Christians had agreed together to retain their principles but abandon their prejudices . . .

There was more to it than this, but these were the men whose initiative, through such tracts for the times as this volume, led to the creation in 1846 of the Evangelical Alliance. There were, of course, limits to the charity of these good men. For John Angell James 'Popery, Puseyism and Plymouth-Brethrenism' were without the pale, though it was upon the *systems* represented by these terms that he poured his verbal fire and brimstone. Individuals within these vile systems could be rescued by a genuine evangelical experience—and indeed from the beginning large numbers of evangelical Anglicans found themselves at home in the Alliance. When we think of the later stages of the modern ecumenical movement we tend to give greatest credit for nursing its leaders to the Student Christian Movement. More credit than is commonly accorded is, in fact, also due to the Evangelical Alliance. In its formative years it commanded the allegiance of such large-hearted Congregationalists as Thomas Binney and John Stoughton both of whom were intimate friends of Dean Stanley and were workers

with him and other leading Anglicans in a host of reconciling endeavours. John Stoughton—a very readable historian, whose long ministry in Kensington was in the spiritual succession of Richard Baxter, though accompanied by fewer hazards—suggested in 1862 that the bicentenary of 1662 should be made an occasion for honouring *all* sacrifices for conscience sake and he therefore paid tribute to the memory of Jeremy Taylor as well as Richard Baxter.[9]

Pathfinders of this spirit, whether working through such organizations as the Evangelical Alliance, or through a wide-ranging personal ministry across the denominational frontiers like that of Henry Allon of Islington Chapel, pointed to the supreme importance of building institutional unity on the basis of the deepest personal relationships in the faith. They were the kind of men who could make one of John Wesley's favourite texts their own : 'Is thy heart right as my heart is right with thy heart? If it be, give me thy hand.' And they point still to the truth that without charity of this kind structural devices for unity will profit nothing.

I turn now to the third and last of the three periods from which I draw—very sketchily—my illustrations. It was the period in which—largely because of those experienced unities which were the product of missionary obedience and of personal commitment to one another in Christ, great endeavours were made to express the unity of all Christ's people in the ordering of the Church. This was and is—the quest for organic unity. It is to the credit of the Anglican communion that notable initiatives were taken during this period by successive Lambeth Conferences as well as by individual leaders. These had their parallels and in some instances their response in a considerable number of Free Church endeavours in which Congregationalists played a large part. The starting-point of the Lambeth appeals was in 1888 when it was still a new thing for the Anglican communion throughout the world to try to speak through an official representative voice. These conferences of bishops got off to a doubtful start in 1867 and it was only in 1888 that it was decided to make them decennial affairs, of a consultative, not mandatory, character. It was at this conference that a commission was appointed on the subject of 'Home Reunion,' and out of the work of this commission there emerged what became known as the 'Lambeth Quadrilateral' As this famous declaration has remained central to union dis-

[9]John Stoughton *Recollections of a Long Life* (1894).

cussions in this country for nearly eighty years—and is still regarded as fundamental by Anglicans, it is as well to recall some of its original terms, though they have since been presented in less rigid contexts :

> We do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired . . . can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence : which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his apostles to the Church unto the end of the world and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender :
>
> 1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith :
> 2. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith :
> 3. The two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution :
> 4. The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration.

What was the reaction of our Congregational pathfinders to this ? The largest NO ENTRY sign was put up by one of those many Congregationalists who in spirit and in the range of their personal friendships reflected, again, much of the temper of Baxter. They believed in and lived for the true nature of a Gospel and Catholic Church. The one I now quote was Robert Forman Horton, scholar, preacher, mystic, inspirer of countless missionaries and the minister of Lyndhurst Road Church, Hampstead, in its greatest period. Said Horton :

> To come forward and invite the Nonconformists to reunion on the bland terms that they should incontinently surrender the very point for which they had striven . . . was not, when one comes to reflect, a probable way of securing the object. Confusion of thought could hardly go further ; it raised a previous question, whether Episcopal intelligence could justify the surrender which Episcopal charity demanded.[10]

