

## English Baptists and the Corn Laws

THE *Times* of November 18th, 1843, scathingly identified the supporters of the Anti-Corn Law League with the following comments:—

“We acknowledge that we dislike gregarious collections of Cant and Cotton men. But we cannot doubt that whatever is the end of this agitation, it will expire only to bequeath its violence and its turbulence to some successor”.

Although the sombre voice of the Victorian establishment was not prophetic with regard to the movement's after effects, it does provide the historian with two distinctive categories of protectionist opposition. Many reasons have been advanced to explain the participation of Cotton men in this crusade, ranging from the protested altruism of John Bright and Richard Cobden to the claims of the anti-league forces that these manufacturers were lobbying for cheap food as a means of becoming more competitive on the world market and thus were really unconcerned for the poor labourer's welfare. The motives of those individuals lumped unceremoniously together as “Cotton men” may range between the two extremes. To-date a great deal of attention has been paid to Cotton men while comparatively little effort has been made to understand the motivation and role of the Canters, particularly the radical left wing of this alliance—the Baptists.

The Baptists who opposed the corn laws were the core of the denomination's Midland and London leadership. This almost complete list of *Who's Who* in Victorian Baptist ranks came into existence for reasons distinctly religious rather than economic and/or political. This was not their first crusade nor would it be their last. Apparently their long experience in religious disability, as well as their theological orientation, predisposed their involvement. These men for the most part had cut their teeth in the abolitionist agitation and would spend their more mature years supporting the British Anti-State Church Association in its battle against the religious establishment and its church rates. As one watches their performances in the middle years of the century the feeling becomes irresistible that in fact these men comprise a Baptist repertory company playing out the various sequences of reform.

Thomas Price, F. A. Cox, William Brock, Benjamin Evans, J. E. Giles, James Acworth, J. P. Mursell, J. H. Hinton all empha-

sized from their pulpits and their personal lives that the religious man although he need not be of the world, lives in the world; that in fact his environment, despite his objections, is coloured by influences both political and economic. The currently orthodox emphasis upon the shaping of politics by economic considerations must have the corrective applied that at certain times politics has been partially shaped by religious considerations. This era of the Anti-Corn Law League is such a time. I propose this cautiously with the conviction that these religious proponents of corn law repeal supported the proposition for what *they understood as Christian motives*.

W. W. Rostow has approached this problem with regard to John Bright. Pointing out first that there were few issues more purely economic in character Rostow said :—

“Bright, the Quaker, threw himself into the crusade out of the broadest motives, as a whole man; . . . he regarded the corn laws as part of a larger political conception for Britain and the world. There is little doubt that many of his followers shared the Free Trade vision, with its full penumbra of hopes for peace, democracy, and universal prosperity.”<sup>1</sup>

England in the Victorian years may well be one of the most religious societies that history has recorded. Although this religious world exhibited a vast range of quality the evangelical concept seems to be the dominant theme. By evangelical, I am suggesting a form of Christianity that had its stress upon personal conduct. Theologically, evangelicalism recognized the necessity of grace yet manifested its doctrines of salvation primarily through works. This emphasis was shared by nonconformity in general and within the Establishment by the evangelical party of which Cobden was a representative.

Those dissenters who engaged in any political activities were referred to as *political dissenters* as opposed to the *pious dissenters* who abstained from such activity. F. R. Salter has rightly pointed out that this is not an altogether fair categorization; to use political as a term of censure overlooks the fact that where a church was established by the government any discussion of its favoured position had to be political. There was nevertheless, as we shall see, a vigorous discussion within evangelical Christianity as to what lengths a Christian might extend his activities to live his faith by works. Even in the midst of the earlier abolition crusade there were pious voices condemning this involvement as being political and *ipso facto* unchristian. This attitude is based upon a reading of the text “be in the world but not of the world”; meaning that to be of the world is to engage in politics. This was certainly buttressed by the obvious corruption existent on the contemporary

political scene. A classic example of this position is provided by one who saw politics as a symptom of decline in spirituality—James Lister of Liverpool :

