

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

William Law, Controversialist and Mystic.

I N this paper little attempt will be made to give biographical details of Law, as the writer agrees with Miss Hester Gibbon (who surely was qualified to judge) "his life is in his works." Suffice it to say that he was born at Kingscliffe, Northamptonshire, in 1686, and was one of a large family. His father was a grocer, but of good social standing, and William, the fourth son, was sent to Cambridge, where he became a fellow of Emmanuel College.

Our main interest is in his religious development, and we lament the loss sustained by the literature of devotion resulting from his silence respecting the inner story of his own pilgrimage. His journey was from the circumference to the centre, from ordinances to personality, from the Gospel to Christ and his final position is very near the heart of Christianity. The purpose of this paper will be to show the path he traced and the end he reached.

Law began his literary career in 1717 as a controversialist, and he never forsook this rôle. First he wrote on ecclesiastical questions, then on theological. He followed on as a champion of practical religion and as an exponent of mysticism—yet he never forgot either deists or indifferent Christians. In order to understand Law's first literary venture it is necessary to recall a little history. When William III. was recognised as King in 1689, about 300 clergy with a number of laymen refused to take the vow of allegiance. They were given the name "Non Jurors." In 1716 Law himself joined them, having courageously resolved to sacrifice all his prospects. He went, therefore, into private life and gave himself to tutorial appointments and to writing. At one time he was tutor in the Gibbon household, and later its spiritual director. Edw. Gibbon, the historian, though uninfluenced by Law's ideas, put on record the following judgment, "In our family Wm. Law left the reputation of a worthy and pious man, who believed all he professed, and practised all he enjoined." His retirement considerably affected Law's ideas, and always he spoke as one removed from the busy traffic of life. The "Non Jurors" had two important principles. *First*, they refused to acknowledge

William's title to the throne, and *second*, they declined to admit that even a legitimate King had the right to dethrone officers of the Church of England without ecclesiastical sanction. They were called "British Hottentots, as blind and bigoted as their brethren about the Cape, but more savage in their manners." Yet sufficient evidence is forthcoming that on the whole their scholarship was profound, and their temper excellent. When in 1691 the vacant seats were filled, the question of the nature of the church was raised and some "Non Jurors" went so far as to declare the national church to be in schism. Dr. Hickee was a party to Non Juring episcopal succession, and he even denied to the usurping bishops any share in the fruits of the Incarnation. He died in 1715, but a posthumous work was published which contained an attack on all who had taken the oath. This led to Bishop Hoadly's reply, and to the Bangorian Controversy. In his "Preservation," Hoadly proposed sincerity as the only test of truth, and declared the church to be subject to the state. He followed this with a sermon on "The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ." He identified the Kingdom with the Church, and insisted that neither was of this world.

"Jesus," he said, "left behind no visible human authority, no viceregent, no interpreters upon which the subjects were absolutely to depend, no judges of the consciences, or religion of His people." These utterances roused the clerical host, with the result that the Government prorogued the Lower House of Convocation (May 17th, 1717). The controversy, however, went on, and in the ranks of the defenders arose William Law, who addressed three letters to Bishop Hoadly between 1717-19. It is impossible in this paper to speak of their contents at length. They have been called "an abiding treasure of English theology," but their misfortune is to have been produced in pre-critical days. They show great logical ability and powers of reasoning, and are models of clear and precise English, but there is a complete acceptance of views of such matters as apostolic succession which do not issue from thorough historical investigation.

In his first letter Law indignantly denies Hoadly's declaration that "regular uninterrupted successions, and authoritative benedictions, are niceties, trifles, and dreams." He attacks Hoadly's view of authority, and claims that the clergy have authority from Christ, and that a constant visible government in church and state is equally necessary. There are two valuable sections on non-ecclesiastical matters, one in which he makes short work of Hoadly's theory (which the Deists shared) that sincerity is enough, and another in which he rejects Hoadly's declaration that prayer should be a calm and unenthusiastic address to God.

The second letter is longer, and in it our author speaks of Confirmation, Ordination, the consecration of the Lord's Supper, Apostolic Succession, and Absolutions. In each defence he goes back to Scripture quotations either particular or general. For example, he founds his argument regarding Confirmation on Hebrews vi. 1-2. He appeals also to primitive observance and to universal practice. His proofs depend on his view of bishops as the successors of the apostles. For Law the Scriptures are *dictated* by the Holy Ghost, and are regarded as inerrant. But more than this, he never attempts any thorough examination of the New Testament words "apostle," "presbyter," "deacon," "bishop." Hoadly would not appear to hold that the Holy Spirit has guided the Church in its appointments, but Law, while he acknowledges the Holy Spirit as "the author and founder of the Priesthood and the Sacraments," limits His activity to the initial act. The Spirit only began a process which starting with the apostles has continued down the ages. Evidence of a defective view of the Holy Spirit will also appear from later writings. Law says in this second letter that he will refrain from dealing with the relation of Church and State because others have already given a sufficient answer.

We pass then to the third letter after noticing Law's pretty gift of irony when he asks Hoadly what his feelings are when he performs the laying on of hands which he believes to be an empty, useless ceremony, and also what would be his attitude if a layman started ordaining in Bangor. The third letter deals mainly with the nature of the church, which Hoadly has described as a universal *invisible* society. Hoadly's text had been "My Kingdom is not of this world," and every preacher ought to read Law's criticism of his exegesis. "Your Lordship," he says, "must be very excellent at taking a hint, or you could never have found out the Kingdom of God so exactly from so small a circumstance. It seems had this little text been all the scriptures that we had left in this world, your Lordship could have revealed the rest by the help of it." Law also shows the characteristically practical bent of his mind, by asking Hoadly to what ends and purposes such an invisible church could have been established. Like his episcopal opponent, Law identifies the Church and the Kingdom, and while he takes into account some of the relevant passages, it is to be regretted that he makes no thorough investigation of the whole subject of the Kingdom. His subtle intellect and "clearness of eye" would doubtless have laid Christians under considerable obligation by such study.

It would be wrong of course to condemn Law for not anticipating the critical results of later times, but there is here

sufficient reason why these three letters have fallen into oblivion despite their logical skill and enthusiastic temper.

Our next discussion must concern itself with Law as a writer on practical Christianity, and especially with his great work *The Serious Call*, published in 1728. Already in 1726, he had given indication of his deep interest in this subject, by his *Practical Treatise on Christian Perfection*, but it is with his later and more developed work this paper will deal.

The Serious Call has won well deserved renown as an example of clear and forcible English, rising at times to eloquence. It may be more a criticism of our own time than of the book itself to say that it gets a little tedious, but the reverend author himself shows signs of tiring towards the end. The book, however, is enlivened with quaint illustrations, e.g., the thirsty man who owned a large pond and yet dared not drink of it lest he should lessen its supply, and whose fate it was finally to be drowned in it. Also there are some thirty character sketches. These are more than stock characters. They are salted with humour. There is Leo, so little concerned with religion as hardly to know the difference between a Jew and a Christian; Flavia, who will read a devotional book—if it is a short one; Succus, who will never contemplate rebellion unless there is an edict against eating pheasant's eggs; Cognatus, the prosperous country clergyman, whose words are always eagerly listened to—if he is discussing the price of corn; Mundanus, an old man, who still repeats unchanged the one little prayer he learned at his mother's knee when six; and Classicus, who would not have the two Testaments in his library if it were not they are written in Greek.

Law's general scheme is to set forth the nature of devotion. This is not exhausted in prayer, but is a matter for the whole life. He first deals with Christianity in action and then with private prayer. After speaking of the nature and extent of Christian devotion our author finds that most Christians fall short through lack of right intention. He is an enthusiast in religion, and he claims that all Christians must live their *whole* life to the glory of God. "Everyone must try for the highest if we may thereby at least attain to mediocrity" (*Christian Perfection*). (Law's answer in 1740 to Dr. Trapps' four sermons on "The Sin, Folly, and Danger of Being *Righteous Overmuch*" can be well imagined.) He also shows at great length that real happiness is impossible apart from devotion. Then in Chapter XIV. coming to the subject of private prayer, he recommends a detailed daily method. He would have men rise early and pray—the subject to be thanksgiving. Very solemnly he argues at length for the singing of Psalms in the privacy of one's own room. He has no patience with those who refuse to sing because they have no

voice. Then at 9 a.m. there must be further prayer, with humility as the subject. Then follows prayer at 12 a.m., when the Christian must practise intercession and meditate on universal love. At 3 p.m. resignation to the Divine will is to be the theme of prayer, and in these chapters he sets forth his views of general and particular Providence. 6 p.m. is the time for evening prayer, and after a short chapter on the need for confession at this hour, he rapidly comes to the *hour of retirement*, when death is the proper meditation. The book then ends with some few pages on "The Excellence and Greatness of a Devout Spirit."

It will be interesting perhaps to ask how far such a book is suitable for Christians to-day, though care must be taken not to blame our author for not being born in a later century. The enquiry will be felt to be worth while when the words of Dr. Johnson are recalled, that the *Serious Call* was the first occasion of his thinking in earnest of religion after he became capable of rational enquiry. In his own day his book, which since has become an English classic, exercised a wonderful religious influence, and John Wesley not only benefited from it himself, but made selections from it for his followers. In the eighteenth century such works were badly needed, for it was a time when, as Law says, "Christians are like Heathens in all the main and chief articles of religion." And again, "Examples of great piety are not now common in the world either among the clergy or laity." But what of its modern value?

The emphasis which Law placed upon religion as a matter for all life, time, occupations, and relationships is needed to-day. He says, "The devout man considers God in everything, sees God in everything, and makes all the parts of his common life parts of piety." To-day, indeed, the gulf between worship and service, prayer and life needs to be bridged, but while Law brings the need for the union clearly before our minds, his treatment has palpable weaknesses from our modern point of view. Throughout he would seem to be thinking only of the individual and not of the individual in wide relations with his fellows. There is no hint of what has come to be called "The Social Gospel." His teaching would not necessarily tend to the abolition of that horrid traffic in negroes which disfigured the eighteenth century, and it would not and did not so quicken the Christian conscience in England that when in 1760 and later the Industrial Revolution came, men, women, and children were spared exploitation. Again no one would gather from his writings that in his lifetime Europe was a battlefield. In other words, Law, along with practically all his contemporaries, did not realise the social, industrial, and international implications of his faith. The farthest he went in this direction was the establishment of

schools at Kingscliffe. He did not seem to realise that the principles of Christ's teaching have to be applied in ever widening circles. In fact, he spoke of Christianity rather than of Christ, of rules and regulations rather than of sweeping principles. Jesus was hidden away behind the Gospel—a characteristic of both Deism and Orthodoxy. It is worth noticing that in almost all his references to the imitation of Christ, he adds the word "apostles." The character of Christ does not shine forth in all its peerless radiance, but is to a great extent equated with the character of His followers.

Such is the Christian ideal of life and character presented here. His ideal is Quietism, Pietism, and "Dietism." He has no thought of a kingdom upon earth. In fact, this life is but a short and fleeting prelude, "a hasty and daily preparation of ourselves for another life." Death looms largely. There are two surprisingly long death-bed speeches, and he suggests that our bed should be regarded as our nightly grave.

He quotes with approval Eusebius' description of the two ways of life, one higher and one lower, and he recommends self-denial, renunciation of the world, virginity, retirement, and voluntary poverty as the easiest way of perfection. (He gives a surprising amount of attention to young ladies, and always recommends virginity.) All this goes to show how limited his appeal must be to-day. But his remoteness is more clearly seen from his elevation of humility as the chief Christian virtue. "It is the life and soul of piety." "The soul and essence of all religious duties." His position surely denies the place given to love by Christ and by the whole New Testament. Love for Law is almost exclusively charity, not in the seventeenth century meaning of the word but in its debased modern significance. Love is not presented as the first-fruit of the Spirit. In fact, the Spirit is given very little place in the creation of Christian character. The phrase "the indwelling of the Spirit" occurs, but more or less only as a quotation.