I must emphasize what I have said about subsequent uses of the Lambeth Quadrilateral in less rigid contexts. In particular, the Lambeth Conference of 1920, in what was felt at the time to be

[10]R. F. Horton, *The Reunion of English Christendom* (1905), pp. 143f.

an epoch-making ' Appeal to All Christian People ' associated with this ' substantial deposit ' admissions and tentative proposals which reflected a very different atmosphere. There was, first, a far more explicit acknowledgement than had been contemplated hitherto that non-episcopal ministries had been blessed of God and used by his Spirit ; secondly, that elusive phrase ' the historic episcopate ' appeared still to be open to discussion and capable of more than one interpretation ; thirdly, procedures for the mutual recognition of ministers, or for the ' unification ' of the ministry, gave some promise of clearly avoiding the inference that re-ordination was implied. Between these Lambeth Conferences of 1888 and 1920 and in the few years following 1920 Congregationalists were active, in public speech and writing, and especially in conference with other denominational leaders, to so great an extent that even a list of significant names would be too lengthy to repeat. Again, I can only be selective. Horton was only one of a great company of eminent men who, by their scholarship, their eminence in public affairs as well as their pulpit renown, were greatly respected in all the churches and not least by many leading Anglicans. Arnold Thomas of Bristol was a contemporary and kindred spirit to Horton. ' There is no good reason ', he wrote, ' why we should continue to be Nonconformists, and I trust the time will come when we shall no longer be called by that name. I confess I do not relish the name.' And yet, out of experience of his discussions with Anglicans he had to say :

> I doubt whether there is any belief prevailing at the present day which is a greater hindrance to the coming of the Kingdom of God than this belief (*in the ' Apostolic Succession '—Ed.*) For it is fatal to that unity of spirit and abiding peace among Christian people without which the work of the Church can never be effectually accomplished . . . . Probably there is no heresy which is more injurious to the best interests of the Church.[11]

Alexander Mackennal of Manchester publicly acknowledged that in their endeavour to interpret eirenically the intention of the Lambeth Conference of 1888, Anglican leaders had shown a ' marvellous spirit of generosity and self-abnegation ' ; he could accept the first three articles of the Quadrilateral ; but Nonconformists, he believed would never assent to exalting the historic episcopate into a position alongside the Bible, the Creeds and the Sacraments.

[11] *Arnold Thomas of Bristol : Collected Papers and Addresses* (Edited by Nathaniel Micklem (1925), pp. 61f., 64.

> He had been reminded, he said, of a moment in the Savoy Conference when the question was put to the Puritan Nonconformists : " You say it is a matter of non-conscience to you the wearing of vestments or even the acknowledgement of the episcopate itself. Why then, do you make so strenous an objection to it ? " The Puritan reply was : " It is not a matter of conscience in itself, but the position to which you are exalting it makes it a matter of conscience with us."[12]

Of the position and experience of our pathfinders towards the end of this period 1888-1920, the period of the main Lambeth Conferences, I shall say a word shortly as I bring this survey to a close. Before then—and still more briefly—I remind you that this was the period which saw the creation of the Free Church Council, the first of the meetings of an International Congregational Council, and a World Presbyterian Alliance, and the famous Grindelwald Conferences, organized by Henry Lunn, between Anglicans and Free Churchmen. Mackennal, Dale, C. A. Berry, as well as others to whom I have already referred, were leading lights in all these movements. Most significant in relation to the post-1920 developments and the period in which we stand, there came the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh 1910, itself an achievement which would not have been possible apart from preparatory processes, direct and indirect, which engaged some of the best minds of the home churches as well as representatives of the great missionary societies. Here also the difficulty is to do justice to the role of Congregationalists without compiling long lists of names. Present at Edinburgh itself there were Wardlaw Thompson and R. F. Horton, R. J. Wells and Nelson Bitton, Albert Spicer and Talbot Wilson, Basil Mathews and H. C. Carter. In the leadership and sometimes the staff-work of the Student Christian Movement, with all the impetus which this movement gave both to mission and unity, Congregationalists included such men as Frank Lenwood, Morton Barwell, McEwan Lawson and Malcolm Spencer. Their concern for Christian unity was inseparable from their passion for social justice, for evangelism and for foreign missions. Moreover, there was a growing conviction among such men that unity was not only relevant to social action and effective missionary witness ; it was needful for the local Church's true understanding of its nature and calling. ' Might it not be,' wrote Malcolm Spencer,