“ I cannot reconcile,” said Lister, “ this warm part in all political matters which is taken and openly defended, with the spirit of Christ’s kingdom, which is not of this world, nor with the true position of Christians as strangers and pilgrims on earth. Nor have I ever seen one example in which devotedness to politics did not injure the spirituality and piety of the individual.”<sup>2</sup>

Obviously the denomination’s leadership and most of its membership did not accept this blanket indictment of political activity. Yet it is necessary for us to understand how as Christians they reconciled their role as “ strangers and pilgrims on earth ” with a vigorous attack on the corn laws and the Establishment which the laws represented.

Professor Cowherd’s *The Politics of English Dissent*<sup>3</sup> provides ample evidence of the religious motivation inherent in both the method and organization of the Anti-Corn Law League. While the League’s energies were devoted initially to mobilizing the already functioning abolition and church-rate movements, it also sought to convince the remainder of nonconformity that the corn laws were opposed to the Christian faith and thus must be opposed as a matter of religious necessity. The Independent, John Pye Smith, said : “ Our object is to teach the politics which flow from piety, the politics of equitable benevolence, the politics of the Gospel and the politics of Jesus our Lord and Saviour.”<sup>4</sup> The earlier involvement of John Bright in the church-rate controversy and of the Presbyterian George Thompson in the anti-slavery struggle had important consequences for the League as they brought many of their followers into the anti-corn fold. Thompson, who headed the British India Society, had a significant following among the Baptists including editor Thomas Price of the *Eclectic Review*. One must not place too much emphasis upon the personal magnetism of Thompson, who it would seem alienated as many people as he attracted. It is quite impossible to explain the anti-corn support of F. A. Cox (who had been bitterly criticized by Thompson on more than one occasion) on the superficial grounds of personal appeal.<sup>5</sup>

Cobden himself did not limit his free trade gospel to personalities but struck out to demonstrate that the monopoly inferred by protectionism was directly linked to religious disability. This was the most uncomfortable rub of dissent in general and the Baptists in particular. Noting that the commutation of tithes fluctuated with the sliding price scale on corn, Cobden underlined the interest of the Established Church in maintaining high prices through the guarantees of the corn laws. Cobden’s appeal was simply this :

"We advocate the abolition of the Corn Law, because we believe that to be the foster parent of all other monopolies. . . ."<sup>6</sup>

Leaving the linking of religious liberty with the corn laws, we shift our attention to the implied role of anti-slavery in gathering League support. During the period of agitation in the middle years of the 1830's Baptists had developed a liaison with American abolitionists. Despite their efforts on behalf of the West Indian slaves and later apprentices, English Baptists found the time and energy to ply their American counterparts with unceasing advice and prayerful support. The connection as it evolved emphasized the common goals and interdependence of the Atlantic community. This feeling was of course not limited to the Baptists, for in this decade a steady stream of English visitors was crossing the Atlantic to visit both the West Indies and the fabled land of religious freedom, the United States. Visitors included George Thompson, Joseph Sturge, H. Martineau, Richard Cobden, J. J. Gurney, John Scoble, F. A. Cox and James Hoby, the latter two having been a delegation of the Baptist Union of Great Britain. As a result of the personal friendships developed during these visits we can trace an intensification of comradery between the abolitionists on both sides of the ocean.

The Wellington Corn Law of 1828 which reversed the spirit of Huskisson's reforms, coincided with an era of poor harvests and resultant famine prices on grains. As a reaction to this the United States exported grains to England where, blocked from sale by a sliding duty scale, they eventually rotted in bonded warehouses. The Whigs had been strongly intimidated by the fear that American corn would capture the market as its cotton had in the prior decade. Despite British needs for an American market to absorb an increased rate of production, corn duties were further hiked in 1834. The problem was basically one in which England needed industrial markets while the American northwest was outgrowing its southern wheat market and needed to expand into the English market. This of course was not possible with the corn law barriers. American frustration was compounded by the fear that the south might well lose its cotton monopoly to a resurgent East Indian producer. Then the United States, to preserve a favourable balance of trade, would be forced to depend on grain exports. An American lobby developed for the sole purpose of dismantling the corn laws. In addition to the balance of trade argument it was further conjectured that the expansion of trade would pay for many of the internal improvements which, as a result of President Jackson's Maysville Road veto, could not depend on federal monies. A third aspect was provided by northern abolitionists. Their contention was that if wheat could supplant cotton as the major export commodity, the slaveholding southern states could be economically isolated and forced to end slavery.