The virtues are not regarded as flowers springing naturally in the soul of the Christian, through the agency of the Spirit, but as separate elements to be sought for one by one. Here is no real approach to Augustine's "Love God and do what you like." The secret of Christianity is not love, but right intention. This one principle will "infallibly carry Christians to the heights of virtue." Men lack not power, not capacity, but willingness and zeal. His scheme thus dethrones love and substitutes humility, and love becomes simply charity. It is to be remembered that when in 1740 Law settled at Kingscliffe with Mrs. Hutcheson and Miss Gibbon, and the rules of *The Serious Call* were put into operation, the whole neighbourhood was

demoralised by promiscuous charity. Tramps and beggars abounded, and the worthy vicar felt constrained to rebuke Law publicly in a sermon. It was a sorry expression of Law's ideas but such results are inherent in his system. But this section must not be closed without heartfelt admiration for Law's stress upon the events of the inner life. He frequently insists on self-examination, and reveals great depth of psychological insight. His protest against formalism was badly needed in the eighteenth century when men were prepared to say, "Things have come to a pretty pass when religion is allowed to invade private life." There was therefore in Law a predisposition to heed Boehme's call, "Know thyself," but it was not until he had dug deeply into that author that he really saw that the Kingdom of God is within.

His treatment of prayer also requires consideration. He has little to say about corporate worship, but this may be a result of his Non Juring position, though he at least continued to attend his parish church. But surely one of the helps in the cultivation of Christian character is regular attendance at Divine worship.

Our first thought of his scheme will probably be that it is overdone. It is part of his policy of retirement, and for its practice it demands extended leisure. Yet our own bustling age would surely profit by learning to be quiet and from increased meditation.

Law is anxious that the habit of prayer should be cultivated, and he gives detailed advice. He recognises that the spirit of devotion is the gift of God, and not attainable by any mere power of our own, yet it is mostly given to and never withheld from, those who prepare themselves for the reception of it. He recommends the setting apart of some place as a kind of private chapel and concentration of the mind upon some particular subject at each separate withdrawal. He gives due place to thanksgiving, confession, petition, and intercession. He values forms of prayer, but seeks to pass from them to petitions based on what is passing in our own hearts.

To gain the spirit of devotion, he suggests the recital of the attributes of God or the rehearsal of events in Christ's life, and that prayer may be enriched, he advises turning into prayer the "excellent words of the Bible and books of piety." He laments that so many Christians are afraid even to be suspected of great devotion, imagining it to be bigotry. He is not afraid of enthusiasm (that bugbear of the eighteenth century) and again and again demands "a lively fervour of the soul," "the language of tears," and "transports of devotions." It is to stimulate the passions that he is so insistent on the singing of the Psalms so

early in the day. "They kindle," he says, "a holy flame and create a sense of delight in God." He sounds a deeper note, however, when he says that the shortest way to happiness and perfection is to make a rule always to thank God for everything. This is an idea which appears again, namely, the effect of prayer in producing piety, and the rooting of morality in religion. Here he reaches a much deeper level than in the first part of his book. He is feeling after the idea that fellowship with God in Christ is the secret of the Christian life and character. Ardent devotion is *the* means to the production of a mighty change both within and without. "Everything good and holy," he says, "grows out of heavenly love, and it becomes the continual source of all holy desires and pious practices."

If, however, he had appreciated this idea in all its bearings, the first part of the book would have been deferred for later consideration, and its treatment would have been very different and more profound.

On the whole, therefore, our conclusion is that the work will make but a limited appeal to our age, though its serious temper, sincere spirit, and forcible style will long preserve it from oblivion. When Froude described it as a very *clever* work, Keble replied, "It is as though you said that the Day of Judgment will be a *pretty* sight."

Here is revealed its modern value. By its appeal to conscience, it will press home the need for moral practice, by its insistent demand for sincerity and zeal, it will produce great searchings of heart, and finally by its call for the cultivation of the life of prayer and its claim of the whole life for Christianity, it will sound notes which our modern world desperately needs to hear.

[*To be concluded.*]

Reminiscences of the Abolition of Religious Tests in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

AS one of the few survivors of that prolonged conflict, I may be allowed to draw the attention of the younger generation to the importance of that crisis in the history of religious freedom. I entered Cambridge as a subsizar of Trinity College in 1859, and was in residence there until I took my M.A. degree in 1866. My elder brother, William Steadman Aldis, was two years senior to me academically, though three years older; and my younger brother, Thomas Steadman, passed the Tripos three years after me. The fact that three sons of an eminent Baptist minister, the Rev. John Aldis, of Maze Pond, London, and afterwards of King's Road, Reading, were successively debarred by the religious tests then in force, from taking fellowships to which their places in the Tripos lists would undoubtedly have entitled them, had a great share in stimulating the agitation which finally carried through Parliament Lord Coleridge's Bill for the Abolition of Tests. This sentimental appeal to the Nonconformists of that day was no doubt enhanced by the fact that the mother of these three wranglers was the youngest daughter of Dr. Steadman, the founder and first President of the Baptist Academy at Horton (Bradford), now transformed into Rawdon College.

My mother was a woman of high intellectual ability. In later life she was more or less of an invalid, and liked to be read to. On one occasion I read to her Dean Mansel's Bampton Lectures *On the Limitations of Religious Thought*. This book is very stiff metaphysical reading: many a University graduate would be glad to throw it up before he was half through. My mother simply revelled in it; she took to it as a duck takes to water. My father always said that we owed our mathematical tendencies to her. She of course had never any opportunity of testing herself in that direction; and her father's own educational facilities had been meagre. His first teacher, at a dame's school, used to rap him over the head if he failed to pronounce each of the words "ton-gue, pla-gue" as two syllables. In his

Life, he states, " My library consisted of little more than a Bible, Fisher's *Young Man's Companion*, Mill's *Arithmetic*, Bunyan's *Works*, etc. With these helps I became well acquainted with arithmetic in all its branches, and the outlines of mensuration and geography. To the mathematics I felt a strong inclination, and had I been furnished with moderate assistance . . . I should have pursued the study of them with great pleasure and success."

My brother William in his whole physique took after his mother, and was obviously a Steadman rather than an Aldis. Dr. Steadman's frustrated aspiration came to its consummation in him. My father's abilities were in the line of languages. He used to read his Hebrew Bible through regularly once a year; and his Greek Testament, I think, twice. And he spoke both French and German so perfectly that he was often taken for a foreigner. Some of his Maze Pond congregation were wealthy people who used to take him as their interpreter when travelling on the Continent. He made the most of these opportunities. That two of us were able to pass the Classical Tripos in spite of having to devote almost all our time to mathematics, we certainly owe to him.

There were three distinct stages in the status allowed to Dissenters at Oxford and Cambridge. Originally these Universities were intended to be training-places for the clergy of the Establishment. Later on lay-students were permitted; but of course they had to be members of the Church of England. Gradually other lay-students came in, though not actually members of that Church. They were tolerated as mere students; but they could not enter for the Tripos examinations. That was the first stage: in the second stage they competed in those examinations, and so gained a public record of their academical honours; but they were not allowed to take any degrees. Then came the third stage, in which my brothers and I passed our time at Cambridge. All through our undergraduate course the question of creed was never mooted. We passed the Tripos and took our degrees, just as others did. But our degrees were merely titular. The M.A. degree did not confer any real membership in the University, unless you signed a declaration that you were " a *bona-fide* member of the Church of England." Nor could you be elected a Fellow of any College in the University unless you signed the same declaration.

This was a serious hardship. My father used to boast that the education of his three sons at Cambridge had never cost him a penny. That was because we went up to the University from the City of London School, which had at its disposal many scholarships, awarded either on the ordinary schoolwork, or on the results of special examinations. One of the tutors of Trinity

College, Cambridge, was an intimate friend of our Headmaster, Dr. Mortimer. This tutor, Mr. Mathison, used to visit the school from time to time, to pick out any specially promising boys. If their parents were poor he admitted these boys as sizars, or 'poor scholars.' No social stigma attached to these sizarships; the only relic of the obsolete tradition that originally they had to act as waiters at the Fellows' dining table, was the custom that on grand feast-days all the superfluous confectionery and goodly meats were brought from the Fellows' table and placed on the sizars' table for the second dinner. There were always two dinners in immediate succession, as the Hall could not accommodate anything like all the undergraduates at once. Thus the sizars were objects of envy. The ordinary undergraduates watched them feasting on venison, turkeys and game, under arches of glittering sugar candy, triumphs of the College pastry-cooks' art. These "poor scholars" were entered first as sub-sizars on very reduced fees; thence they were promoted by merit whenever vacancies occurred among the "full sizars." A "full sizarship" was worth about £100 a year. In their second year they could compete with the other Trinity undergraduates for a Foundation Scholarship. This had not a higher money value, but it conferred a social distinction, and it could be held until you took your M.A. degree three years after the B.A. if you continued in residence. I used to tell my friends that to be a Scholar of Trinity was as great an honour as to be a Fellow of one of the small colleges. This was hardly an exaggeration of the truth.

But with the attainment of the M.A. degree the onward path was barred against all Dissenters. Normally the college-scholarship would be transmuted into a Fellowship after taking the B.A. degree. Such Fellowships could be held for life if the holder devoted himself to College work, *e.g.*, as a tutor or lecturer, or they could be held without residence for a term of years long enough to enable the holder to go through his special professional training, and keep himself until he had begun to make an income by his profession. But the Dissenter of moderate means, unless he signed the obnoxious declaration, would have to earn his own living while studying for his profession. This is practically impossible. So Dissenters were all shut up to the profession of schoolmasters. And even there they were excluded from the better-paid posts by the mere fact of their dissent.

That my brothers and I ever went up to Cambridge we owed to Dr. Mortimer. Such an idea had never crossed my father's mind. When his son William had finished his education in the highest of the commercial classes at the City School, my

father arranged to remove him, and have him placed in some business firm. As soon as Dr. Mortimer heard of this, he sent for my father, and told him that such a course would be supreme folly: the boy obviously was destined for an academic career; and he simply must go to Cambridge. My father saw in this a clear leading of Providence: so he kept his son at school till it was time for him to go to Cambridge in 1857. A further leading of Providence soon showed itself. The Charity Commissioners had recently discovered some unused municipal funds wherewith they founded in perpetuity the "Marshall's Charity Scholarships" tenable at Oxford or Cambridge. These scholarships, of £100 *per annum*, were to be given in the first instance to boys educated at St. Olave's School; failing any such, to boys born in Southwark. The first examination was held in 1857; St. Olave's School had no boy qualified, and there was only one other candidate from Southwark; so my brother easily secured the prize. When my turn came in 1859 I was the only candidate.

While I was at Cambridge the agitation for the removal of religious disabilities began to take a prominent place in political circles. Cambridge just then was an admirable place for Dissenting undergraduates to hold firmly by their convictions without being narrowed by sectarian antagonism. Our headquarters were the Baptist Chapel in St. Andrew's Street, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. William Robinson. His congregation contained an unusual number of highly educated, intelligent people with whom we were encouraged to be on friendly terms. But it was Mr. Robinson's own personality that held us together, and made us feel like one family. His house, with its beautiful secluded garden, was a home where we were always made welcome. And his fixed determination was to make his chapel a place which should attract University men by an intellectual atmosphere worthy of its academic surroundings. He was a close reasoner, a fearless thinker, and a most original theologian. I have never met a minister from whom I have learned so much. And he was a keen controversialist. About the time I came into residence (or shortly before) he had published a pamphlet, *The Sin of Conformity*. This pamphlet made him for conservative "Dondom" an object both of hatred and of fear. He never missed an opportunity of attacking the ecclesiastical and academic authorities whenever they laid themselves open to his strictures by acts of bigotry or intolerance.

But he was far from being a mere intellectualist. I have never heard a preacher who made one feel more deeply that his whole being was aflame with the realised presence of the ever-living Christ. I can see him now, in such ecstatic moments,

as he leaned forward over the pulpit with his supreme message : " In the path of present duty strive earnestly to be well pleasing to the Lord Jesus " ; his face aglow with divine fire, his eyes piercing through one's very soul.

Before giving the history of the opposition to tests in Cambridge, one point must be explained. In ancient times men were placed in order of merit by their success in public disputations (hence the name *wrangers*). Gradually the system of written answers to printed questions was introduced, at first to supplement, later on to supersede, this *viva voce* work. Through the influence of Newton, mathematics took the place of the old exercises in Latin, logic, and philosophy. The Mathematical Tripos was instituted in 1748, and until the advent of the Classical Tripos in 1824, was the only examination by which a man could take a degree with Honours. But in 1769 a further examination was added, which took place soon after the publication of the results in Mathematics. This was the examination for the two Smith's Prizes, which were given for familiarity with the highest branches of mathematics, and for evidence of real originality and genius. Thus the Smith's Prizes supplement, and may correct, the Mathematical Tripos lists. A man may become Senior Wrangler solely through having a prodigious memory, with an unlimited capacity for hard work, and sufficient skill in the application of the regular formulæ to the solution of problems. But no one can gain the First Smith's Prize unless he is a real mathematician. As a rule the Senior and second Wrangler took the first and second Smith's prizes respectively, but there have been many exceptions. The last of the real Senior Wranglers was in 1882. After that date the higher mathematics were removed to a separate ordeal, Part III. of the Tripos, afterwards Part II.; though the name of Wrangler was still kept for those who only took the earlier test.