[12]Dugald Macfadyen, *Life and Letters of Alexander Mackennal* (1905), p. 226.

that our individual churches lack the high spiritual vitality proper to a Church because they are not sufficiently braced and stimulated by the pressure of the revelation enshrined in other Churches (just as the others may be suffering from the lack of our emphasis upon the important principle of local autonomy) ?

If the single local Christian congregation is to have the plenary inspiration of the whole Church it must learn how to maintain contact with the representatives of other Christian Communions, to accept the discipline of trying in humility to understand and appreciate their special insights.[13]

Why was it that a period which culminated in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, which included Congregationalists and other Free Churchmen of the temper just illustrated and which was blessed with the spiritual significance of Edinburgh 1910, did not result in more impressive achievements in the realm of organic unity ? Why did Lambeth 1920 fail, to such an extent that ten years later, when Lambeth 1930 met, the general mood was a much more discouraging one and the prospects for unity less hopeful ? To some of the most notable Congregational pathfinders—or path seekers—of this period, the main reason was clear. Faults on all sides were admitted. There were intransigent Free Churchmen just as there were intransigent Anglicans. But the insuperable stumbling-block and the ground of repeated frustration and disappointment in discussion and conference, lay in that fourth article of the Lambeth Quadrilateral concerning the ' historic episcopate '. Some, indeed most, of the Congregationalists I have named in the last few minutes were prepared to do what years later Archbishop Fisher asked the Free Churches to do—to take episcopacy into their system, PROVIDED it was a kind of episcopacy which was not made finally determinative of the gift of grace in ordination. As K. L. Parry put it, in an address to Anglicans in 1929 : ' We are perfectly willing to retain Episcopacy within the Fellowship. But we cannot consent, and never will consent, to confine the Fellowship within the institution of Episcopacy.[14] Episcopal functions, yes ; spiritual oversight and care . . . but *not* a conception of episcopal authority and office as the only and

[13] " The Reconciliation of Individual and Corporate Revelation ", an address to the Eighth Theological Conference of Congregationalists, 1934, reproduced in *The Congregational Quarterly*, (October, 1934) pp. 542ff.

[14] " The Free Churches and Unity ", an address given at All Hallows Church, Lombard Street, London ; reproduced in *The Congregational Quarterly* (July, 1929).

essential guarantee of grace in ordination and continuity with the Church of the New Testament. J. D. Jones—who was sometimes suspected by his Free Church brethren of being too willing to compromise at this point was, in fact, in no doubt about the issue at stake. He had been signatory, with the two Archbishops, to a statement which said :

> Ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's words and administer the Sacraments, as Christ has ordained, and to whom authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned are real ministers of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.

But, alas ; recalling this agreement, J. D. Jones had to say, ' Our Anglican friends have not yet accepted the logical consequences of that declaration ' ; and after his retirement he wrote : A solid union can never be built on the basis of studied ambiguities, and all the Schemes hitherto propounded abound in them. The differences between Anglicans and Free Churchmen strike deep. We are not one in our conception of the ministry '.[15] In the same sad vein Garvie confessed towards the end, ' Much as I have pondered this matter I must admit that I have not yet got even a glimpse of the synthesis in which the Catholic thesis and the Protestant antithesis can be harmonized . . . I have tried to understand the Catholic position so as to rise, if I could, above the opposition, but I have failed.'