The American lobby operating through anti-slavery channels opened its campaigns against the corn laws in London at the World Anti-Slavery Convention in 1840. James Birney and H. B. Stanton, representing the Liberal Party and the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, arrived with the material of their dual cause in hand but were denied the convention floor. Their programme with its dominant theme of "Slavery upheld by the Corn Laws" was nevertheless published and for the most part accepted by the Baptists. A later stage found John Curtis as an agent of the Liberal Party (forerunner of the Free Soil and Republican parties) working with Cobden for eight months as an agent and member of the Anti-Corn Law League.<sup>7</sup>

The theory advocated by the Americans—that in fact the corn laws aided and abetted American slavery—came to English Baptists as an answer to fervent prayer. This is due to the tremendous sense of frustration they experienced over their stark inability to do anything about U.S. slavery. Baptists felt deeply the failure of their yearly resolutions and letters of admonition. As a result of their deputation in 1835 they understood in a limited way that the American federal system did not offer the same ameliorative possibilities as their own central government. Baptists and their dissenting brethren, who in some instances had been abstaining from slave-grown produce for years, saw an opportunity to attack slavery through the corn laws. They saw the possibility of beating the American federal system into submission with an economic club which could with effort be secured from their own Parliament. *The Spectator* of March 31, 1838, offered a valuable insight into this English zeal for the negro slave. Suggesting that the concern arose from the fact that it was a problem easily reducible to black and white, good and evil, saint and sinner, it said: "Ordinary home questions are dull as lectures and sermons (but) slavery has the excitement of a tragedy." The columns of nonconformity's favourite newspaper *The Patriot* provides ample evidence of the success of this drive to convince dissent that the corn laws were guilty by association with perpetuating American slavery.

The American rationale can be summed up in the following:

*"If England desires America to be freed from slavery, England must receive the products of our free labour, instead of the products of our slaves. Let, then, every Abolitionist in England consider that view, and strive in every lawful way to open your ports for the corn of our country, which grows upon free soil, and is cultivated by free men."*<sup>8</sup>

The principles of free trade were thus firmly wed to anti-slavery which had an established momentum and a religious *imprimatur* as well. The agitation against the corn laws became by association a struggle against human bondage and for religious freedom.

Returning to the manner in which religious liberty was hitched to anti-corn law agitation, due to non-existent manuscript sources, one must depend on the denomination's periodicals. *The Baptist Magazine* had taken an active part in the earlier slavery controversy and the subsequent uproar over the apprenticeship system. The new editor, William Groser, facing the prospects of an even more bitter struggle, was unwilling to jeopardise an already shaky subscription list for the cause of the corn law repeal. Since he had been receiving letters from both sides urging that he take a stand, Groser decided that wisdom was the greater part of valour and closed the magazine to the issue.<sup>9</sup>

This forfeiture left the denominational discussion primarily to the *Eclectic Review*. Although the *Eclectic* had been founded by the Independent, Josiah Conder, it passed into the control of Thomas Price, former pastor of the Devonshire Square Baptist chapel. Price, turning to journalism because of a failing voice, edited *Slavery in America* between 1836 and 1837. Closing down this vigorous abolitionist journal he carried its major theme into the *Eclectic's* editorial stance. A close friend of George Thompson, Price was predictably interested in the corn law issue.