Between 1769 and 1882, twenty-one Senior Wranglers failed to win the first Smith's Prize. In estimating a man's worth the Smith's Prizes must always be taken into account, as well as the place in the Tripos.

With one important exception, the " Nonconformist martyrs " were all Wranglers, though a few took classics as well. No Senior Wrangler ever took the Classical Tripos after 1835. The work of the Mathematical Tripos grew too exhausting to allow double honours : that was why this Tripos was truncated in 1882.

Trinity College was by far the largest of all the colleges : St. John's came next : the others were called " small colleges." Trinity, moreover, as the college of Newton, Barrow, Bentley, and Whewell, had a reputation to keep up. Yet from 1847 to

1859 inclusive they never once had a Senior Wrangler. How great was their delight when in 1860 their man Stirling was Senior Wrangler and First Smith's Prizeman! But he belonged to the United Presbyterians, and refused to sign the declaration: so he was lost to the teaching staff. In 1861 W. S. Aldis was Senior Wrangler and First Smith's Prizeman: he was a Baptist, so he was similarly excluded from their Fellows. These two sledge-hammer blows, coming in immediate succession, shook the stronghold of conservative Dondom to its foundations. In 1863 I was sixth Wrangler, and seventh in the 3rd Class of the Classical Tripos. This was a far inferior degree, but well within the Fellowship range. The *Calendar* shows that several Trinity men were elected Fellows who took lower places in mathematics (eighth to sixteenth) and never attempted the Classical Tripos.

In 1866 my younger brother, Thomas Steadman, was Second Wrangler, second Smith's Prizeman, and sixth in the 3rd Class of the Classical Tripos; a degree of almost more merit than any merely mathematical degree, however high.

From this time onwards the agitation (both in the Press and in Parliament) for the Abolition of Tests became more and more insistent. In 1869 a fresh surprise awaited the Dons. A Jew, Hartog of Trinity, was Senior Wrangler and Second Smith's Prizeman. To take a degree one had to kneel before the Vice-Chancellor, who was arrayed in his scarlet robes, and seated on his throne at the head of the crowded Senate House; one had to place one's hands, palms together, between his hands, while he recited the formula, "*Auctoritate mihi commissâ, admitto te in gradum baccalaureatum, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Sancti Spiritus, Amen.*" That was all. But Hartog felt that to submit to this ceremony would be equivalent to renouncing the monotheism of his forebears and of his race. So he refused to take a degree under those conditions.

It was within the power of the Dons to pass a resolution of the Senate of the University (technically called a *Grace*) exempting Hartog from the Trinitarian formula. There was also a statute which they could neither ignore nor override; a statute which could only be altered by Act of Parliament, with the consent of the Sovereign. This statute provided that in any given year none of the men who had passed the Tripos could take his degree until *after* the Senior Wrangler had taken his.

So the Dons were in a dilemma. Either they must pass this special Grace, or deprive 114 men of their B.A. degrees. George Otto Trevelyan (afterwards Rt. Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan) whom I remember well as a Scholar of Trinity, and a graceful satirist of our College in his *Horace at Athens*, was then an M.P. He interviewed the Dons, and warned them that if they

did not give Hartog his degree he would rouse such a storm in the House of Commons that they would never hear the last of it. The Dons were cowed, and passed the requisite Grace.

Sir Philip Hartog, a younger brother of this Senior Wrangler, married a niece of an intimate friend of ours. Finding themselves a few months ago in our neighbourhood, they called on us, and I got the above story in all its details from him. The Cambridge *Historical Register* merely says in a footnote to Hartog's name at the head of the Tripes, "As a Jew he was excluded from a degree, but he was admitted by special Grace of the Senate."

The conservative Dons were now getting the worst of the fight. But later on in the same year a bombshell burst in their midst.

For some time previous to Hartog's degree a section of the University had been advocating a simple solution of the declaration difficulty. They maintained that everyone who was neither an Atheist nor a Mohamedan, any one who ever attended the Prayerbook service, above all every one who had regularly attended College Chapels (which all undergraduates did, as a matter of course) was practically a member of the Church of England within the meaning of the disputed formula. Consequently all Nonconformists should sign it as a mere matter of conventional form; just as a Duke when writing officially to a costermonger will sign himself "Your obedient servant."

This notion seemed to be gaining acceptance, though of course many strongly opposed it. One of the Fellows of Trinity, a Senior Classic, Sidgwick, took the lead in this opposition. And he clinched his arguments by a decisive act. He had signed the declaration himself, because he was by birth and education a Churchman; he had done so as a matter of course. But since taking his degree he had thought more seriously on such questions, and he felt that he no longer agreed with the doctrines of the Prayerbook sufficiently to sign himself a *bona fide* member of that Church. He therefore made a public explanation of his position, and renounced his Fellowship. That was a staggering blow to the Dons. To keep so brilliant a scholar on their teaching staff they created a special post for him, and made him Lecturer on Moral Science. In this way they retained his services, but they all felt that they had lost the battle against Nonconformity. No one henceforward could pretend that signing this declaration was a mere matter of form. The abolition of religious tests was now undoubtedly imminent. To my mind this one "Martyr" eclipses all the rest. It is one thing to forgo a Fellowship because you are unwilling publicly to sign a document you do not believe: it calls for far more moral courage to give up a

Fellowship that you have held for nearly ten years, when there is no external cause to compel you to do so.

One more "martyr" remains, whose martyrdom was very brief. Hopkinson, the Senior Wrangler of 1871, who was bracketed with the fourth Wrangler for the Smith's Prizes, was a Nonconformist. This was in January. In June the Tests were finally abolished; so that he had no difficulty in securing a Fellowship not much later than would have been the case had the Tests never been in force. His name is starred as a Fellow in the 1871 Tripos list of the *Historical Register*.

That is the full story of the abolition of Tests as seen from within the academic pale. But it is more important for us to notice the effect of these Tests on the intellectual, moral and spiritual life of the Universities themselves. One point is obvious. They hindered the bulk of Nonconformists from sending their sons to college, and thus very largely deprived the Universities of a class of exceptionally keen students, gifted by tradition, home education, and heredity, with the austere morals of the Puritans, and their firm grasp of religious truth. Furthermore these Tests had been in force for so long a time that they could not fail to impress a definite character on the corporations which they controlled.

As regards intellectual life we have it on the authority of Mr. Conybeare (*Cambridge Review*, April 29th, 1909, p. 349) that up to the year 1860, Cambridge men looked on it as bad form to be strenuous in study or in sport, or to exhibit any marked enthusiasm of any kind. Indeed, a University in which the teachers were compelled to be "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost" to retain salaries of some four or five hundred a year (holy orders were usually a condition for permanently retaining a Fellowship) was self-doomed to intellectual as well as spiritual paralysis.

As regards religion, we have more definite evidence. Mr. J. W. Clark (*Cambridge Review*, March 4th, 1909, p. 303) tells us that a certain college dean (before the forties of last century) "hauled up" an undergraduate for not attending chapel. The young man's defence was that the early hour of service and the chilly weather made it impossible for him to fix his mind on his prayers. "Sir," said the dean, "we don't want your damned prayers in chapel, we want to see your damned face." The mere fact that a clergyman, the dean of his college, could say such a thing, proves that the whole atmosphere of religious teaching and worship was one of mere formalism.

My own personal knowledge is confined to the sixties. Of course I attended College chapel regularly, and as a Foundation Scholar had to take my turn in reading the lessons morning and

evening every week-day: and though free on Saturday evening and Sunday I almost always went for the sake of the glorious organ-music and choral singing. Trinity men used to boast that their chaplain read the service so fast that he could give any other chaplain up to "Pontius Pilate" and yet come in easily first with the Benediction. A space round the Communion Table was always crowded on Saturday evenings and Sundays with undergraduates, because it was out of reach of the Dean's eye. It was called "Iniquity Corner"; the men there played cards while the prayers were going on. We were regularly fined sixpence if we failed to attend chapel on the morning of the first Sunday of each month. This was because on that one occasion there was a Communion service and collection, and the Dons assumed that if you absented yourself it was simply to avoid the collection. So the sixpence was duly entered in our weekly buttery bill; a curious commentary on the offertory sentence read at the communion, which enjoins giving "not grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver."

Of course the men were not compelled to communicate: almost all of them came out pell-mell immediately after the Prayer for the Church Militant, leaving a few "pi's" to shiver in the empty cold. One of these "pi's," whom I will call Smith, for some special reason came out one Sunday with the non-communicants. A burly boating man cannoned against him in the crush, and, suddenly recognising his friend, called out, "Hullo, Smith! how is it you're not stopping to lunch to-day?" For this story I can vouch, having got it at first hand. Such an irreverent speech would be impossible in Cambridge now, when many colleges have a well-attended voluntary eight o'clock communion service every Sunday morning.

Of course there were plenty of men whose personal piety was undoubted. But such men owed their religion to their home-training and its traditions; the University as such in no way helped them, except perhaps in the University sermon preached every Sunday afternoon, attendance at which was voluntary. I used to go regularly; and though as a rule the sermons were formal and commonplace, occasionally they were both instructive and rousing. Among the preachers whom we heard on these occasions was Kingsley.

There was one religious organisation at Cambridge which was a sort of *imperium in imperio* in the University. Its headquarters were at Caius College, and its leader was Clayton, an ultra-Evangelical clergyman. Caius College was largely attended by medical students, who had the reputation for being the rowdiest men in the University. This college was popularly divided into "Heaven, Earth and Hell"—the first consisting of

the Simeonites under Clayton; the last of the medical students; while a small minority of reading men kept aloof from both extremes. One incident will reveal clearly what was Canon Clayton's attitude towards the University and Caius College. There was a schoolfellow of mine, Garrett, a medical student at Caius, whom I knew almost solely by name. One day I heard that he had been ill. My informant thought that he had gone home, but was not sure. So I called on Canon Clayton, who was tutor of the College. I explained my errand. He paused for a moment to recollect. Then he repeated the name "Garrett, Garrett, m'mm. Ah, yes! Garrett. I'm afraid he is not a converted character. I never see him at any of our meetings."

That one sentence shows that Canon Clayton looked on the University and his own College simply as a vantage ground for converting undergraduates to his own religious beliefs. His followers were even more egotistically exclusive. I think popular report must have exaggerated the wildness of the Caius medical students: when I walked Addenbrooke's Hospital (1864-66) I never saw any sign of it. But to whatever extent their reputation may have been founded on fact, I feel sure it was mainly a natural reaction against the ostentatious pietism of the Simeonites. The chief influence they had on the religion of the University was to make men dislike and despise Evangelicalism itself.

Such being the state of religion at Cambridge in the sixties of last century, it follows that the morals of the undergraduates must have been very unsatisfactory. I can hardly imagine anything worse than what I saw and heard of them in my time. But the great improvement in this respect which undoubtedly has taken place since 1871 has largely resulted from outside influences. To investigate the share in this improvement which is due to the abolition of religious tests would be mere guesswork.

The moral of this story is obvious. All attempts to enforce uniformity of religious belief or ritual by the compulsion of pains and penalties, or of social deprivations, can never bring about anything better than a half-hypocritical uniformity. Such attempts will always react upon their originators. They will inevitably dwarf intellectual development, and more or less poison the moral and spiritual life.

JAMES A. ALDIS,
*Sometime Headmaster of Queen
 Mary's School, Walsall.*

The Muslim Dogma of Tradition.

MISS HILDA MACLEAN, of the Victorian Baptist Foreign Mission, read a paper in December 1927 to the annual conference of Australasian missionaries in Bengal, on "The Traditions among Ordinary Muhammedans." Its object was not only to show how Islam in Bengal is really based on the Traditions, but as a corollary to set forth their leading features as rendered into English by Mr. William Goldsack, and to urge that approach must be made to the Mussulman along their lines. This practical aim is beside the mark for a stay-at-home Englishman; but the facts as to the Traditions raise interesting points as to inspiration, and as to parallel facts in Christendom. We may first cite some evidence as to the popularity of the Traditions.