Yet none of these men would either give up the quest or retreat into any kind of contentment with separation. ' I think that possibly I have always had a keener sense of the Catholic Church,' wrote J. D. Jones, ' than have most Congregationalists. Congregationalists have been tremendously devoted to the *local* Church, but have not always given much thought to the *total* Church. I did not belong simply to the Congregational Church, I belonged to the Holy Catholic Church.'[16] Along what road this might still be made more manifest was the unceasing quest of these Congregational pathfinders. If they did not always succeed in being path-*finders* they continued to be path-*seekers*, leaving with us the lessons they learned, the experience they gained and the hopes they cherished. I began this lecture with a salute to A. E. Garvie, and I have had to return to his name in connection with disappointments in the quest. But Garvie's ecumenical zeal was not quenched between

[15] J. D. Jones, *Three Score Years and Ten* (1940) pp. 200f ; 205.
[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 199.

1920 and 1930. After Lambeth 1920 came COPEC—a famous conference on Christian responsibility in Politics, Economics and Citizenship—with the Congregationalists Malcolm Spencer and Will Reason amongst its architects and Garvie its enthusiastic chairman. In 1925 Garvie was at Stockholm for the Life and Work Conference, and in 1927 (with W. B. Selbie, Vernon Bartlet and others) he was at Lausanne for the Faith and Order Conference. In the '30s came the decision to launch the World Council of Churches and, even through the dark years which followed, ecumenical relationships were widened and deepened, leading to the achievements of these last few decades which constitute at least the beginning of a new ecumenical era. Within the manifold tasks and pursuits of the movement in this era, we have still to discover, in the sphere of ecclesiastical unity, that reconciliation which the pathfinders sought but did not attain. In this, I believe, the reaching of agreement on the meaning and role of *episkope* within the wholeness of the Church constitutes still our hardest problem, and one in which we must take heed still even of some of the earlier NO ENTRY signs. Yet even at this intractable point there is to be discerned at least a new willingness within the historic episcopal churches to distinguish between *episkope* as a function of the Church and the episcopate as an office determinative of the ways of grace. But whether progress in this sphere is accelerated or tarries, the term 'change of climate' is justified in relation to more than the consequences of Vatican Council II. In this change of climate and in this strange new world, if we take its newness seriously and are not daunted by its strangeness, we may yet find paths to that better country in which the unity that Christ wills is perceived in its true nature and realised in glad obedience—paths by way of which the solidarity of Christ's people is seen and found, not as an end in itself, but as a consequence of concern for the unity of all mankind in the knowledge, the saving power and the service of Christ.

NORMAN GOODALL

"QUEEN ANNE'S DEAD!" AN UNUSUAL FUNERAL SERMON

"Queen Anne's dead!" The *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* refers us to *The Heir at Law*, a comedy by George Colman first produced in 1797. It would have been in use for some time before appearing in literary form; and it seems likely to have arisen among the Dissenters, who had good reason to dwell gratefully on Queen Anne's death. "Pray, Sir, is this a funeral?" one of the black-gowned London ministers was asked when they were on their way with a Loyal Address to the new King, George I. "Yes!" replied Thomas Bradbury, their leader against Jacobitism and High Church, and the minister who prayed boldly for the House of Hanover when apprised of the Queen's death by the dropping of a handkerchief from the gallery: "Yes! It is the funeral of the Schism Bill, and the resurrection of liberty!"

The purpose of the Schism Act, which had been passed in the previous year, was to prohibit Dissenters from teaching in schools or Academies. One of the Academies temporarily closed was that at Warrington superintended by Charles Owen, the Dissenting minister in the town. Owen, who was to become a leader of Hanoverian Nonconformity in the North of England, thus had good grounds for rejoicing in the Queen's death and the change of dynasty; within five years the Schism Act was, in fact, repealed.

Now in the *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches . . . in London*, iii (1810), Walter Wilson claims to have seen a sermon on the Queen's death preached by Owen from *I Kings* xvi. 30 ('And Ahab, the son of Omri, did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him'). He does not give its title, however. In *Lancashire Nonconformity* Halley picks up Wilson's reference; Gordon also mentions the sermon in his article on Owen in the *D.N.B.*; but they appear not to have seen it, for again no title is given.

