

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>

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

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



incorporating the Transactions of the
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
EDITORIAL

THE Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held in the Lounge at Bloomsbury Central Church on Monday, 29th April, immediately after the afternoon sessions of the B.U. Assembly. Following the transaction of business, an address will be given by the Rev. B. Grey Griffith, B.D. For the convenience of those attending tea will be served at a small charge before the meeting. It is hoped there will be a good attendance of members and interested friends of the Society.

* * * *

At least 130 of the early Anabaptists were hymn-writers. Their compositions appeared in several German and Dutch Anabaptist hymnals printed in the 1560s, while many others circulated in pamphlet or manuscript form. Of these early hymns many—such as those in the oldest section of the *Ausbund* (referred to in our January issue) were written by prisoners or martyrs. That so many of them were extremely lengthy and narrative, doctrinal or didactic in form is explained by the fact that they were intended for use in the home and in private devotions as well as for congregational praise. Soon after the middle of the sixteenth century two German and three Dutch printed hymnals made their appearance. Between 1582 and 1790 more than a hundred different hymnals were published in Holland alone. Few of the earlier hymns were included in the later Mennonite hymnals of Holland, Germany and Russia. Their place was taken by hymns from the books used in the respec-

tive State Churches, though the *Ausbund*, first printed in 1564, was reprinted many times, used until about 1900 in Europe, and is still in use among the 15,000 Amish members in the U.S.A. The considerable number of Dutch Mennonite hymnals were all displaced in 1944 by the *Doopsgezinde Bundel*, which the Remonstrant and Protestantbond congregations also use. Psalm singing was not at first favoured by the Anabaptists, but the example of Hans de Ries who, in his 1624 hymnal included rhymed versions of all the Psalms, was increasingly followed, but from the end of the eighteenth century, psalm singing fell out of favour again. In earlier times no more than two hymns were sung at a meeting or service but nowadays, among the Dutch Mennonites at any rate, as many as five are sung, with pipe organs—which began to appear in their churches from about 1770—to accompany the praises of the congregations. In the faith and worship of all Christian communities, hymns have played a significant part, and in this the prolific hymnology of the Anabaptists has been in no way exceptional.¹

* * * *

Was George Washington a Baptist? The question may not be of desperate importance but, through the years, it has often been argued in the U.S.A. That he was a Baptist has been asserted by many, while others have held that, although never a member of any Baptist church, he was in fact baptized by immersion. In response to a number of inquiries the editor of the American Baptist journal, *The Watchman Examiner*, recently reprinted an article, first published some years ago, by Dr. Lemuel Call Barnes. The strong tradition that Washington sought Believer's Baptism at the hands of Chaplain John Gano, says Dr. Barnes, is based on the testimony of officers in Washington's army and of members of Gano's family. But, he continues, Washington was an episcopalian, born, bred and buried in the Anglican fold. If he did submit to Baptism by immersion it was a purely private and personal affair, not uninfluenced by the fact that his own Rector believed immersion to be the correct method of baptizing and by Washington's personal friendship with Gano, whose personality and ideas he greatly admired. All that can be said, if Dr. Barnes is right, is that Washington was never a Baptist but may have been baptized by immersion privately by his friend Chaplain Gano.

* * * *

The name of John Howard Shakespeare will live in Baptist history. It is right, therefore, that at the Annual Assembly in London, time will be set apart to remember the greatness of the

¹ See "The Hymnology of the Anabaptists" by H. S. Bender and "The Hymnology of the Mennonites in the Netherlands," by N. van der Zijpp, *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1957.

man and his work and that at his birthplace, Malton in Yorkshire, a Commemoration service will be held in the Baptist church on 13th April. We are grateful to Sir Geoffrey Shakespeare and to the editor of the St. Mary's, Norwich, *Messenger*, for permission to reprint in our pages Sir Geoffrey's tribute to the memory of his father, whose genius made upon Baptist life and work in this country an unparalleled impact.