At a recent Bengal Women's Educational Conference, a Muslim lady speaker, pleading that the Quran should be translated into the vernaculars so that it might be not only read but understood, confessed:—"We seldom act according to the teachings of the Quran. It is merely read and repeated, parrot-wise, and tied with a cloth, and kept with great care. A few days ago, in a mass meeting of Muslims held at Allahabad, Miss Jafia Soleman, an educated Egyptian lady, asked those amongst the audience who could really understand the teachings of the Quran, to raise their hands. Only three men did so. If our men are so poor in their knowledge of the Quran, it is needless to say how much poorer their women must be." Turn then to the villages and see. In almost any home, ask what they read, and they will produce, along with the children's school books and possibly a popular novel or life of Muhammed, some filthy, dirty, ragged, coverless volume, which probably contains some garbled story from the "Kasas." Happy indeed is the woman who can afford to buy the complete work, and happy those who can gather to hear it read aloud.

What is the "Kasas"? It aims at giving the traditional histories of all the prophets, from the creation of the "Light of Muhammed" before the beginning of the world, to the advent of Muhammed himself; and the histories of the four Imams. The original was written in the fifth century after the prophet's death, and is most readable, however ridiculous and unclean some of the stories are. A glance at the index shows many familiar names: Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Ishmael, and the building of the

Kaaba, Lot, Isaac, Joseph (sixty pages), Job, Pharaoh, Moses and the children of Israel (another sixty pages), Elijah, Elisha, Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon (150 pages), John the Baptist, Zechariah, Mary and Jesus (twenty pages).

This ancient work is not only widely circulated in the village dialect, but is the basis of children's books for the home, text-books in Muslim primary schools, volumes for the lending libraries. In some cases the stories are told as we ourselves might relate them; in others the main object is to exalt Muhammed, so that we hear of the Splitting of the Moon, the Night Journey to Heaven, constantly cited by Muslim children to show how superior their prophet is to Christ.

Go back a step, and ask where the writer of the "Kasas" obtained his material. He drew chiefly on six collections of Traditions, committed to writing in the third century after Muhammed. The chief of these collectors was Al Bukhari. He says in his preface that he was inspired to the task by a dream in which he seemed to be driving away flies from the person of Muhammed; an interpreter told him that the flies were lies which had settled upon the apostolic tradition; so he decided to gather and sift the current traditions. Sixteen years did he give to this task, travelling from Iraq to Egypt, interrogating 40,000 men, collecting 600,000 traditions, of which he memorised a third. He was critical, prayed over his work, and never committed a tradition to writing without an ablution and a prayer. From his mass of material he chose about 7,000, and since many are doublets, his collection actually enshrines about 3,000 stories. He does not expressly state the principles on which he chose or rejected; but it does not seem that he considered internal evidence, for the stories are often childish or absurd or even immoral. He did record traditions which explain laws and customs that were not enjoined in the Quran. But in every case he was most careful to show the continuity of the tradition, by some formula such as:—"A told me that B (the son of C the son of D) said to him from his father, from E, from F (the son of G), I have heard from H (the son of I) that he heard from J (the son of K) that he heard the prophet say—or that he heard the prophet do—or that he noted the prophet permitted, such and such a thing." The utmost care was taken that the complete chain of tradition should be exhibited, that each link should be identified.

The veracity of each man manifestly is important; and Al Bukhari was so far conscious of this that he discarded 593 out of 600 stories. He might have good opportunities for distrusting many men, and for trusting others. But while he might dare to neglect men of recent generations, it was dangerous for an orthodox Muslim to hesitate about the Companions of the

Prophet. Attend then to those earliest links in the chain; they consist of four men who knew Muhammed long and closely, three men and a woman who knew him towards the end.

The four Older Companions were Abu Bakr, Omar, Uthman and Ali. It is unfortunate that comparatively few traditions came through them. This was not for want of curiosity, but one of them distrusted his own memory:—"Were it not that I feared lest I should add to the facts in relating them, or take therefrom, verily I would tell you." And another had occasion to rebuke a tendency to glorification:—"I fear that if I tell you one thing, ye will add thereto a hundred, as from me." It had been wonderful if all transmitters of tradition could resist that temptation.

No scruples seem to have hindered the four younger people. One of them alone is responsible for twice as many anecdotes as the four Older Companions together; it is satisfactory to know that he was freely charged by his contemporaries with sheer invention; it is less satisfactory that Al Bukhari nevertheless incorporated many traditions which depend solely on this one man, Abu Hurairah, who had been a convert only three years when the Prophet died, and was but a lad then.

Ibn Abbas, the second, was only fourteen years old at Muhammad's death; yet Al Bukhari relies on him for as much information as the four Older Companions together. The third, Anas bin Malik, was nineteen at the prophet's death; a man of no birth, standing, or education. The fourth was Ayesha, the child-wife, "utterly unscrupulous, passionately partisan, and lacking in character": she is the authority for more than 2,000 anecdotes. To these four young people are due all the stories attributing miraculous powers to Muhammad.

What now is the attitude of Muslims to these traditions? The villager in Bengal knows them better than the Quran itself, and they are the practical standard of both faith and practice. But what of the Muslim theologians? The great bulk of them, the Sunnis and the Wahabis, agree that while the Quran is the word of God Himself, dictated to the prophet by the angel Gabriel, yet the Traditions are inspired on a lower level, so that the words are human, and only the ideas divine. These theologians uphold the practice of the prophet as binding; thus because he picked up his rice with three fingers, this is the standard Muslim method. Some of them were afraid to use their own judgement when no precedent was quoted; one man knew that Muhammad ate water-melons, but because he did not know whether the prophet broke them, bit them, or cut them, he thought it wiser to abstain; he even tried to force his scruples on others, and forbade a poor woman to spin by the light of

torches carried along the street, because no one knew if the prophet had ever used another man's light without asking leave. Such extreme views illustrate the outcome of this line of theology. But from the second century there was a divergent line of men who pointed out flaws in the traditions and ridiculed them. The Shiahs of Persia and India rejected all which did not depend on their patron, Ali, one of the four Older Companions; of his recollections they have five books. And even among the Sunnis to-day there are a few who minimize or even reject, going "Back to the Quran."

The whole course of events reminds us how Islam is but a revised Judaism: the Jewish Scriptures were supplemented by tradition, and this both by theologians and the populace came to be in practice more highly esteemed, till even in our Lord's day there were some who made the word of God of none effect by their tradition. It is equally interesting to compare with doings in Christian circles.

A Muslim says that nothing whatever was written down from the lips of Jesus, and therefore nothing in the Christian Scriptures stands on the same plane of the Quran. All the sayings attributed to Him are due to the memory of some Older Companions, perhaps Peter and Matthew, and to some Younger Companions, such as Mark and John, and to one man who was not a Companion at all, Luke. To a Muslim there would be a grave defect in that Luke gives no vouchers for his stories; thus the stories of the Prodigal Son and of the Good Samaritan have no attested pedigree. Another large part of the New Testament is a collection of letters by Paul, who was no Companion, and whose relations with the Companions were on his own showing somewhat strained. Paul does once or twice emphasize that he was transmitting a tradition, but he also declares emphatically that he taught on his own authority, believing that he too had the spirit of Christ. A Muslim pays no attention to letters by men whom he does not acknowledge as prophets, nor even to a Revelation to a Companion, but limits himself to the Injil, the Gospel through the prophet Jesus: he puts the original on a level with his own Traditions, inspired as to ideas, not words; but he does not hesitate to use the Lower Criticism, and say that even what the Companions handed on has not reached us without alteration.

But we have a mass of literature which presents other analogies; apocryphal gospels, ecclesiastical traditions. The general sense of Christians has discarded several gospels, although they are attributed to Companions, such as Peter. They can be shown to have originated at a late period, and can often be traced to definite places; they are not complete stories, but

are evidently supplements to the four Canonical Gospels; they abound in anecdotes which strain our credulity: we readily endorse the judgement passed upon them in the third and fourth centuries, that they are unworthy of public use. Yet there are scattered incidents in them which have found wide acceptance; that Mary was ever a virgin, that an ox and an ass worshipped at the manger, that the wise men from the East were three kings, &c., &c.

These indeed were taken up and stamped with some ecclesiastical authority, and so we are led on to consider ecclesiastical traditions generally, of which one has lately excited some attention—that communion should be fasting. It would be well if those who speak glibly of tradition would heed the rigid test of Islam—that every link in the chain of tradition should be named and approved. In the early days there was a consciousness of this, men did appeal to the churches founded by apostles, did enumerate the men who in unbroken succession presided over them; in the remarkable case of Jerusalem, a rival prelate often pointed out with care that there was a gap, and the tradition of the original church faded away at Pella, while the church of *Ælia Capitolina* on the same site did not inherit the tradition. But “tradition” has come in practice to mean something very different—the code of rules and the body of doctrine which have been evolved in the course of centuries. A decision arrived at in Nicea, in Constantinople, at Trent, in the Vatican, may be promulgated with authority, and be accepted ever since; but it is not, in the true sense of the word, an apostolic tradition; it is handed down from a definite time and place, and depends on the authority of the Church, not on the direct authority of Christ.

While in many parts of Christendom the Traditions do seem as important as in Islam, it would seem that Christian theologians might learn something as to Inspiration and Tradition from Muslim thinkers.

A Visit to Spain.

By the Rev. Robert F. Elder, of Buenos Ayres.

DURING the Baptist Congress in Toronto I met the Rev. Ambrosio Celma, Pastor of the Baptist church at Barcelona, Spain. He suggested a visit to the Baptist churches of Spain. That seed thought brought forth fruit in the visit that my wife and I have just made to the mother country of Argentina.

We arrived at Barcelona on September 21st, and were warmly welcomed by Señor Celma and the Rev. Leroy David, who is Principal of the Baptist Bible Institute there. Mr. and Mrs. David provided generous hospitality for us during our stay.

Barcelona is a beautiful city, with mountains rising behind, the blue Mediterranean in front and the contrasts and harmony of colour in the city itself. At present it is a hive of activity, making preparations for the great Exhibition which is to be held next year. Beautiful Exhibition buildings are being erected on the slopes of Montjuich, from which is to be seen a wonderful panorama of the city, behind which Mount Tibidabo rises 1,600 feet above the sea, with the crags of Montserrat in the distance and on a clear day some peaks of the Pyrenees standing out against the horizon. Barcelona fairly won our hearts.

The Baptist church is in a central position, but without any sign or notice to indicate what it is. The services are conducted upstairs, a veritable "upper room." Formerly a school was conducted there, but it was closed as part of the retrenchment necessitated by the Southern Baptist deficit. We attended the Sunday School on Sunday morning, and spoke to a group of bright, intelligent-looking young people.

In the afternoon Mr. David took us to Sabadell, said to be the most industrial town in Catalonia. The young Pastor, Señor Antonio Almudevar, was already known to us by his poems, some of which we had used for recitations in Sunday School entertainments in Argentina. We went first to a well-attended meeting of the Young People's Society. It was a real privilege to speak to those fine young folk and afterwards preach to a good, warm-hearted congregation. When in response to an appeal two people gave an outward sign of an inward decision to accept Christ as Saviour, my heart was strangely stirred

because the Lord had used us to co-operate with the Pastor and his earnest people in winning some souls for Christ in Spain. The owner of the hall lived for some time in Argéntina and attended services conducted by Rev. Pablo Besson, but was not converted till after his return to Spain. After his conversion he built the hall, and arrangements are being made for the congregation to acquire it by instalments. The authorities allow this congregation to have a notice board outside. Most of the congregation came to the train with us when we were leaving, and they sang rousing hymns there till the train had left.

On Monday we took part in the opening of the new session of the Baptist Bible Institute. There was a good attendance of interested friends from the churches. Some seven promising young men are there to prepare themselves to be workers. The importance of this work cannot be calculated. The teachers find themselves handicapped by the poor schooling that the young fellows have had. The importance of higher education does not seem to have gripped even the Spanish evangelicals as it should. Mr. and Mrs. David are trying to impress this on them, but it is a pity that some of the evangelical schools had to be closed through lack of funds to carry on.

Rev. N. Bengtsson and Señor Pedro Franco (formerly a professor in a Roman Catholic Seminary before his conversion) are co-professors with Mr. David. It was our privilege to talk to the students each day during our stay, on some phase of the preacher's work.