A copy of *Ahab's Evil: a Funeral Discourse on a Late Occasion* (followed by the text), London: Printed and sold by J. Baker in Pater-Noster-Row, 1714, Price 6d., is in the library of New College, London, with a manuscript attribution to Charles Owen, and with the signature of a former owner, R[oger] Flexman, minister at Jamaica Row, Rotherhithe, from 1747 to 1783. That Owen published the sermon anonymously (as he did several other pieces) and with no overt reference to the nature of the 'late occasion' is not surprising. For another publication in the following year he was in fact prosecuted.

Of the sermon's 38 pages only pages 3-15 are given to conventional exposition of the text. Owen then proceeds to ' reflect back upon the Lives of some of our Kings, that we may see how many of them have deserv'd the Memory of Blessed,' and provides scornful and racy comment on each of the Stuarts in turn. James I was ' a great Blasphemer, and would swear faster than speak.' Charles I was ' a Prince that raised and wasted more Treasures, wilfully spilt more innocent Blood, divested more the Lands and Habitations of his Subjects, ruin'd more Families, and more embroil'd this gallant Nation, than any since the coming in of the Norman Race.' Charles II ' continu'd to persecute many of the People of God, whilst himself made Provision for the Flesh, to fulfil it in the Lust thereof.' Of James II he says that ' tho' not altogether so lascivious as the former, yet he was a very Bigot to the Church of Rome ' ; till ' the Sacred Fences of our Laws, the very Constitution of our Legislature were quite broken thro'.' ' And now comes in the Brave K. William, a Prince of Blessed Memory indeed.' ' who deliver'd us from Popery, French Slavery, and Arbitrary Government.' Then we have the following.

> But as for Queen Anne, I only say, that she dy'd the first Day of August, that very Day that the Schism-Bill took place, and was buried on that Day commonly called Black Bartholomew, the very Day on which her Uncle turn'd 2000 godly Ministers out of their Livings. And there's an End of the Race of the Stuarts, I say an End of the Stuarts. (p. 30).

To claim this passage as the actual source of the saying " Queen Anne's dead ! " is not necessary ; but it may indicate the milieu in which the saying originated. Owen's sermon evidently enjoyed some popularity at the time, for it ran into five editions (the New College copy is the second). It appears now to be rare. There is a copy in the British Museum, but it is left anonymous, as it is in W. T. Morgan's *Bibliography of British History, 1700-1715* (Bloomington, Ind., 1934-42). This work lists another sermon, *The Rebel's Doom* (1716) as ' by the author of *Ahab's Evil.*' The New College copy of *Ahab's Evil* is bound with another anonymous sermon also with Flexman's autograph and also attributed to Charles Owen, *A Funeral Sermon Preachd to a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters, Upon the sad Occasion Of the Death of the Late Bishop of Sarum.* This was Gilbert Burnet, whom Owen compares admiringly with Samuel.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL

ARCHIVES AT CHESHUNT COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

In 1964 one of the writers of this article wrote (*Archives*, vol. VI, p. 237) that Cheshunt College had no archives. At that time the College believed this to be true, but two years later the other writer looked more closely in different parts of the College and found more than 100 volumes of minutes, accounts and the like in the common room and five boxes of papers in the secretary's office. Other manuscripts and archives were found in the combination room and the library during the course of a search which brought to light cuneiform tablets and a collection of butterflies. The removal of the college to Westminster College buildings in the autumn of 1967 has made it necessary to discover the extent of the College's possessions in detail.

Cheshunt College is the direct descendant of Trevecka College founded by Selina, Countess of Huntingdon at Talgarth in Brecknockshire in 1768. The original buildings still stand, although they are now occupied by a farmer, close to the settlement established by Howell Harris. Long after the Countess's College had moved to Hertfordshire Howell Harris's settlement became a second Trevecka College, for training ministers of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church. It has more recently been used as a school and in 1966 was converted into a youth centre—both under the auspices of the Welsh Church.

Because the Countess's building was only held on a short lease it was soon decided to move elsewhere. The Countess favoured a site near her chapel at Swansea, but the Apostolic Society, which took over the responsibility for her College four years before her death in 1791, moved it in the following year to Cheshunt in Hertfordshire. In 1905 the college moved to temporary buildings in Cambridge and in 1913 the foundation stone of the present building was laid by Viscount Haldane.