John Howard Shakespeare

The centenary of Dr. Shakespeare's birth falls on 16th April of this year. His son, Sir Geoffrey Shakespeare, Bart., P.C., here gives a short appreciation of his father's life and influence.

MY father was born at Malton in Yorkshire on 16th April, 1857. He was minister of St. Mary's, Norwich, from 1883 to 1898. St. Mary's was his only church. He went there in 1883 as a stop-gap preacher, while still a student of Regent's Park College, and made such a profound impression that he was invited to be their minister, though not yet ordained. Towards the end of that same year he married my mother. When she introduced my father to a friend, the latter exclaimed, "John Howard Shakespeare—love, philanthropy and genius—what a happy combination!"

My father's ministry at St. Mary's was brilliantly successful and fruitful, and St. Mary's was the centre of great influence and activity in the city and county.

My mother now lives at Cambridge. She is in her 96th year, and still retains her wonderful memory. She lately recounted to me how with the late Mr. Richard Jewson she started the first night-school for illiterate men in Norwich. She and Mr. Jewson visited public-houses and many dwelling houses in the neighbourhood of St. Mary's, and announced that classes in reading and writing would start in St. Mary's school-room at six o'clock on the following Tuesday. At this first session sixteen elderly pupils turned up. Within a few months there were sixty. Many a citizen who later played a prominent part in the civic life of the city learnt to read and write in my mother's night-school. But she would not let the class disperse until Mr. Jewson, or some other suitable person, had given them a ten-minute talk on a religious topic. She stood by the

door and prevented anyone slipping out. To one man who pleaded that his wife was ill and he ought to go home at once, my mother replied: "If she is really ill you should never have left her. As you have done so, another ten minutes won't do any harm." Courageous for a new minister's wife, aged twenty-two!

When I asked her to name some of the members of the Church in those days, she replied: "George White, J. W. Jewson, George Jewson, J. G. Howlett, Holmes, Blyth, Willis, Culley, and Gould." A roll call of Church members today would include several with the same surnames, even if initials are different!

My father was a powerful preacher, but it is as a great organiser and administrator, visionary and statesman that his name will live. After leaving St. Mary's in 1898 he became General Secretary of the Baptist Union, and in that post until his retirement through illness in 1924, his genius and gifts had full scope. He welded the churches into a real and living union. He initiated and organised the collection of three great appeals for funds: The Twentieth Century Fund in 1899, The Sustentation Fund in 1912, and The United Fund in 1920. Over three-quarters of a million pounds were raised by these appeals. The Baptist Church House stands as a monument to his foresight. He fortified and sustained the finances of poorer churches; increased minister's stipends and placed their superannuation on a surer basis. He raised the status of the ministry by initiating scholarships, by improved methods of selection, and by requiring higher qualifications and culture. The Baptist Union under his leadership became a force in the religious life of this country. Indeed, the story of the growth and rising influence of the Denomination since the turn of the century is largely the story of my father's life and work.

He was also one of the founders of the Baptist World Alliance, and became its European secretary in 1905. Towards the end of his life he was a fervent advocate of Christian Unity, and in 1919 he was chosen as the first Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches.

He died at the early age of 73, worn out by his exertions. But his fame lives on, and his name is already linked with those of the great leaders in the history of our denomination.

GEOFFREY SHAKESPEARE

Who were the Baptists ?

(I)

I WAS pleased to have Dr. Payne respond so frankly to my article, "Who were the Baptists?" The purpose of such a response, I assume, is to elicit further discussion. Our disagreement is partly one of emphasis, but it is also apparent that at one or two points I left room for misunderstanding. Quite obviously, I did not make myself clear, for I intended no "unjust reflection" on the Anabaptists. My intention was merely to indicate that they represented a different tradition. Nor was I attempting to deny the similarities and affinities that exist at certain points—the conception of a gathered church, etc. But simply because two men may have brown eyes does not necessarily make one the child of the other. They may be brothers, children of a common parent; or it may be that they are not related at all. The Anabaptists and the Baptists both possessed the Bible, and both groups were familiar with the teachings of the Reformers. Consequently it is difficult to understand why certain similarities should make it necessary to posit indebtedness of one to the other.