A visit to the town of Tarrassa interested us greatly. Most of the other churches receive grants from the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. The Baptist church of Tarrassa is self-supporting. Some six years ago a work was started there by members of the Vila family. Their spiritual enterprise was blessed to such an extent that there were some 130 baptisms in five years. A gifted son of the family, Señor Samuel Vila, became Pastor. His father sold properties to help build a commodious and attractive church building, and thus inspired others to heroic self-sacrifice and generous giving. The architect and builder, Señor Jaime Pujol, was converted and baptised in Argentina, and had there imbibed some of the progressive ideas with which he inspired the others. The fine example of this church is stimulating others to attempt greater things and to aim at similar independence. We had a splendid meeting with these warm-hearted people, and again had the joy of seeing some decisions for Christ.

On the Thursday night we had a great time with Señor Celma in Barcelona, when lantern views of Argentina and the Baptist work there, were shown. Mr. Bengtsson is doing a very

important piece of work in the publication of evangelical literature.

Then, passing through a wealth of vineyards, olive and orange groves, rice, pea-nuts and potato-fields, we came to Valencia.

From there we went at once by omnibus to Carlet, an old-time town with modern school equipment. There is a small but vigorous Baptist church there. The Pastor was in Argentina for some time before his conversion. As the people work on the farms until sunset, and then have to come to the town, for there the farmers live in the town, the meeting held on Saturday night was at 9-30. One elderly lady came with a glass of water under her shawl. Asked why, she said that sometimes she became sleepy, and took the glass of water so as to moisten her eyes. The church has secured a well-situated building site. Some of the members have joined their Pastor and have made all the bricks they will need for a modest building. They are going to build the foundations at once, and are hoping that money will come in for the carpentering work so as to be able to go on. A young man from this church has just entered the Bible Institute as a student.

We returned to Valencia on Sunday, and took part in a fine meeting of the Young People's Society first, and then a very fine service where there was real spiritual power and some more decisions for Christ. This church is part of the fruits of the work of Mr. J. Uhr, of the Swedish Baptist Mission. The present Pastor, Señor Ramón Lopez, had his preparation in colportage work at a very good theological seminary. He regrets that he has to spend so much time at business in order to support his family.

A Summer School was held in Valencia in August, and they had a great time. One outcome was the formation of the Baptist Convention of Spain. Señor Julio Nogal of Madrid is the first President.

Jativa was the next place visited, an attractive little town nestling at the foot of high hills. The Pastor has also spent some time in Argentina; some of his children were born there. He has worked as a colporteur. He is a deeply spiritual man, who quietly wins souls for Christ, more by personal work than by eloquent preaching. Their hall is in the third story of the building. The congregation reflected the simplicity, piety and earnestness of their Pastor, and was so responsive as to make it a joy to preach. He told us of a man who had bought a Bible and an evangelical book from a colporteur in Argentina, before returning to Spain. The reading of them had opened his eyes and made him stop going to confession. When he heard the

preaching of the Gospel he was converted, and now Señor Estebe holds meetings in the place where he lives, and others have been won for Christ.

Tuesday saw us in Alicante. The Pastor of the church there is a cultured man, Don Luis Ponzoa. He was known to us by his writings. To our great disappointment we did not meet him. He has been seriously ill, and was away convalescing. We were, however, delighted to find that Sergeant Zacariah Carles is able to take his military service and at the same time act as temporary Pastor of the church. He is a young man who studied in the Bible Institute. It speaks well for his tact and personality, that though the military authorities know that he is a Protestant preacher, who has asked to be excused from attendance at the Roman Catholic Mass, he has been made a sergeant and has permission to be off duty for the services in his church. A solid work has been done by Señor Ponzoa and his brave wife, and a good congregation listened to our message, in spite of a rainy night. We had been told that it scarcely ever rained in Alicante. There used to be a good school here as in Valencia and other parts, but it had to be closed because of retrenchment.

Albacete was the next place to be visited. The Pastor, Don Francisco Pais, has had experience in Cuba. He took us first to a meeting for women, where my wife told how in some Argentine churches the women organise in order to evangelise. Later we had a fine meeting in the good hall they have. This hall has been built specially by one of the members, who charges a moderate rent for it, and thus the difficulties experienced in some places are avoided.

To be in Madrid was the fulfilment of a long, long dream. There is a very enthusiastic, aggressive little Baptist church which meets in a hall that could scarcely be worse as far as ventilation, light and accommodation are concerned. It would not surprise me to hear that the authorities had prohibited meetings to be held in it. Señor Julio Nogal, who ministers to the church, worked for some years in Cuba. He tells me that if he had some 10,000 or 12,000 dollars he believes the congregation would find the rest. That would be a splendid investment for some of our Baptist friends. We ought to have a place that is more worthy of us in the capital of Spain, and have it quickly.

It had been arranged for me to speak at a united meeting in the Reformed church of Spain. At this meeting it was a great joy to meet sons of Juan B. Cabrera, Carlos Araujo, and J. Flidner, who were such valiant ministers of Jesus Christ a generation ago. Financial and time-limitations prevented us from visiting other churches.

Colonel Sir Jerome Sankey, M.P., Ph.D.

HIEROME ZANCHEY is a spelling often adopted for his name; and this invites the query whether he was connected with the Italian Hieronymus Zanchius who died at Heidelberg in 1590. But the query is unanswered; and possible early experiences at Cambridge and as proctor at Oxford, have no real bearing on his life, which was mainly spent across St. George's Channel, as may be traced largely in Dunlop's "Ireland under the Commonwealth."

He emerges in January 1645 as wounded at the capture of Nantwich. At the siege of Colchester, his dragoons performed the marvellous exploit of capturing two royalist ships. He was colonel of horse in the army that went to Ireland in 1649, and was much associated with colonel Daniel Axtell, another Baptist, who had kept order in Westminster Hall during the trial of Charles Stuart. Sankey was prominent in the relief of Passage, at the skirmish of Dundrum, and at Clonmel. He was then put in command to run down colonel John Fitzpatrick, and was able to secure the surrender of Limerick. Here he signalled himself by suggesting a mode of pacification. There were some 30,000 Irish still in arms, who were willing to go abroad, and as whole regiments to enter the service of the king of Spain: he distinctly favoured this solution. So on 12 May, 1652, articles of agreement were made and concluded; Lieutenant-general Ludlow authorised Commissary-general Reynolds, colonels John Hewson, Hierome Sankey, Daniel Axtell, Richard Lawrence, Henry Pretty, Scout-master Henry Jones, Adjutant-general William Allen, and captain John Vernon to sign such a treaty: the list shows the predominant position of Baptists in Irish affairs.

For the next few weeks Sankey was busy sweeping up the remnants, clearing King's and Queen's County, and being in special charge of the Tipperary forces. On 12 August an Act of Settlement was passed, whereby Ulster, Leinster, and Munster were divided into Precincts, each under a commander-in-chief: Sankey was put to govern Clonmel, and after a council of war at Kilkenny on 30 September to wind up the transportation of the Irish regiments, he turned to civil affairs.

Thus in January, 1653, he was put on a committee to encourage tillage, and to settle lands on such as had served the Parliament. For under authority of one of the last acts assented to by Charles, the Irish were to be sent across Shannon into Connaught, and the other three provinces were to be newly colonised from England. In April he was bidden remove the Irish from his precinct, giving them two months' notice, and not

actually displacing until English tenants were available. In June he was put on a commission to deal with the plague, and with providing for the poor. Then it was found that the Scots who had long been in Ulster were not satisfied with the new government; and he was put on a commission to transplant some of them into Leinster. In August a small Standing Committee was set up "to consider all matters referred to them by the Commissioners of the Commonwealth": as a first instalment they were to decide what was fit to be done as regards the propagation of the gospel; and as a counterpart, what inducements be offered to the Irish to abandon their religion, how priests may be removed. Correspondence survives as to his interest in English ministers brought over, and as to the details of the land settlement.

By August 1655 things had so far settled down that the University of Dublin held a grand meeting to entertain their Chancellor, the lord Henry Cromwell. The most conspicuous figure after the chancellor himself was colonel Sankey: the Proctor made a speech in order to philosophy, after which Dr. Loftus the Doctor of that Chair presented Sankey to be admitted *ad eundem gradum*—which apparently proves that Wood was right in alluding to his English university career. Next year a parliament was assembled at Westminster under the Instrument of Government, which was far-sighted enough to unite England, Scotland, and Ireland; to this Sankey was returned as M.P. for Kilkenny. This marks the inauguration of what was hoped to be domestic peace, and on 23 October the Lord Protector ordered accounts to be made up for the disbanded forces. It proved that in the seven years since the army landed in Ireland, Sankey's regiment had earned £96,657 13s. 10d., the largest sum paid.

He proved a loyal Cromwellian, upholding the settlement for the three countries, and especially backing Henry Cromwell in Ireland. In the plantation he acquired Coolmore in county Tipperary, and founded what proved to be a stable family there. So it must have been disturbing when the great Protector passed away, and his system began to crumble in England. Richard Cromwell was too weak, but Sankey backed Henry Cromwell in Ireland. In 1659 he was called to London, as yet another civil war seemed imminent, and was taken into council at Wallingford House. When Sir George Booth actually did raise troops, Sankey went back to Ireland, and brought 500 horse to Holyhead, marching them to Cheshire; where the Irish Brigade effectually put down the rising. For the next few months he was most busy: on the social side he had a controversy with Dr. Petty as to the actual survey of lands for his disbanded

soldiery; on the political he took part in proposals for a new constitution; on the military he was sent north by the party of Fleetwood and Lambert to negotiate with that most uncertain man, general Monk in Scotland. From Newcastle he was sent forward to Berwick for an interview. And there Monk carried out his crafty policy, detained Sankey, and marched his troops onward. Early in 1660 Monk formally deprived him of his command, and that ended his brief intervention in high politics.

When the Restoration was effected, he was apparently ready to acquiesce in the royalist settlement, and he did emphatically dissociate himself from Venner's rising. Back in Ireland, he found useful occupation at first; was invited to arbitrate in some Dublin affairs, joined in a project to restore a mile-long causeway in Munster. But like many other old soldiers, he found reason to think that the new government did not mean to play fair, and that little by little the soldier-settlers were to be ousted. He therefore joined in the rebellion of 1663, to begin with the capture of Dublin Castle: it was betrayed, and he fell in the rising. Thus ended a career showing what good material went to form the Baptist churches of that period.

BRIDGWATER. The first appearance of this church is in 1655, when it entertained the Western Association. The church book begins in 1689, showing forty-nine members with Toby Welles pastor. The meeting-house was built in 1692, the date being legible in 1770. In 1693 Edward Elliott came on probation, he was ordained August 1696, when there were fifty-two members. He was a disciplinarian, so that a crisis came in 1703, and he soon left for Wapping. Then Thompson heard of a pastor named Shepperd. In 1717 Dr. Edward Evans became pastor, till 1741. This was a dangerous time, for the Presbyterian minister, John Moore, junior, had an important Academy, which became a centre of Arian teaching: the Baptist church evidently felt the influence, and a generation later was known to Thompson at a distance as "General Baptist," a label decidedly misleading. A Mr. Harrison followed, then Evan Thomas, ordained 1749. About 1757 came Charles Harris, "the first Calvinist"—a great mistake, but probably the first hyper-Calvinist. He purged the church most effectively, and guarded its purity so well that when he died in 1774 he had admitted only eight members. Thomas Lewis followed, leaving in 1780 for Ireland. After another purge, Seth Morris came for two years, then went to Anglesea. George Scraggs spent five years, then turned Pedobaptist. With Benjamin Morgan from Swansea in 1791, the church emerges into clear light.

Coxe Feary, Founder of Bluntisham.

C OXE FEARY was born in the parish of Bluntisham on May 29th, 1759. At the age of twelve he was taken from the village school and began to work on the farm belonging to his parents, but as he had a thirst for reading, his leisure hours were devoted to his books.

Sherlock *On Death*; *The Whole Duty of Man*; Stackhouse's *History of the Bible*, were among the religious books which the boy eagerly perused. It appears that shortly after attaining his seventeenth birthday, he began to have serious questionings on religious matters. He tells us in his memoirs "that at this time he began to be dissatisfied with the trifling, and, as he thought, irreligious conduct of those who attended the parish church in his village."

This induced him to turn his attention to the Dissenters, in whom he thought he saw more regard for religion than among the people of the Establishment.