The archives now discovered can be divided into three main groups—the papers of the Countess, the archives of her College, and the papers relating to her Connexion, together with a few other miscellaneous items which have been given to the College.

When found the Countess's papers were arranged in bundles, some of which had been examined between 1905 and 1916. At that time a few letters of particular interest had been extracted and placed in showcases in the library (where they still remain).

The rest of the bundles have probably not been examined since 1792 when they were parcelled up for the move from Trevecka. There is no definite evidence that any of them were used for the Countess's official biography, *The Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon* (2 vols., London, 1844), and their existence has been unknown to almost everyone for 180 years.

But the collection of papers is curiously incomplete. Almost nothing earlier than 1770 survives and there are curious gaps after that date, including the correspondence with Howell Harris. This correspondence can be recovered from the Trevecka letters at the National Library of Wales, but other gaps are not so easily filled. Since these papers were almost certainly at Trevecka in 1791 of the other houses in her possession and that it was these other papers which her official biographer used in 1844. Unfortunately, it is possible that the Countess left the rest of the archives at one their present location is unknown. Some of her earlier papers are still to be found with the Hastings family archives and have been printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in their *Report on the Hastings MSS*, vol. III and by the Huntington Library in *The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne* (ed. C. F. Mullett, California, 1940).

There are about 1,000 letters and papers ; one half is concerned with the Countess's chapels and other Methodists and the other half with the Orphan House established by George Whitefield in Georgia. The Countess inherited this property by Whitefield's will and her attempts to run it from the wrong side of the Atlantic were hampered by ineffective agents, fire and the American Revolution. These problems must be seen in the context of her difficulties in establishing and maintaining congregations in England and Wales. While reinforcing the picture of the Countess as an energetic and optimistic woman, the papers show a far more pleasant and human character than the picture of the Countess drawn by her sanctimonious official biographer, A. C. H. Seymour.

The college archives begin with the printed proceedings at its opening in 1768 and the minute book of the Apostolic Society established in 1787 to ' preserve the Countess's College in Wales or elsewhere ' and which took over the responsibility for it after her death. This volume contains the minutes of the governing body up to 1793 and it is followed by a continuous series of trustees' minute books up to the present time as well as several committee minute books. The printed annual reports begin in 1792 and a

continuous series of these has also been preserved. The books into which letters have been copied by the old-fashioned 'press' method run from about 1864 to 1910. Unfortunately the dates on these volumes are not always clear and the copies are sometimes difficult to read, but they form a useful addition to the formal minutes. The subscriptions of the trustees and staff between 1787 and 1899 to fifteen articles of faith and the rules for the government of the college are preserved in one volume. There are also various registers and photographs of students and bundles of correspondence relating to the trust, the admission of students and similar matters. Other papers are concerned with William Bull and the academy at Newport Pagnell which amalgamated with Cheshunt and the Oldham Trust.

The archives of the Countess's Connexion preserved at the college are not very extensive and this is particularly disheartening because the secretary of the Connexion has no minute books more than a hundred years old. There is a set of printed trust deeds and a few bundles of papers of general interest, but the rest relate to individual churches. The early records of Spa Fields (later Northampton) chapel, London are there. The other chapels represented by minute books and accounts are Ashbourne (Derbys.) and Enfield (Middx.). As the boxes containing these papers have not yet been examined in detail, it is possible that more will eventually be discovered.

The miscellaneous papers, which have evidently been presented to the college at different times, include a large quantity of manuscript sermons. Some of these, together with a few letters, originally came from the Congregational churches at Bideford and Barnstaple in North Devon and include late seventeenth as well as eighteenth century papers. There are eight volumes of William Copeland Astbury's diary recording the activities of an active and ecumenical Evangelical gentleman in the 1830s and 1840s. He played an important part in the revitalising of Repton School. William Bull may have presented the manuscript translation of a work by Mme. Guyon which has also come to light. But perhaps the most surprising discovery is a contemporary manuscript copy of Henry Barrowe's book—*A True Description of the Word of God of the Visible Church, 1589*. Its discovery raises the interesting question about other theological colleges—How many similar priceless documents have been presented to them and are now hidden away in their cupboards and boxes ?