Both the conception of a gathered church and of believer's Baptism would seem to be rather easily derived from the New Testament and not entirely illogical deductions from the teachings of the Reformers. Furthermore, if Roland Bainton's analysis of the indispensable supports to a theory of persecution is correct, it is apparent that the Reformation provided the necessary materials to fashion a concept of religious freedom. Lastly, as James Maclear has pointed out, the whole dynamic of the Puritan movement fostered what he calls "the lay tradition." Perhaps there were hidden Anabaptist influences at work in Kent and East Anglia, but they are not necessary to account for the rise of the Baptists.

Dr. Payne rightly points out that in any attempt to assess our heritage it is necessary to distinguish between the two major currents represented by the General and the Particular Baptists. The General Baptists were Arminians, and Arminianism is a variant form of Calvinism. Actually, of course, the General Baptists are of much less importance to us in terms of our own self-understanding than the Particular Baptists. This is true because the Particular Baptists represent the continuing Baptist current, whereas the General Bap-

tists frayed out in England and all but disappeared in the United States.¹

It is possible to argue, I suppose, that the Particular Baptists adopted the London Confession of 1677 (substantially the Westminster Confession) simply on the basis of expediency, affirming by this means their essential solidarity in a time of persecution with the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and that therefore it is not to be taken seriously as a statement of their own faith. In the light of their other writings which reflect faithfully the point of view of the Confession, this would seem to be a rather untenable argument. But if it is accepted, it is difficult to understand why they should adopt the same Confession in Pennsylvania where they were not subject to "the common sufferings of Dissenters" and had no need "to present a united front." If it is difficult to understand why the Philadelphia Association adopted it, it is even more difficult to understand why the Warren Association in New England should have adopted it, for this association was formed primarily to carry on the struggle against a Congregational establishment. And it was not only adopted, it was vigorously defended by American Baptists.

This common heritage becomes even more apparent when one reads the various books of discipline which were compiled by early American Baptists. The reader is constantly referred to the writings of John Owen and Thomas Goodwin and Thomas Hooker for further explication of the points discussed. I suspect that the same is true of the manuals of the English Baptists of the period. It is true at least of Elias Keach's *The Glory and Ornament of a True Gospel-constituted Church* (1697). He adds Isaac Chauncey to the list of Congregational writers the reader is urged to consult.

Dr. Payne would never divorce the Baptists from the context of English Separatism and Independency, but in the United States there has been a tendency to do this. And this tendency to relate the Baptists in a direct and positive fashion to the Anabaptists has had "unhappy consequences." It led McGlothlin, for example, to include confessions composed by John Smyth after his break with Helwys among his *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. These confessions which reflect points of view which have not been characteristic of Baptists, as a consequence, have been cited as representative Baptist confessions. This tendency has also led others to try to deduce the Baptist doctrine of the church, the nature of the pastoral office, the power of associational bodies, etc. from the writings of Hubmaier rather than to follow the advice of their forebears and consult the

¹ The New Connexion General Baptists were so completely reconstituted under the influence of Evangelicalism as to be generally regarded as representing a new body. The Particular Baptists, both in Britain and America, were penetrated and transformed by Evangelicalism but not to the extent that continuity was destroyed.

writings of Owen, Goodwin, and Hooker to clarify the grounds of their practice.