The opening corn law polemic of this pulpit-less preacher appeared in January, 1839. His 20-page discourse was summed up with :

“ The huckstering legislators, or the legislating hucksters, determined that their ware, which was corn, should be increased in price by the exclusion of such increase to the food of the community, as might have been derived by foreign trade.”<sup>10</sup>

Price, never one to settle for merely influencing opinion, sought to mobilise support at the polls in 1841 for those men “ outspoken in favour of civil, religious, and commercial freedom ”. He said **FREE TRADE . . .** must be the rallying cry at the elections; free trade in corn . . . timber, and every necessary of life”.<sup>11</sup> Highly critical of the Tories he sought to inspire both Liberals and Radicals for the election struggle.

One of the great 1841 events was the conference of ministers summoned by Cobden to Manchester to discuss the subject of the corn laws. Drawing himself to his full oratorical height, Cobden called upon the clergy present to declare that the law was “ opposed to the law of God, was anti-scriptural and anti-Christian ”. This conference drew 645 ministers, many from within the evangelical fold. Of this total the Independents were represented with 276 men, the Baptists with 182, Presbyterians 52, Methodists 59, Unitarians 23, Roman Catholics 10, Church of England 2, Church of Scotland 2, and the minor sects represented by 39. J. E. Giles, a Baptist minister from Leeds (and a close friend of the Corn Law Rhymer, Ebenezer

Eliot) made one of the major addresses of the session. G. Kitson Clark suggests that this was the only conference for which the thrifty Leeds Baptists paid their delegates' travelling expenses.<sup>12</sup>

The major theme of the conference was the charge that the vested interests of the State Church was a key factor in the existence of the corn laws. With this presupposition affirmed by most of those present it was a simple matter to train their spiritual artillery against the Establishment through the issue of free trade and more immediately the corn laws.<sup>13</sup> A rather important sidelight on Baptist attendance at this meeting is the observation that the number present was far greater than any attendance record of the Baptist Union.<sup>14</sup> Also, Thomas Price, since he reprinted the Conference news from the *Patriot, Morning Chronicle* and the *Manchester Times*, probably was not in Manchester although the meeting's tenor obviously met with his complete approval.

*The Quarterly Review*, taking a tack diametrically opposed to that of the *Eclectic*, bitterly regretted the actions of those dissenting ministers,

“. . . who, forgetful of that ‘Christian charity’ and ‘those sacred functions’ of which they were so fond of reminding the clergy of the Established Church, erected themselves into a POLITICAL convocation, whence they promulgated . . . the grossest dogmas of nonsense and falsehood, with, indeed, the most rancorous spirit—but with such ignorance, vulgarity, inconsistency, and stupidity, that, fortunately, their interference did more good to the Conservative cause than their most sanguine malevolence could have hoped to do mischief.”<sup>15</sup>

Price returned to the lists in November with a history of the corn laws. Perhaps the most illuminating section of this article was his keen perception of the widening gulf within the class structure between the Chartists and the League. With this in mind, Price proposed a “cordial union of the middle and lower classes” as a means to win both popular freedom and untaxed bread.<sup>16</sup> Sturge's Complete Suffrage Union was organized that month.

Although much of the *Eclectic's* interest was focused on slavery in early 1842, by March it turned again to the matter of free trade. Interested in the debates in Commons on Peel's proposition, Price reviewed in this general context a pamphlet written by Baptist W. Noel, brother of the Earl of Gainsborough and a prominent Evangelical. Written for and sold by the Shoreditch Anti-Corn-Law Association, this one penny tract represents one of the few anti-corn law opinions expressed from within the Established Church. Entitled *A Plea for the Poor, etc.*, it was expressive of the deep concern of this London clergyman for the state of the poor in both England and Ireland. Characteristically within any religious discussion of

the corn laws, scripture was present as an authoritative basis. Four passages were quoted from the Old Testament: Psalm 41 : 1, Proverbs 19 : 17 and 29 : 7, and Isaiah 58 : 10, 11. The intention of these references is best seen in the Isaiah passage: "... if you bestow your bread upon the hungry and relieve men in misery, then light shall dawn for you in darkness and your dull hour shall be bright as noon, and evermore shall the Eternal guide you, guarding you without fail" (Moffatt).