STEPHEN ORCHARD AND C. EDWIN WELCH

INFANT'S FRIEND SOCIETY

BRUNSWICK CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

Pastor — Rev. T. P. Lansdowne[1]

RULES

I. That this Society be known as the "Infants' Friend Society, Brunswick Congregational Church."

II. That its object be the Relief of Poor Married Women during their confinement.

III. That the Society be managed by a Committee of Ladies (at least six), who shall be elected annually. Two-thirds of the Committee constitute a quorum.

IV. The Committee shall meet at least once a month for the transaction of business and work of the Society.

V. That a Meeting be held twice during the year, to which the Mothers who have been helped be invited. A Tea to be provided, followed by a Baptismal Service.

VI. That a Statement of Accounts be rendered to the Church at its Annual Meeting, and that the Officers be elected.

VII. That no person receiving help from another similar Society be eligible for this one.

VIII. That there be provided for the use of every poor woman relieved two chemises, two night-gowns, a shawl, a pair of sheets, two pillow-cases. For the infant two shirts, two blankets, two gowns and twelve diapers.

IX. That all articles belonging to the Society be plainly stamped, and with every box a pound of soap be enclosed ; also a Bible and suitable tracts.

X. That the Member of the Society recommending the case shall, with one other, visit the recipient, and relieve her with a sum not exceeding two shillings of the funds of the Society.

XI. That, at the expiration of one month, the Committee see that the box of linen be returned clean and in good order.

XII. That in the event of the clothes being returned clean and in good order, *half* the *Infant's Clothes* shall be *given* to the poor woman, with one additional shilling.

[1]T. P. Lansdowne was minister from 1894-99.

REVIEWS

Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Puritan Spirit : Essays and Addresses.* Epworth Press, 358 pp. 42s.

This is a book to browse in and also one to treasure for future reference. By bringing together lectures, articles and reviews prepared during a period of some thirty-five years, Dr. Nuttall has provided rich and varied, as well as substantial, fare. It reveals the wide range of the author's interests and scholarship. Papers on Dante and Erasmus and on a visit to Chartres are to be found side by side with more substantial (and less unexpected) treatments of George Fox, Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge. Towards the end of the volume, together with two University Sermons and some shrewd comments on the Ecumenical Movement, one comes upon brief but welcome appreciations of W. B. Selbie, William Temple, A. D. Martin and A. G. Matthews.

Dr. Nuttall is famed for his mastery of 17th Century Nonconformity and is acquainted with the by-ways as well as the more familiar places and personalities. It is good to have brought together here material which supplements his notable book on *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* and his illuminating, detailed studies of 'Visible Saints', both English and Welsh. One reader at least takes leave to doubt, however, whether Arminianism had as much to do with the missionary revival at the end of the 18th Century as is suggested in the paper read to an Arminius-Symposium in 1961. Both William Carey and Andrew Fuller were under the influence of Jonathan Edwards.

'We are all shy and reserved about our greatest experiences', writes Dr. Nuttall in his paper on 'The Minister's Devotional Life'. This is in fact one of the two papers which reveals most of the author's personal convictions and attitudes. The other is his Drew Lecture on Immortality. One could wish indeed for a little more self-disclosure. Unlike many of his denominational contemporaries, Dr. Nuttall emphasises that 'part of the historical interest of Congregationalism is in its inter-weaving of the Calvinist and Anabaptist strands' and declares his own sympathy with the Anabaptist strand. An ancestry running back into Northamptonshire Nonconformity through six generations and illustrated by references to inscriptions in a burial-ground in Sibbertoft help to explain this. His understanding of more radical religious attitudes was no doubt strengthened by having among his tutors A. D. Lindsay and W. B. Selbie and by friendship with F. J. Powicke.