The religious life of the Commonwealth period was "a tumultuous sea" in which one can find almost anything and everything—Famulists, Behemists, Quakers, Muggletonians, Ranters, Seekers, Socinians, Universalists—and in the chaos of the time the Baptists—like other bodies—were a formless grouping played upon by many winds. The problem is which of these winds really shaped the denomination that eventually emerged. William Dell is sometimes referred to as a Baptist, but if one wishes to find his continuing influence embodied in an existing religious communion one must look to the Society of Friends and not to the Baptists. In the same way, the significant fact about Matthew Caffyn was not the fact that he was a Baptist and a Hoffmanite in Christology but the fact that his Christological views were repudiated. The remarkable thing about the Baptists is the way in which they were able to emerge from this confusion with what might be termed a "Reformed churchmanship" still intact. As late as the end of the eighteenth century, John Witherspoon was able to say of the Baptists of New Jersey that, except at the point of Baptism, "Baptists are Presbyterians." Witherspoon was a knowledgeable person. He had been a leader of the Popular party in Scotland and was the most prominent leader among the colonial Presbyterians. His statement indicates that there had been a softening of Presbyterianism in the American environment, but it also indicates the major stance of the Baptists. Is it not possible that the early Baptists knew what they were saying and meant what they said, when they asserted that they were "falsely" and "unjustly" called Anabaptists?

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Who were the Baptists?

(II)

IN the *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1956, there is an article dealing with the old question of the relations between the continental Baptizers' movement (Anabaptists) and the origin of the English Baptist churches. It is well known that there have been different opinions on this historical question. The author of the article just mentioned is Dr. Winthrop S. Hudson, and he takes a definite stand for an indigenous origin of the English Baptist movement, quite independent of the Baptizers' movement on the Continent. It is an interesting article and will certainly stimulate further research in its

area. Some scholars, however, will not be convinced by the arguments put forth in Dr. Hudson's article, and as to myself I have put several question marks in the margins. Here, I am going only to make these known; not build up an argument by references and notes.

First of all it seems to me that the question is not one of *identity*, still less a question of "succession." The latter idea could be left aside altogether, as the historian should have no other interests than the historical facts according to source material and conclusions in analogy with happenings in human fellowship. When Dr. Hudson speaks of "the identification of the Baptists with the Anabaptists," I am not sure that he gets to the real point of modern research. I don't know of any historian who ever would try to make such an *identification*, and to give arguments *against* an identification is an easy task. But the question is not solved by that. In the same way one would not be able to show an identification of the General Baptists with the Particular Baptists in England, but in spite of that one must admit, that both were of the Baptist movement, with the basic characteristics in common.

Exactly the same problem must be faced in the question of Baptist-Anabaptist relations. One should not lay stress on special, sometimes peculiar differences between the two movements. If one used the same method on the Baptist unions within the Baptist World Alliance today, one would be able to show that there is such a diversity, that an identity could not be spoken of, but still we know that the basic Baptist teaching is common also in dissimilar unions. But now to the arguments put forth in the article by Dr. Hudson, "Who were the Baptists?"

It is true that the English Baptists in the seventeenth century complained against the term Anabaptist as a name of reproach unjustly cast upon them. But such a protest had been heard ever since the Baptizers' movement started in early Reformation times. Balthasar Hubmaier in a writing about paedobaptism in 1527 emphatically denied that he and his followers were Anabaptists. After the fanatical Münster revolution of 1534-35 the representatives of the sound and peaceful Baptizers' movement refused to use the name Anabaptists. In the eastern branch they had the name Hutterites and in the western movement Mennonites or, early in the sixteenth century, only Doopsgezinden (Holland). The peaceful Mennonites tried to prove that there was no connection between them and the revolutionary Anabaptists. In spite of thus rejecting the name of Anabaptists all these branches had "the distinctive features" common to the original Anabaptists. If now the early English Baptists did the same, that is to say, rejected the name of Anabaptists, this surely cannot be taken as an evidence of their independence of the continental movement. In fact, they only

followed the example of the many Dutch Mennonite refugees in England during the sixteenth century.

When one nowadays, for historical reasons, uses the name Anabaptists, one may apply it to the whole movement represented by the Baptizers from 1525 through the sixteenth century. But then one must not lay stress on details and variations as community of goods, a strict negative attitude towards state and community, or practising of feet-washing and the like. In several Baptist unions today there are conscientious objectors to military service, and many also refuse to take oaths or go to court to get their rights, but they do not cease to be Baptists because of that. No, "the distinctive features" were the ones that we in the whole family of Baptizers have held since Balthasar Hubmaier in his Nicolsburg days in 1527 wrote the following clear statement about the order of the "gathered church": "This is the sequence: first, Christ; second, the Word; third, faith; fourth, confession; fifth, baptism; sixth, church." He also said: "He who teaches aright Baptism and the Lord's Supper, teaches faith and love aright."