Noel, who was later to defect to the Baptists, was convinced that there were a great many people willing to work but, lacking employment, faced starvation. England's cultivatable land was already under the plough and a surplus of labour was forcing similar conditions upon the rural parishes. Failing foreign markets were forcing power-loom operators out of work even as they had displaced the hand-loom people. Noel was also aware of the rapid rise of population of some 400,000 a year which threatened to produce a reaction that found "... the hungry multitude . . . goaded by want into rick burning and trade unions, into chartism, and every other expression of impatience at unendurable calamity. . . ." <sup>17</sup> This was very simply what Noel saw as the "condition of England".

He categorically denied that the usual methods of middle and upper class philanthropy would have any positive effect on the problem: "Soup kitchens, tickets for coals and potatoes, mendicity societies, night asylums, and charity balls, or charity sermons, will not fatten their lean visages, nor furnish their empty dwellings nor make them bless God for plenty." <sup>18</sup> He was sure that there was a surplus of food available on the Continent. Further, if there were jobs for the English poor (and no corn laws) then starvation and general deprivation would not exist.

This plea for the poor was: repeal the corn laws and set up a fixed scale with reduced duty on foreign corn—and the poor would eat. Noel's economic analysis suggested that the sliding scale drained bullion from England that in turn prevented the expansion of trade and the concomitant expansion of jobs. A fixed low duty would thus ensure a steady demand for both exports and jobs. This arrangement with regard to the fixed low duty would generally reduce food prices and subsequently wages. Yet, he hastened to add, the opening of new markets and the addition of new jobs would prevent wages from falling as quickly as prices; this to the worker's advantage. Another advantage, due to the abundance of work which would force wages up, would be the increased pressure on the labour market. Not content to limit his arguments to the urban poor, Noel saw distinct benefits in corn law repeal for the rural populace whose surplus would find jobs on an increased urban market. His contention was that agricultural wages would rise with fewer workers on the village labour force.

He had hopes that with steady employment and a reasonable diet



there would be a significant rise in health, child survival and adult longevity. Parents could afford to have their children educated; thus a welcome rise in literacy. Certainly the "wise and wholesome" New Poor Laws would function as they were intended, since the problem of the able-bodied pauper would be banished by full employment. Noel continued by saying: ". . . the millions of Chartists who lately carted their enormous petition to the door of the House of Commons, too busy, and too comfortable to think of grievances, would no longer hate the Constitution and the Government, because the one would seem to them beneficent and the other would have no occasion to be severe."<sup>19</sup> Although he did not understand the motivation of the Chartists he may well have been right in feeling that improved economic factors might well have emasculated the movement. While doubting that the landlords needed any more protection than seven shillings a quarter he emphasized that labour is the poor man's sole property and it should be protected with the same zeal as the rich man's rents.

After anticipating many of the questions that would be raised concerning the foregoing analysis, Noel called for Christian support that went beyond party loyalty to improve the condition of the working classes creating an England of unbounded prosperity. There was food but the poor must be allowed to work to earn that food.

In summary Noel suggested that there were three ways to handle the problems of the poor's lack of job opportunities and food. First there was immigration which not only took pressure from the limited number of jobs in the home islands but would spread the English way in a globe-girdling missionary effort. However, to do this would require government training of urban workers to survive in the agricultural colonies. This project would also require government subsidies for transporting the immigrants who certainly would not have needed to immigrate if they could have afforded to pay their own bills. Secondly, there is a rather crude form of birth control which would dispose of all children of working families in excess of three; in short infanticide. Noel said that immigration was inadequate, infanticide was inconceivable, and that only the third solution was feasible and sufficient for the task—repeat the corn laws and give the people an opportunity to buy food with their labour.