Three things Dr. Nuttall believes Christian ministers should constantly have in mind are the large outlook, the ordered life and the tender spirit. The reader of these pages will realise what the author's friends well know, that he has himself cultivated these qualities with marked success. In one of the latest of the papers he quotes a remark of B. L. Manning : 'The main value of history is for the heart. It keeps the heart tender, as only a study of our own poor humanity can.' Would that this was more widely realised.

To both author and publisher we must be grateful for this attractive and satisfying volume.

E.A.P.

Lady Glenorchy and Her Churches—The Story of Two Hundred Years by Rev. D. P. Thomson (Perth, 1967). Obtainable from The Research Unit, Barnoak, Crieff, Perthshire, 7s. 6d.

It would be as unfair to call Lady Glenorchy the Scottish Countess of Huntingdon as it would be to call Howell Harris the Welsh George Whitefield. Yet to most people outside Scotland it is the best potted biography. The editor of the *Concise Dictionary of National Biography* was obviously of this view when he summed up Lady Glenorchy's life—'adopted peculiar religious views *c.*1764 ; founded chapels for her followers . . . . '

Lady Glenorchy was born in 1741, the daughter of a Dr. Maxwell, but her mother was an heiress who married secondly the Lord Justice Clerk of Scotland. As a result of the second marriage both Miss Maxwells married members of the Scottish peerage in 1761. Lord Glenorchy, Dr. Thomson hints, had a bad reputation, but no proof of the contemporary gossip about him is supplied here. A few years later Lady Glenorchy came into contact with the English Calvinistic Methodist movement. Dr. Thomson is equally uninformative about this. He briefly mentions her acquaintance with the daughter of Sir Richard Hill and ignores her meeting with the Countess of Huntingdon in order to concentrate on her one meeting with John Wesley. But the Calvinistic Methodist link was undoubtedly more important in her life than the Wesleyan and it was Sir Richard Hill who made her acquainted with her two earliest chaplains—Erasmus Middleton and Thomas Grove, two of the St. Edmund Hall Methodists.

Lady Glenorchy founded or revived meetings at Edinburgh (1770), Strathfillan (1773), Exmouth (1777), Carlisle (1781), Matlock Bath (1784), Bristol and Workington (1786). The two Scottish

churches became Presbyterian and survived in different ways the Disruption of 1843; the English churches all became Congregational. She died in 1786 and although her friend Lady Maxwell continued her work for a time the meetings seem to have been left to shift for themselves. She also appears to have founded an academy on the same plan as Trevecka College, but Dr. Thomson gives no details of this. On the basis of this book it is a small achievement and it does not justify Dr. Thomson's disparaging reference to the Countess of Huntingdon in his introduction.

However it is clear that this book was written in a hurry—between the early summer of 1966 and March 1967 according to the introduction—and it suffers from the usual defects of centennial histories.

C.E.W.

Also received: A Profile in Courage (Henry Montgomery, 1788-1865) by William McMillan (Newry, 1966), n.p., E. Hodgett Ltd., 4 Margaret St., Newry.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES

The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, Vol. XIII, *No.* 3 (May 1966) includes a brief article by N. Caplan on 'Presbyterian ministers in Sussex: Checking the accuracy of Common Fund Surveys, 1690-91'.

Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society, Vol. XIII, *No.* 4 (May 1966) includes the Index to Vol. XIII. Roger Thomas gives an interesting account of the tracing of some MSS of Edmund Calamy, which had been assumed lost.

The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society, Vol. 51, *No.* 1 (1965) 'The Apprenticeship of George Fox' is an attempt by Janet P. Whitney to describe the formative period of Fox's life.

Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society, Vol. XXXV, *Parts* 5, 6, 7 and 8 (March to December, 1966). The Index to Vol. XXXV is included in Part 8.

The Baptist Quarterly, Vol. XXI, *No's* 5, 6, 7 and 8 (January to October, 1966). No. 6 has a useful survey by M. J. Walker on 'Baptist Theology of Infancy in the 17th Century'. An interesting glimpse of the last century is given by K. R. M. Short in No. 7: 'English Baptists and the Corn Laws'.