This teaching also had many representatives in England in the sixteenth century, and the refugees from the continent at that time certainly drew attention to their teaching, as many legal actions in courts and several edicts clearly show. This Anabaptist teaching was not derived largely from the humanists of the Northern Renaissance but from an eager study of the Scriptures, as the original writings of the pioneers in the sixteenth century clearly show. The Anabaptists of the 1520's came out of the Reformation in Switzerland and Southern Germany, and no one perusing their letters, pamphlets and books can avoid the impression that they had their doctrinal basis in a faithful Bible reading, and therefore demanded a more thoroughgoing evangelical reformation than they found in the movements led by Zwingli and Luther.

Another thing is that among the English Baptizers in the beginning of the seventeenth century there developed two branches, one more like the continental type as to the doctrine of grace, another with a strong trait of Puritan Calvinism in it. The latter naturally made good progress, because it had a congenial field for recruiting within the strong Puritan movement. But it is not their variations that are distinctive traits in Baptist churches, nor other theological questions as to Christology, open or closed Communion and the like, because we well know that among Baptists to this day there are various opinions on such matters. One ought to go back to Hubmaier and find the characteristics from the very beginning: Christ, the Word of God, a "living faith," a personal confession (when all the brethren and sisters should kneel down and pray for the candidate), then the Baptism and as a result the building up of the church, gathered around the Lord's table.

If the Baptizers came from the Zwinglian reformation, from Lutheranism or from Puritan congregations in England or in Holland, this fact can in itself offer no explanation for their status as Baptizers. There is also still the open question of the influence of Dutch refugees in Norwich on the first clearly Congregational church under the leadership of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne in the beginning of the 1580's. Some historians lay stress on that, and I see nothing strange in such an influence by a closed group of foreigners with a distinctive religious teaching and practice. At that time, people were certainly not less interested in the customs and ideas of refugees than we are in our days. The Calvinist Congregationalists certainly lost several members to the Calvinistic Particular Baptists, and sometimes there were no clear borderlines between the two movements, as Dr. Hudson also points out. But were the Particular Baptists more Baptist, so to speak, than the General Baptists, who as to the doctrine of grace evidently followed the continental Baptizers (Anabaptists)? Naturally there was a leftward "spiritual pilgrimage" in the Puritan movement, but the question is why this should have started in Norwich, where the many Dutch refugee Baptizers had their dwelling. Earlier "gathered churches" in England had been organised because of occasional reasons, i.e. more out of expediency than of principle. As the recently published writings of Harrison and Browne show, something new had come into the arguments.

Let me also emphasise the historical fact, that the "spiritual pilgrimage" of Puritans into the Baptist camp did not take place until Puritan Congregationalists had settled in a country (Holland), where the Baptizer's movement (Anabaptists) had been active for more than seventy years. A historian must lay some stress on such a fact, as he always must remember the old saying, that "life precedes literature." If John Smyth did not agree with the Dutch Mennonites in all details and Helwys and Murton openly disagreed with them, still they had in common the distinctive features, that Hubmaier already had laid stress on: a living faith, individual confession, Baptism, the gathered church, and the Lord's Supper.

I have thus added some question marks to Dr. Hudson's article. There is, however, still one point that I must deal with a little more, and this is his presentation of the Anabaptist theology and activity "in the early years of the movement." Here one has the subject for a treatise, but I venture to point out that the early Anabaptist leaders did not represent "the understanding of the Christian faith which was characteristic of the Northern Renaissance and which found its most eloquent spokesman in Erasmus," and that they did not repudiate the doctrine of justification of faith. There may have been examples of such repudiation later, but among the early Baptizers one finds quite another teaching. As early as Hubmaier's