Prior to the appearance of this popular tract (circulation 23,000 copies) its author had been appointed, over the strenuous objections of many churchmen, as one of Victoria's chaplains. The *Quarterly Review* chose this occasion to review both the *Plea for the Poor* and the appointment. "We have read this pamphlet, and, had it been anonymous, we should have thought it to be the work of some crazy canter. . . ." The gazetting is ". . . an outrage on decency, on the Church, on the Constitution, and on the Queen's Majesty, only to be equalled by the former presentation at Court of the socialist Owen".<sup>20</sup>

Price however felt that the pamphlet was a voice crying in the Establishment's wilderness and had nothing but praise for the effort. He chose to emphasize in his review, which characteristically deviated far afield from the pamphlet's content, that the church was joining the anti-league forces to protect a major source of its finances—the agricultural tithe. This review is also interesting because in the brief space of two pages, this Baptist 'canter' provides two splendid examples of League appeal—emotional and religious.

" . . . the modern inhabitants of England . . . find, when compelled by famine to seek food by importation, that they are driven from the sea by coast-guards and revenue-cutters, and when they fall back upon the land, they are starved by a monopoly which can only command high prices by a systematic diminution of production.

" Is not the finger of God himself here, pointing out to us, in the vast tables of the world, the inscription of his great law of common fatherhood, and his proclamation, that he had made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the whole earth?"<sup>21</sup>

A leading supporter of the Anti-Corn Law League in Scarborough was Benjamin Evans, pastor of the First Baptist Church. As a denominational journalist he was second only to Thomas Price. Evans had through *The Church*, which he amalgamated with his earlier *The Northern Baptist* in January, 1846, voiced a powerful opinion that was virtually an echo of the West Riding of Yorkshire Baptist Association. Published in Leeds and London—eight pages for one penny—this magazine was oriented to religious issues as well as those which its vigorous editor considered of a quasi-religious sort, including the corn laws. Advertising itself as the cheapest religious periodical in the empire, its circulation during its first three years rose from 4,000 copies per month to 17,000, and with this steady increase, its influence particularly in the north and midlands. The role of *The Church* was supplemental to the influence of the *Eclectic* in the metropolitan area. Undoubtedly *The Church* had the larger circulation by far and, reached an entirely different group of readers than the more literary and costly *Eclectic*.

The position that *The Church* took was almost identical to that of the defunct *Baptist Examiner* published in Leicester during 1844-1845. Among the several causes espoused by this journal one finds free trade and the abolition of the corn laws. The editorial positions of the two magazines are so similar as to suggest virtually the same editor and readers. Although issued in anonymity, never admitted by Evans, there is evidence to support his editorship of the *Examiner*. *The Church* and its influence made a strong contribution to the reputation that Leeds enjoyed during the 1840's as a hot Whig-

Liberal centre. Evans personally saw the matter of the corn laws as a moral issue; the enemies of the League were enemies of the voluntary principle as well.<sup>22</sup>

Thomas Price said that the dissenting clergy had lifted the anti-corn law agitation from "a question of more or less robbery into one of principle". Going further he assumed that the man in the pew followed his spiritual adviser even down the anti-corn path and that because of this, men of benevolence demanded that "not a farthing shall remain of the tax on Lazarus' crumb and there can be no negotiation betwixt such men and titled skeleton makers". He predicted that the restrictions imposed upon industry and trade would be destroyed by a free press and free speech, bringing about a world of free trade in which industry, government and agriculture would be directed to the entire community's well being.<sup>23</sup>

The Anti-Corn Law League in its effort to achieve its goal appealed to dissent for support, which it received in significant amounts from men as dissimilar as Thomas Price and Baptist W. Noel. The League came to London to win strength and respectability which it did partially through the support of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations. Why was the League successful in this quest?