There had been since 1657 a few families of the Quakers in Bluntisham, and in 1774 they sold their meeting-house and erected another at Earith.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century there had been three or four families of the Baptist persuasion at Bluntisham, who had occasional preachings at their houses; but made no effort to increase their numbers.

Thus about the year 1776 the whole village, except the few families mentioned above, were strict Church people.

Coxe Feary first went to the Baptists at Needingworth, but "found them High Calvinists, very narrow-minded and illiberal, pronouncing destruction on all who did not believe their creed." The Quakers at Earith he found to be more according to his own views, and occasionally he attended their place of worship, but being a Churchman he could not make up his mind to join them regularly. In this undecided state he continued till 1780 when the Dialogues of James Hervey came into his hands.

Having been much delighted with his *Meditations*, he began to read *Theron and Aspasio*, but was offended with the doctrine of Divine Grace set forth therein, because he found that the merit of good works was wholly discarded. But for the next two years the remembrance of the book was a disturbing factor in his thoughts, and in 1782 he was under "strong conviction" that he must read the book again. So great was the impression

made upon him by this second reading, that he ever afterwards dated his conversion by it, and also, from the time of reading, he began to have a concern for the salvation of his neighbours, speaking with them often of their eternal well-being. Notwithstanding the total change he had undergone in his religious views, and the deplorable state of religion in the Establishment, he continued to worship at the parish church, though the preaching was entirely contrary to his liking, for he could not be reconciled to worshipping regularly with the Dissenters.

In the spring of 1784, being in a book-shop in Huntingdon, he entered into conversation with a Mr. Brock, the clergyman from Stukely, and by him was advised to go to Yelling, where the Rev. Henry Venn was Vicar.

On Easter Sunday he went to Yelling, a distance of twelve miles, and was so uplifted by Venn's preaching, that he forthwith gave up attendance at his own parish church and regularly journeyed to Yelling on Sundays, thus beginning a friendship which continued throughout life.

This "strange conduct" of his excited the curiosity of his neighbours, who "thought him righteous over-much," and often questioned him as to the reason for his actions . . . which gave him opportunity to speak to them of the advantages of Evangelical preaching and of the salvation of their souls.

In the autumn of the same year he purchased *The Life and Sermons of Whitfield*, and the same evening read one of them, entitled, "What think ye of Christ?" to two of his labourers. The next evening, unexpectedly, a number of the poor people of the village came with a Mr. Kent, a gentleman of the village, to hear him read a sermon. He was so embarrassed at the thought of reading before so many people, and also at the idea of being thought a "Methodist preacher," that he refused to comply with their request, but so determined were they, that they threatened to remain in his house until he did read to them, and eventually he read the same sermon to them. One of the poor women begged him to come to her house the next night and read again, and he promised to do so, on condition that she did not let any others know. When he arrived, however, he found the house filled with people, who "with profound attention and deep seriousness received the glad tidings of salvation from the reading of Mr. Whitfield's sermon." He continued thereafter to read to the people in the same cottage throughout that winter, but their numbers increasing, they opened a larger house in the spring of 1875, where they met as opportunity occurred, two, three, and sometimes four evenings a week. Here Coxe Feary for the first time found courage to pray with them, and "They being unaccustomed to any such thing, it produced such a feeling

of affection and surprise, that like the people of Lystra, they would have done sacrifice."

During all these months, he had been attending Venn's church at Yelling, and on acquainting Mr. Venn of what was happening at Bluntisham, was encouraged by him to remain at Bluntisham on Sundays, and to gather the people together and read to them, Venn promising to come over and visit them in the summer.

About this time the Rev. Chas. Simeon of Cambridge came on a visit to Mr. Feary's house, and preached at a service held in the garden at five o'clock in the morning, at which service Elizabeth White was "called under Divine grace." She was one of the first members of the church that was later established, and an aunt of Daniel White, who later was pastor at Cirencester.

The company still increasing, Mr. Kent offered the use of a barn as a meeting-place and the people fitted it up with a few simple furnishings. This idea of a regular meeting-place was a sore trial to Coxe Feary, "as it looked so much like a separation from the Establishment." He approached Simeon with a view to getting an Evangelical Curate for the parish church. Simeon put forward a Mr. Houseman, who agreed to come if the Rector consented; the people agreeing to subscribe for his salary. But the Rev. Jacob Oates was not at all favourably disposed to the Evangelical Revival and refused to consider the proposal.

This refusal caused the people some bewilderment, and realising the impossibility of continuing as they were; "Church-people dissatisfied with the means of Grace provided by the Establishment, and desiring to walk together in the order and fellowship of the Gospel," yet not vitally connected with the church, they applied to Mr. Saunders, minister of the Independent church at Cambridge, for advice as to the principles of Dissent. After long consideration, the advice of Mr. Saunders was followed. On December 28th, 1786, a public meeting was held in the barn, when in the presence of a numerous congregation, "Coxe Feary and twenty-five others, related severally the Lord's dealings with them, and gave themselves to the Lord and to each other, to walk together in fellowship." So was gathered out that band of twenty-six, to form a church destined to great things in the service of the Kingdom of God.

According to the Constitution of the church as drawn up by Coxe Feary, they affirmed belief in: The existence of God; the sufficiency, authenticity, and authority of the Scriptures; the personal distinctions in the Godhead; the doctrine of divine providence; the original perfection of man at creation; man's apostasy in Adam's transgression: the universal depravity of the whole race in consequence; the impossibility of man's

“entreating” himself from this condition; eternal and personal election; particular redemption through the death of Christ; justification, pardon, and eternal life, as the free gift of God; the necessity of the New Birth, together with the final perseverance of such as have experienced that Divine change; the Resurrection of the Body, the Day of Judgement, the final happiness of the Saints and the everlasting punishment of the wicked.

According to the Trust Deed of the first Meeting House built in the following year, they called themselves “A company of Protestant Dissenters from the church of England.” Up to 1791, they were in practice more in line with the present-day Congregational church as regards the ordinance of Baptism; each member on reception was “sprinkled.” But in 1791 a change took place. For some years Coxe Feary had been thinking seriously about the matter of infant baptism, and on many occasions he had spoken with Robert Robinson of Cambridge, a frequent visitor to Bluntisham, concerning his doubts as to New Testament warrant for the practice. Having eventually arrived at the conviction that the baptism of the New Testament was that of BELIEVERS and the mode IMMERSION, he definitely relinquished the sprinkling of infants, and on April 5th, 1791, he with a congregation of 500 people, went to the river Ouse at Over Court. There on the bank he addressed them on the New Testament rite of baptism, and then with twelve others was immersed by Thomas Baron of Cottenham Meeting. So the church passed into a definitely Baptist church.

Mr. Feary remained as pastor of the church until his death in 1822. During his ministry he received into the church 267 persons, the majority of whom received their first religious impressions from his ministry. He not only founded and built up the local church at Bluntisham, but planted causes in other villages, viz., Somersham and Woodhurst; and at his death left a flourishing church and congregation, the latter amounting to 800 people, drawn from the neighbourhood around to an extent of an area of twenty-five miles.

Among his intimate friends he counted Andrew Fuller of Kettering; Robert Hall, who was at Cambridge during the most active part of Mr. Feary's life and was a frequent visitor at Bluntisham; Robert Robinson of Cambridge, who probably influenced Coxe Feary more than any other; Charles Simeon, Henry Venn, and W. Jay of Bath.

He was without doubt a remarkable man. The moral reformation which he effected in his native village and its neighbourhood, is an event to which not many parallel cases can be adduced.

Commencing his work without a single follower; without education, except the slightest rudiments of it; without influence, except what naturally accrued to him as a result of his labours; he produced a most remarkable and permanent change in the greater part of the population around him. Continuing through many discouragements as well as successes, he built up and established a church which has, since his day, played a significant part in the religious life of the county.

A. EDLEY WILLINGS.

JOHN GAMMON OF BOAR'S HEAD YARD. In Bunhill Fields there were two stones, copied by Curll in 1717. "Here lyeth interred the Body of Mr. John Gammon, late Minister of the Gospel. He departed this Life the 8. Day of August, 1699. in the 47. Year of his Age." "This is the Footstone of Mr. John Gammon Minister of the Gospel. Though dead I lye; I speak to you that live: Your heart, your All To Christ be sure to give." This is the pastor of an open-communion church to which Bunyan preached his last sermon in London. Gammon wrote, "Christ a Christian's Life, &c." perhaps in 1680; it was first printed 1691, second edition 1702, 1705, 1707. From the fifth edition, 1738, it was translated into Welsh and published at Pontypool in 1740.

NEHEMIAH COX, M.D., OF PETTY FRANCE. This son of Benjamin, the clergyman, who was once a shoemaker at Cranfield, and was called to the ministry at Bedford on the same day as Bunyan, married Margaret, second daughter of Edmund and Margaret Portman. He died 5 May, 1689, and was buried in their tomb at Bunhill Fields, beneath a stone slab raised on brick. By Sloane MS 656 we learn that he was hon. F.R.C.P., and that "Institutiones Medicae" was dedicated to him by G. Needham. We do not know whether this man was related to Walter Needham, a contemporary doctor, or to the Baptist Needhams of Hitchin.

Sutcliff's Academy at Olney.

JOHAN SUTCLIFF was originally of the Pennines in Yorkshire, born 9th August, 1752. When Dan Taylor started a day school at Birchcliffe, Sutcliff became his usher, or assistant, and learned Latin with Taylor's help. He was baptized in 1769 by John Fawcett, and moved to Wainsgate that he might the better prepare for Bristol Academy. When ready, he spent a winter week in walking down to Bristol, where he was admitted in 1772. Three years later he settled at Olney, where Fawcett ordained him, and here he laboured till his death on 22nd June, 1814. His services to the Northants. Association, to the B.M.S., to the Home Missionary Society, are well known; and he lived just long enough to help found the Baptist Union. Remembering his early home and struggles, he bequeathed his valuable library to the Northern Baptist Education Society, and many of his books are still at Rawdon.

It was the natural thing in those days for every educated minister to support himself by keeping a school, often styled an Academy; and Sutcliff followed the example of Taylor and Fawcett. Many of his pupils entered the Baptist ministry, and the following list shows some whom he thus influenced.

William Carey, shoemaker at Moulton, ten miles to the north, began a school there in 1785. He joined the Olney church, and feeling how poor was his education, enlisted as an out-pupil of Sutcliff, so that after one refusal he was accepted as a preacher, and presently became pastor at Moulton. With 1787 his studies under Sutcliff ended, and he guided his own education. In 1793 he sailed for Bengal, laboured there unsuccessfully for nearly six years, and wrote home for colleagues.

Daniel Brunson, born at Defford, his mother attending the Pershore church, of the Broadmead church under Ryland, was the first volunteer, and he was placed by the B.M.S. committee at Sutcliff's academy for a few months, sailing in 1799. He and his colleagues boldly declared themselves missionaries, and were therefore forbidden to land in British India; whence came about their settlement at Serampore under the Danish flag. The town was captured in 1801, and Brunson died that year in Calcutta. His letter of 20 Nov. 1800 pays high tribute to Sutcliff's influence.

John Chamberlain was a fellow-pupil in 1799, and three years later followed to Serampore. His labours in India were indefatigable till his death at sea in 1822.

John Biss was one of four prepared at the same time, 1802 and 1803, for Serampore. He was twenty-five years old, and married, a member at Plymouth Dock. His health did not last, and he died on the *Bremen* from Calcutta to Philadelphia in 1807, his widow and children returning to India.

Richard Mardon was of the same church, a year older. After exploring at Rangoon, whence arose the Burman mission, he worked at Goamulty, where he died of cholera in 1812.

Joshua Rowe, aged 20, came from Saffery's church at Salisbury. He was spared to labour twenty years, dying at Digah on 11 October, 1823.

William Moore came from Stogumber, about 25 when admitted. He was stationed first at Miniary in 1808, and lived till 1844.

William Robinson was himself of Olney, studied here 1804-5. He arrived at Calcutta 23 August 1806, and his presence became a test case as to the protection of the Danish flag. He was able to stay, and except for one exploration to Java, spent a long life in Bengal till 1853.

Christopher Anderson, at the academy the same time, supported the B.M.S. from Edinburgh, dying one year before Robinson.

Thomas Coles came from College Lane, Northampton; and was ordained at Gretton in May 1808.

A student named George, his contemporary, may possibly be the John George who settled at Shouldham-street in London 1816.

Davies, his fellow-student in 1806, may conceivably have been the Philip Davies who was at Oakingham five years later, and went on to Whitechurch 1819-1840. Or he may be the R. Davies who was at Middleton Cheney in 1809.