writing, *A Summary of the entire Christian life*, in 1525, one will find this confirmed: "We find that there is no health in us, but rather poison, wounds and all impurities," and in himself man finds no help and is a miserable thing. But Christ is come in this world "to make the sinner righteous and godly," and Jesus, according to his own words, is "the only gracious, reconciling interceding peacemaker with God our Father." In faith God makes these Gospel teachings "to live, wax green and bear fruit." From Christ, the sinner derives his life, and he can with Paul say, "that it is not he that lives, but Christ that lives in him." Having in this way, inwardly and by faith, surrendered himself to a new life, a man has outwardly to testify to it to the brethren and sisters in the church, "who live in the faith of Christ." Thereafter he testifies to it publicly by being baptized in water.

A whole pamphlet could be filled by such quotations from the writings of the first theologians among the Anabaptists. In his important book about the Christian doctrines, "which every man before he is baptized should know," Hubmaier speaks about Christ having "paid for our sins and already overcome the devil and hell." Christ died for our sins, and rose to be our righteousness, that "our sins might be atoned," and we reconciled to God. I could quote similar words from other sources. When the Baptizers' movement started among the Zürich left wing group in 1525, it had the character of a revival with tears, wailing, and confession of sins. And in the writings of that time one will find the stress led on the forgiveness of sin and the new life through faith in the work of Jesus Christ. As to Conrad Grebel and his relations to the humanists, I think that Harold S. Bender has cleared that problem well in his large book on Grebel.

In the so-called Schleithem articles (1527), it is stated that Baptism should be administered to those "who believe truly, that their sins are taken away by Christ and who walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ." About twenty years later another theologian among the Anabaptists, Peter Riedemann, taught that the propitiation and redemption of Christ was fully accomplished for our justification, but Christ is not only the justification *for* us, but he also works righteousness and godliness *in* us. By means of repentance and faith we must come into possession of salvation and sanctification acquired through Jesus Christ. We are grafted into the true vine, and therefore we have the power to bear the fruits of a Christian life. Similar doctrines were characteristic also of the Dutch Baptizers who had the Schleithem articles translated into Dutch in the 1550's. Calvin's refutation of them was translated into English a decade earlier. Here a historian must ask, why?

The teachings of Menno Simons and other Dutch writers cannot be dealt with here, but the distinctive features of their doctrines

pertain to the "living faith," individual confession, Baptism in water, the gathered church and the Lord's Supper. Common to all Baptizers was strict church discipline and excommunication according to *Matthew* xviii. In other points there were variations.

With these remarks I feel obliged to point out the necessity first of all of studying the original texts of the Anabaptist fathers to find out their real teachings about the main doctrines and, second, to pay keen attention to the historical significance of the lively communications between the Continent and England during the sixteenth century. For my part I cannot cut off the Baptizers' movement through the centuries after the Reformation from the very source of it in the 1520's.

GUNNAR WESTIN

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ARNOLD H. J. BAINES, M.A.,

Member, Baptist Historical Society.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON, D.D.,

President, American Baptist Historical Society; Professor, Colgate Divinity School, Rochester, N.Y.

ERNEST A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.,

General Secretary, Baptist Union of Gt. Britain and Ireland.

D. S. RUSSELL, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.

Principal, Rawdon Baptist College.

GEOFFREY SHAKESPEARE, Bart., P.C.,

M.P. for Norwich, 1929-1945.

GUNNAR WESTIN, D.Theol.,

Professor of Church History, University of Upsala, Sweden.

REVIEWERS : G. Henton-Davies, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., W. S. Davies, B.A., B.D., S.T.M., F. Dodson, F.R.C.O., G. W. Hughes, B.A., B.D., D. Lant, Ll.B., L. J. Moon, M.A., B.D., G. H. Price, M.A., B.D.

Thomas Tillam

EARLY issues of the *Transactions* of the Baptist Historical Society contain a number of references to Thomas Tillam, whom the late Dr. Whitley once summarily and somewhat cryptically described as "lecturer at Hexham, commissioned by Knollys church but disowned, organiser of Muggleswick, Seventh Day, emigration agent." The references in the *Transactions* are not all consistent with one another and they contain one or two obvious inaccuracies. Tillam has passing mention in the histories of both Whitley and Underwood.