Obviously the relationship of free trade and abolition had a certain magnetism especially for the Baptists who had dedicated a great deal of effort to the cause of human freedom. Secondly, some support was derived from those who saw in this cause an opportunity to whittle away at the Established Church's structure through its financial foundation. These men were for the most part strongly committed to the voluntary principle which despised governmental interference in such diverse areas as religion and economics. Thirdly, there were men that responded emotionally to the demagogic pleas of Price, Thompson, Cobden and Bright, even as there were staunch Trinitarians who shied away from the movement because of the prominence of the Unitarian W. J. Fox. Finally there were supporters of Cobden's gospel, who like Noel, believed that God had provided sufficient food for His creation and that people starved only because of governmental interference. This group saw the provision of food to the hungry as a basic Christian responsibility even when the answers to the problem were hewn out of economic principles and not biblical proof-texts.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Rostow, *The British Economy of the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford, 1948, p. 143f.

<sup>2</sup> *The Baptist Magazine*, 1849, London, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> R. G. Cowherd, *The Politics of English Dissent*, London, 1959, et. al.

<sup>4</sup> *Conference of Ministers of all Denominations on the Corn Laws held in Manchester*, Aug. 17-20, 1841, London, 1841, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> K. R. M. Short, "The Road to Richmond", *Foundations*, Rochester, April, 1964, Vol. vii.

<sup>6</sup> R. S. Cobden, *Speeches on Questions of Public Policy*, ed. J. Bright and J. E. T. Rogers, London, 1870, p. 183.

<sup>7</sup> T. P. Martin, "The Upper Mississippi Valley in Anglo-American Anti-Slavery and Free Trade Relations: 1837-1842", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Sept. 1928, Vol. xv; and D. H. Maynard, "The World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Dec., 1960, Vol. xlvii.

<sup>8</sup> *The Patriot*, London, July 20th, 1840.

<sup>9</sup> *Baptist Magazine*, Feb., 1841, p. 84.

<sup>10</sup> *Eclectic Review*, 1839, p. 80.

<sup>11</sup> *Eclectic Review*, 1841, p. 101.

<sup>12</sup> G. K. Clark, "The Electorate and the Repeal of the Corn Laws", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1951.

<sup>13</sup> Report of Manchester Conference, et. al.

<sup>14</sup> E. A. Payne, *The Baptist Union*, London, 1958, p. 84.

<sup>15</sup> *The Quarterly Review*, London, 1841, p. 504.

<sup>16</sup> *Eclectic Review*, 1841, p. 510.

<sup>17</sup> B. W. Noel, *A Plea for the Poor, showing how the proposed repeal of the existing corn laws will affect the interests of the working classes*, London, 1841, p. 5.

<sup>18</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> *Quarterly Review*, 1841, p. 504f.

<sup>21</sup> *Eclectic Review*, 1842, pp. 340, 342.

<sup>22</sup> K. R. M. Short, "Benjamin Evans, D.D., and the Radical Press, 1826-1871", *Baptist Quarterly*, April, 1962.

<sup>23</sup> *Eclectic Review*, 1842, p. 358.

K. R. M. SHORT

## THE LAYING ON OF HANDS

(Concluded from page 327)

<sup>7</sup> Tillam argues along very similar lines here.

<sup>8</sup> Keach is here very close to certain of the Puritans; compare G. F. Nuttall, who characterises the Puritan view as follows:

"It is in prayer preeminently that we see taking effect the Godward aspect of the Spirit's work. That witness is that we are children of God" (*The Holy Spirit in Puritan Life and Experience*, 1946, pp. 62-63). Examples could be multiplied, but we may note especially Sibbes, *Works* (1863 edition) Vol. III, pp. 420-80, and Vol. V, pp. 138-44, Owen, *Works* (1852 edition), Vol. II, pp. 240ff., Goodwin, *Works* (1866 edition), Vol. I, pp. 227-53, Thomas Horton, *Sermons on Romans*, chapter 8, verses 15-16 (1674), and John Preston, *Treatise on the New Covenant* (1634), Vol. II, pp. 154ff. For other references see Nuttall, *op. cit.*, pp. 138ff.

<sup>9</sup> Gill seems to have been instrumental in banishing the use of the laying on of hands from Park Street after its heyday in the time of Rider and Keach.

<sup>10</sup> See further E. A. Payne, *Baptist Quarterly*, Jan. 1954, Vol. 15, No. 5.

J. K. PARRATT