George Dobney was at Wallingford in 1814. His fellow-student Richards has not been traced.

J. Smith settled at Burton in May 1809.

Thomas Jarvis settled in July 1810 at a new church, Newark.

W. Brown settled at Keysoe by 1811, and died there 1818.

Eustace Carey, nephew of William, came in 1809; his grandparents wrote two years later that he was making great progress, and often preached in the neighbourhood. He went out to India in 1814.

William Gamby from Southill came at the same time for the same purpose, but died at Olney, aged 23.

Richard Moss Worth was a fellow-student in 1810, but he inherited a baronetcy, and made no mark as a Baptist pastor.

Thomas Welsh settled at Lynn in 1811, afterwards at Newbury for twenty-five years, at Uxbridge in 1840.

E. Burdett settled at Sutton-in-the-Elms 1811.

C. Chown settled at Burford, also in 1811, June. It would

be pleasant if we might connect him with the William Chown who succeeded William Carey as schoolmaster at Moulton. There is some uncertainty as to his initial, and he may be the J. Chown who was at Harpole in 1827.

Samuel Peters was with Sutcliff in 1811, and was pastor at Shepshed for ten years after 1814.

John Lawson was a wood-engraver who offered to go and help Ward; the B.M.S. committee sent him here, and he reached Serampore in 1812, where he did fine service for thirteen years with oriental typography.

Franks left in February 1814. He may have been the John who was at Newport 1821, and/or at Kingston 1831-35.

Griffiths is an uncertain quantity. He may be the James who was ordained at Wotton-under-Edge in 1814, or the Thomas who, with his wife, arrived in Ceylon 1816 and spent five years before returning.

Harris is equally uncertain. As he was with Sutcliff in 1814, he may be the man who joined the Bristol Fund in 1817, and died 1821.

William Knowles was ordained at Hackleton in 1815, dying there in 1866 at the age of 80. He was perhaps son of the William who was at Rushden in 1790.

Benjamin Medlock was ordained at Sabden, near Sutcliff's first home, in 1817, and in 1832 went to Keysoe.

Lee Compere from Halstead became the second missionary of the B.M.S. to Jamaica, appointed 1815; but ill-health obliged him to go to the United States, where he continued missionary work among the Creek Indians at Withington in Alabama.

Pope is another enigma. He, with the five others last mentioned, was at the academy when Sutcliff died. Solomon Young came to carry on the work for two months; he was from Inkberrow in Worcestershire, had been trained at Bristol and held a pastorate at Truro. He was now invited to become classical tutor at Stepney, to help Newman and Cox. It would seem possible that he took on with him George Pope, who quitted Stepney in 1818, and was soon at the new church of Sutton-on-Trent, then by 1835 at North Collingham.

All these thirty-three pupils were men, not boys, when they went to Sutcliff; and many of them were sent to him by the B.M.S. It is a good illustration of how what were essentially mere private boarding-schools commanded such confidence that their proprietors were entrusted with the coaching of men for foreign missions; William Gray kept such a school at Chipping Norton, and was the next coach employed by the B.M.S. Sutcliff's school seems to have died on the departure of Young to London.

It may be noticed that Sutcliff gave the first impulse to Carey which directed his thoughts abroad; and that the next seven of these men followed. The B.M.S., in its earliest stages, owed as much to Sutcliff as to any man.

With Thomas Coles an old vein of ore was re-worked. It had been not unusual for a pastor to take a promising young man as a kind of apprentice, and so fit him for his life-work in England. Sutcliff himself had thus profited by his coaching from Fawcett. From 1808 onwards his contributors to the home pastorate were substantial. And perhaps he was the last of this line, for now, besides his Alma Mater at Bristol, the Northern Society at Bradford and the Welsh Society at Abergavenny were ensuring permanence to the work, while London was soon to begin.

Sutcliff's library went back to the Pennines, where another Bristol man, William Steadman, was thus carrying on the Fawcett tradition. The missionary spirit went with them, and soon Bradford students turned their attention for the first time to Jamaica, Canada, Australia, Calcutta, and South Africa. The good was not interred with his bones.

[The editor regrets that the name of the compiler of this list of pupils has been mislaid.]

BATH. Josiah Thompson learned about 1770 that the Baptists began about 1744 in a private room, that Hugh Evans of Bristol opened at Kingsmead square in 1747, moving soon to Collett's back yard on Horn street. A church of nine members was organised in 1752, with six more baptised at Paulton, and joined the Western Association at once. Bernard Foskett opened a meeting-house in 1755, and Robert Parsons was ordained. In 1760 the church was strong enough to entertain the Association; and two years later it enlarged the meeting-house, acquired a burial-ground, and started to register births in its families. In 1769 it shifted to a new home on Garrott street, having ninety members. So far the story is consistent, but there is a puzzling fact that from 1689 to 1697 John Gay represented "Bath Haycomb" at various assemblies. And in 1837, when the church was at Somerset street, and William Peachey was pastor, and the church surrendered its registers to Somerset House, the claim was made that the church originated in 1720. The only justification seems to be that Henry Dolling, who was a trustee of the Presbyterian meeting in 1726, registered his house in Widcombe for public worship by Baptists; it is not certain that there is any continuity between that event and the organisation in 1752.

Wales under the Indulgence, 1672-5.

DR. THOMAS RICHARDS, librarian of the University College of Wales at Bangor, has published with the above title a fourth valuable instalment of his studies. The National Eisteddfod Association recognises the appropriateness of publishing it, so that within nine years the English reader has at length a series of well-documented works covering the Puritan movement from 1639 to 1687. Most praiseworthy are both author and publishers.

This volume is of even wider scope than its title suggests, for it has been necessary to study the activities of Welshmen in England, and also to evaluate the Indulgence generally. The speculation as to its motives is interesting, though perhaps sufficient weight is not given to the need of Charles to placate the militant Dissenters who did not hesitate at strikes, assassination, aiding foreign foes. The reader of Bate and Lyon Turner will find ample material to reconsider their conclusions. Especially noteworthy is a careful argument that when a teacher was given only a licence for a particular place, the addendum to it was intended, "With further licence and permission to him the said [person] to teach in any other place licenced and allowed [for that congregation] by Us according to Our said Declaration." For often a congregation had many places of meeting, even in different counties; and this was rather the rule than the exception among Baptists. Yet Dr. Richards recognises that both the licence-holders and the public at large soon confounded these particular licences with the general; so that Bunyan, licensed really for Bedford and other places of his congregation, exhibited that licence in October at Leicester and had it registered by the mayor without demur. The distinction was clear only to a few experts, and received scant attention even after the Declaration was cancelled. Of the teachers at large, licensed generally, Dr. Richards counts 236, leaving 1,371 licensed for particular congregations, in all England and Wales. He quite agrees with previous students that a map of all will show only those Dissenters who asked for licences and obtained them, and leaves out of account the large numbers who did not apply. He further criticises the value of the descriptions Presbyterian, Independent, Congregational, Baptist, Anabaptist, and in many cases proves how faulty they are.

These general appreciations may now be followed with an abstract of his information as to Baptists in Wales over the whole period of his studies, as presented in this volume. He begins with the principality "at the mercy of any hot gospeller that came to the border: Hanserd Knollys preaching adult baptism over the highlands of Brecknock and Radnor, Jeremiah Ives propagating Arminianism in the upper reaches of the Wye, William Rider advocating imposition of hands to the Baptists of the Hay, Henry Jessey putting Llanvaches in order and re-baptising Vavasor Powell sixteen years later, Anna Trapnell staggering the poor peasants with her prophecies of doom," and John Tombes entering "the ring at Abergavenny to defend baptism by immersion against two Anglican opponents." The result of this English propaganda was to produce several types. "One line of cleavage made Baptists either Calvinistic or Arminian, another angle of vision made them 'open' or 'close.' Both Baptists and Independents divided into two schools over the question of State maintenance; there were close upon seventy unpaid preachers in South Wales alone."

Of the open Baptists, followers of Tombes and Jessey, a good representative is William Thomas of Llantrisant, described in Commonwealth times as "the self-ordained pig, wallower in water," leader in all south Monmouth, in close touch with Broadmead in 1667, dying in 1671, whose people four years later were "in judgment for free communion with saints as saints," like the distant followers of John Bunyan. Dr. Richards proves and emphasises that Baptists of this type were often content to be called Congregational. Of the close Baptists, the champion at first was John Miles of Ilston, but when he and most of his members in 1663 took the church-book to a new Swanzey in Plymouth colony, his mantle fell on William Jones, who settled at Rhydwylym in the south-west. The Arminian Baptists under William Bound "were too fond of acting on the defensive, lacked breadth of outlook," and though energetic, so that a Radnor woman in 1672 was "sorely tempted by Satan to be rebaptised and to join the Arminians," yet they sought no licence.

In 1660 an open Baptist, John Davies, once a tailor, then a soldier at Worcester, now holding the living of Llangattock in Brecon, sought to fortify his title by obtaining Presbyterian orders at Hereford. But an act passed in September by the Convention Parliament displaced seven Baptists, including John Miles, and thus settled the controversy as to taking State pay. It is hard to sell one's birthright for a mess of pottage, and then be deprived of the pottage.

Powell fared worse, and was promptly thrown into prison; only in 1667-8 was he able to renew his physical activity, though

his pen was frequently busy. And Jenkin Jones shared the same fate at once. The only authority for these imprisonments was the old Conventicle Act of 1593, long dormant, under which we have shown that Bunyan also was incarcerated—it is almost the only point not remembered by Dr. Richards. The whole legal position was so obscure, and so kaleidoscopic, that on 21 July, 1662, David Davies wrote from Penmain in Gower for a copy of the "Statutes at Large"; but as he wanted to know what laws were repealed and which were not, it was very poor economy to stipulate for a secondhand copy. After special legislation against Quakers, the Cavalier Parliament in 1664 passed a new Conventicle Act to hold for three years. One "bizarre development" was that "a fanatical Catabaptist of Abergavenny, a thatcher, one that carried a musquet to Worcester against his sacred Majesty," applied to the bishop of Llandaff for ordination, to the scandal of Baxter and others.

For the three years, life was indeed hard. "A young Baptist woman of Brecknock out of communion with the Church had her body exhumed from the churchyard of Bryn Pabuan, and buried at cross-roads like a common suicide; the corpse of an old help-mate of Vavasor Powell . . . was allowed to remain unburied for ten days in the churchyard of Llangollen; . . . a barbarous lack of humour was displayed in taking away the last cow of an Arminian Baptist at Llanddewi Ystradenni, thus depriving his children of the milk they craved." We should like to publish an English version of the poetic effusion of Richard Pugh, miller, of Tredwstan in Brecknock, preserved by Joshua Thomas, which shows with a wealth of vivid colouring the whole machinery of persecution as wielded by the sheriffs and the officials of the consistory, down to 1687.

One result of these troubles was to bring into temporary fellowship "saints as saints," whatever their exact type of doctrine or of church polity. But the fall of Clarendon in 1667 caused the persecution to slacken, and as Parliament was prorogued without extending the Conventicle Act, this expired by March 1668/9. There was prompt renewal of Baptist activity, and prompt renewal of minor differences.

Thus Powell not only emerged from prison and preached at London and Bristol, but came back to Llanfyllin and Merthyr Tydvil. He was a good lawyer, and defended himself vigorously at Cardiff and Cowbridge, he was astute enough to quote Coke that the oath of allegiance could be exacted only once.

But he was no longer the guiding spirit in the principality. From Carmarthen prison, William Jones an ejected rector came to Olchon, and was there baptised. In 1668 he and William Prichard and Thomas Watkins travelled to Rhydwylym in the

south-west, and on 12 July organised a church on the strict lines of Miles; though they utilised Powell's confession, they deleted from it the article as to open-membership. This church was destined to become the great focus of Baptist development, Jones alone baptising sixty-two members in four years. "Wherever in Wales Baptists of loose and invertebrate principles consorted with Independents, the former succumbed to the alchemy of assimilation." Not only in Wales, not only then. The staunch leaders revived a wide itineration, so that far-flung congregations had many habitual meeting-places. Some men were wise enough to attend to the rising generation, and open schools. William Milman at Llangwm was indeed a Sabbatarian, so he may have taught on Sunday while he preached on Saturday. Reginald Wilson was a man of good education, always designed for public ministry; he opened a large school at Aberhafesp, which later on attracted the sons of gentlemen of quality; and in 1669 he was abetting two conventicles in Cydwain.

In 1670 Sheldon persuaded Parliament to frame a new Conventicle Act, with no limitation of time. Charles insisted that it should explicitly recognise the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, thus continuing the tradition from Henry through Edward, Elizabeth, his grandfather, and his father. The first important use of this supremacy was to seal on 15 March, 1671/2 (when Parliament was not sitting) a Declaration of Indulgence to all sorts of nonconformists, offering to allow them a sufficient number of places for public worship, and to approve the teachers of their congregations. Applications were soon made, and many Baptists of Wales obtained licences between 15 June and 3 February 1672/3. Next day Parliament met, and furiously attacked the King's dispensing power, so that Charles broke the seal of the Declaration on 7 March, and within a month the grand jury of Montgomery was attempting to revive persecution. A picture of the Baptist licences may be sketched.

The first to profit were Thomas Joseph of Bridgend, who had been displaced from Llangeinor living in 1660, and Howell Thomas displaced from Glyncoirwg under similar circumstances. For their ministrations were made available Joseph's own house, the houses of widow Williams at St. Bride's, of Llewellyn Morgan at Llangewydd, and of William Andrews at Newton Nottage. All these were explicitly defined as Baptist, and they show the persistence of the Miles tradition in Glamorgan, even to the itinerant system. On the same day Joshua Miller, once-incumbent at St. Andrews and displaced in 1668, was licensed for the house of Morgan Thomas in Wenvoe; he had written against the Quakers, had sold books in London; the clerks-

entered him as a Presbyterian; what he really was cannot be verified, but the entries as to Wenvoe and John French raise some suspicion.

In July the open Baptists made appearance. It is true that the house of John Kynaston at Bryngwyn in Montgomery was licensed for "Congregational" worship; but Maurice three years later classified the people here as Baptists in judgement for the most part, and Henry Williams of Ysgafell, their leader, was certainly such. No licence seems to have been obtained for a teacher at this date.

A third group was the Seventh-day Baptists of Monmouth. Walter Williams was licensed for the house of Edward Waters at Llangibby, and William Milman for the house of William Richards at Llangwm. But the former was content to be styled "Congregational," the latter was not defined at all.

More important was a large group served by itinerants, on the borders of Glamorgan and Monmouth. Thomas Quarrell took out a licence for the house of John Maurice at Shirenewton. He had once been ready to fight for freedom, having won it, he settled as usher of the Puritan free school at the town of Montgomery, had come into family connection with Powell, had been working from Whitchurch in Glamorgan over a wide area. His congregation was destined to be represented at London in 1689, a welcome token that the Particular churches there were partly Open, partly Strict; and he himself was well reported of next year.

His lead was followed within three weeks by many coadjutors, and 10 August saw several new licences. Thomas (John or) Jones, a preacher since 1654 of the Strict order, now living at Gelligaer, was content to admit Independents, and so accepted the label Congregational, when licensed to preach at Eglwysilan. The place chosen was the house of William (John or) Jones, who at Craigyrallt had suffered severely under the Conventicle Act, and was destined to live to the days of parliamentary toleration in 1690. At Gelligaer itself, Thomas had the house of Lewis Rees, and at Llanfabon the house of William Rowlands. As the house of Margaret Jones at Henllys in Monmouthshire was for Independent worship, it probably belonged to Quarrell's group. It is less certain whether the house of James Lewis at Caldicot was another station; this had been at first described as Presbyterian, but on 10 August was corrected to Congregational. Aberystroth had two houses, of Llewellyn Rosser and John Jones, the latter being preacher. At Llanwenarth there was the house of John Watkins; at Magor in the house of Walter Jones, Thomas Barnes who had been ejected in 1662 and had since laboured in Bristol, ministered

again to his adherents. At Marshfield there was the house of Jane Reynolds, and at Newport the house of Barbara Williams. The centre of all this work was Mynyddislwyn, with three houses available, Evan Williams once farmer of a Monmouthshire living, Thomas James, and Watkin Jones. This last man was himself a preacher long linked with Quarrell, and it is not surprising that after his itinerant career he disclaimed the title Presbyterian, and this day took a licence as Congregational. All this group seem to have followed the lead of Tombes and Jessey, rather than that of Kyffin. And there is room to doubt if some were Baptist of any shade at all.

But at Abergavenny there were others of less compromising mould, who plainly avowed themselves Baptist. John Edwards the shoemaker, and Christopher Price the apothecary, who had supported Tombes in 1653, did not follow him now in calling himself Presbyterian, though Edwards had seen his way to accept the living of Llangorse till displaced in 1660. Price survived to sign a letter to the Assembly of 1690. With them is to be classed a second Thomas Jones, licensed for his own house at Bedwellty.

The next applications were granted on 30 September. At Llanigon and at Talgarth in Brecknock, houses belonging to William Watkins were licensed; a captain of this name living at Penyrwrlodd was a most influential Dissenter, with a most devout wife who would travel even to Llanwenarth in the days of persecution. Dr. Richards is uncertain whether they are to be classed as Open or Strict. The teacher contemplated was David Williams, who apparently lived at Cefn-y-gwaelod by Troedrhiwdalar, and was remembered as late as 1780; in 1675 Maurice knew him as ordained elder here.

Carmarthen had a group sustaining the traditions of Miles, and avowing themselves Baptist. They chose three places of meeting; at Llannon the house of John Morgan; at Llangennech (misspelt in the Entry Book) the houses of Edward Williams and Joshua Franklin; Joshua kept up the usage of Jenkin dating from 1657. The teacher was Robert Morgan. With them is to be taken the house of William Dykes in Swansea, where Lewis Thomas, formerly of a farm at the Mwr, cut free from his entangling alliance at Newton Nottage and ministered to out-and-out Baptists, on the lines of Llewellyn Morgan at Llangewyth.

The next batch of licences was issued for Radnorshire. It is to be noted that Henry Maurice, himself a pedobaptist, was most active all that summer. He held a meeting in Church Stretton at the house of widow Sankey on 2 July, though she only obtained her licence on the 25th: it is good to find her upholding the principles of her husband, colonel Sir Jerome

Sankey of the Irish Brigade. In August Maurice was at Llanigon, Talgarth and Glasgwm, in company with John Hanmer. On 18 November five licences were issued for houses; at Glasgwm, Richard Mills and Thomas Price; at Llanbister, Anne King; at Llanfihangel Nant Melan, Thomas Tonman; at Llangunllo, Richard Griffith. Four of these were described as Congregational, Tonman's has no definition. Tonman was an adherent of Powell from 1655 at least, in 1687 was reported as wealthy; and the Tonmans of 1725 were Baptist supporters. It would seem therefore that in 1672 the group was Open Baptist. Their teachers were Edward Owen at Glasgwm and John Hanmer at Llanbister; the latter had been one of the most faithful henchmen of Powell.

The group strengthened its position on 9 December, when Morris and Richard Griffith with Owen Morgan, all of Beguildy, took licences for themselves at their own houses. True that all were marked Presbyterian, but all had been supporters of Powell, and Dr. Richards utterly disallows the clerk's classification.

With these may possibly be taken the house of John Weaver at New Radnor, licensed on 30 September. He had been incumbent there till 1660, had moved to Bettws Diserth and kept school there, and was now content to be called Congregational.

Whatever pedobaptist strength there was in this group at 1672, John Evans in 1715 found that at Nant Melan, Glasgwm and New Radnor there was one Baptist church with 400 members; this amply warrants the critical scrutiny of the 1672 appellation.

The last licences issued at all were on 3 February 1672/3, and half of them attest Baptist progress. At Llanfeugian in Brecknock the house of David Williams was allowed; Lewis Prytherch was teacher, and in 1675 Maurice says he was elder-elect. This congregation was of the Open type, probably on friendly terms with the people of Llanigon and Talgarth. At Llanafanfawr, also in Brecknock, Thomas Evans, who had so far paltered as to take the living of Maesmynus till 1660, but was not afraid now to call himself Baptist, took out a licence, and probably thought that covered his own house. With him is to be reckoned William Greene of Llandrindod in Radnor, perhaps the man who in 1656 signed the "Humble Address" just before John Miles.

Such is a critical account of all the Baptists in Wales who in 1672 obtained the king's licence; and it must be repeated that there is ample contemporary evidence of others who did not apply for one. A few notes may be gleaned as to later growth.

Henry Maurice early in 1673 became "a teacher errant, who leads a body of 200 or 300 after him in the face of this country"

of Brecknock. "For the next ten years he was to be settled pastor of the gathered church of Bapto-Independents" which commonly met at Llanigon; and in 1675 Terrill of Bristol obtained from him a valuable letter as to the condition of all the gathered churches in Wales, printed with the Broadmead Records in 1847.

By 1681 the Strict Baptists of Rhydwylyn had revived the old common-law marriage, disregarding the parish buildings and registers, but invoking the witness and the goodwill of their own church. Two years later, in the renewed persecution, the Arminian Baptists of Llanddewi Ystradenny, shepherded by the Gregorys, sent a small contingent via Milford to Philadelphia, and they established a flourishing cause at Pennepec. The remnant of this group in 1702 joined the Baptist Association of Wales, quietly adopting Calvinism.

While our excerpts deal simply with the four types of Baptist, Strict and Particular, Open and Particular, Seventh-day and Particular, General, we close our appreciation with the reminder that all Welsh Dissent is here studied, and with Dr. Richards' verdict:—"The short-lived Indulgence emphasised the Independent hegemony, crystallised the Baptist creed, dissolved the dream of Presbyterian comprehension, witnessed the efflorescence of Dissenting schools, and furnished a remarkable proof of the organic unity of Puritanism with its glories in the past."

STOGUMBER and HATCH BEAUCHAMP had their early history entwined. We may disregard a statement of 1770 that Bicknal was founded in 1630, and may put together all manner of contemporary gleanings. When the Western Association met in 1655 at Bridgwater, there was a messenger from Hatch, and next year George Parsons of Hatch signed the Somerset Confession. When Charles, in 1672, issued licences, they were taken at Ashbrittle by Francis Bryant, John Carnall, and Isaac Farman; at Pitminster by Edward Gatchell for his own house; at Minehead by Stephen Lanclark for his own house; at Broomfield by Robert Speare for the house of John Speare; and at South Perrott, just over the Dorset border, by Jeremiah Dry for the house of Robert Cartisse. In 1689 they registered two buildings for worship, one at Dunster, and for Stogumber the house of Christopher Hawkins at Higher Vexford. That year Jeremiah Dry attended the London Assembly as pastor

of Hatch, while Dunster and Stoke Gomer were grouped as one, without a minister; so also in 1692. But Thompson refers to the records at Bicknal, and says that from 1690 to 1700 Jeremiah Dry was pastor at "Coyland near Bicknall," which may be Leighland near Bicknoller. He was followed by William Tixe till 1722. In 1715 John Evans heard of the Dunster group; of Lancelot Spurrier tending forty-six people at Minehead; and of fifty-four more at Stokegomer. About 1750, Ryland at Warwick heard nothing about these churches. Thompson of London, in 1770, heard that Dunster was served in 1720 by Sampson, then by Spurrier, Bryant, Jackson, Jeffries, after which it was absorbed by the Presbyterians: this sounds quite credible, though documents are not published. The MS. records of the Western Association at Bristol, from 1697, might amplify this summary. The MS. records at (New College for) Regent's Park tell that in 1733 at the re-organization against Arianism, letters were sent from Dunster and Stogumber; and that in 1745 the Association met at Bicknell. Thompson knew of the church records there, dating from 1690, and knew of the minister in 1770. At Stogumber the Baptists obtained the present site in 1726, and soon built; they enlarged later with the materials of the old Presbyterian meeting at Bicknoller. The registers they started in 1726 are now at Somerset House. At Hatch they began local records in 1742, and Samuel Burford settled in 1750 for nine years; Thompson heard that he revived the cause at Bicknell. There was no meeting-house at Hatch till 1783, and Thompson overlooked this group. With 1790 Rippon, a west-country man, calendared James Adams at Hatch, and Augustus Crisp at Stogumber. After that the churches lived in the light of day.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the Society will be held on Thursday, 2nd May, at the Baptist Church House. Reports and accounts will be submitted, officers and committee will be elected. A paper will then be read by Professor Frank Edward Robinson, M.A., B.D., on the 250th Anniversary of Bristol College. Visitors will be welcome: tea will be served first at four o'clock.