Whitley more than once committed himself to the suggestion that Tillam was of Jewish origin. There seems little evidence to support this view except his later Sabbatarian and other vagaries. That he was a Roman Catholic in his youth he appears to have asserted in 1653 when hoaxed by a young Scotsman. Probably he first visited the continent in his early years.

At the beginning of the sixteen-fifties, Tillam came into association with the Baptist church in Coleman Street, London, of which Hanserd Knollys was pastor. He was clearly already an able and energetic personality. An exposition of *Revelation xi*, entitled *The Two Witnesses*, came from his pen in 1651 and the Coleman Street church felt ready to authorise him to preach and baptize. In the fashion of the time, he was designated a "messenger." Presumably because of the status thus achieved and partly, it appears, through the influence of Colonel Robert Lilburne, Tillam was able to secure appointment under the Commissioners set up by the Long Parliament to inquire into the state of religion in the four northern counties, and was given the "lectureship"—that is, the post of occasional preacher—established at Hexham Abbey some twenty years earlier by Puritans connected with the Mercers' Company.

Tillam threw himself into his new task and speedily convinced a number of persons of the truth of Believers' Baptism. A Baptist church was formed, which met at first in the Abbey precincts. One of those received into membership was Tillam's wife, Jane, who was connected with a Baptist church in Cheshire, perhaps Hill Cliffe. It seems possible that Tillam himself originally came from those parts or had early connection with them. Indeed, J. J. Goadby in *Bye-Paths of Baptist History*, says that Tillam was pastor at Hill Cliffe at the time of the outbreak of the Civil War. The Hexham

church showed itself very active in propaganda and evangelism, achieving notable success in the village of Muggleswick and at Stokesley, in Yorkshire. The members also looked northwards and had a share in the formation of a Baptist church in Leith.

These beginnings were propitious and Tillam was held in high regard. Troubles came in 1653, however. A Roman Catholic, of Scottish parentage, came to the neighbourhood by sea, masquerading as a Jew. He was introduced to Tillam by Paul Hobson—then army officer and Baptist leader in Newcastle—professed conversion and was baptized. But the stranger's real identity was discovered, apparently by Samuel Hammond, a Congregationalist, who, like Tillam, held an appointment under the Parliamentary Commissioners. Tillam was reluctantly convinced of the fraud and then showed himself displeased with the account of the matter published by Hammond and others. Tillam's own narrative appeared under the title *Banners of Love displayed over the Church*. There were already difficulties between the Newcastle Baptists and the Hexham Baptists. To judge by the surviving correspondence, they concerned matters connected with both the "blessing of children" (with the laying-on of hands) and congregational singing in worship, but soon became more personal in character. Thomas Gower (or Goare), who had signed the London Baptist Confession of Faith in 1644 with Paul Hobson, was now with Hobson in Newcastle. He took strong objection to some of Tillam's views and actions.

The Hexham church was in correspondence with the Coleman Street church regarding the formal recognition of Tillam as pastor. The original commendations of Tillam by the London friends had been in very eulogistic terms, though they admitted that their acquaintance with him had been brief. Now they felt that Gower's criticisms should be disposed of, but that in any case it was for the Hexham church to take its own decision about the pastorate. George Fox was travelling in the north at the time and had "a great meeting a-top of a hill" near Hexham. His preaching proved a further embarrassing influence on the local Baptists.

These various complications and troubles caused Tillam to visit London in 1653 or 1654. He was already an advocate of the "laying-on of hands" in accordance with *Hebrews* vi. 2. Indeed, the first baptism he had administered in Hexham had been followed by this rite. For some years a number of Baptists had been observing what they called "the fourth principle." Tillam made his position clear to the Coleman Street church and then set out to make contact with other groups who shared his views. So it was he came to know Dr. Peter Chamberlin, one of the most remarkable Baptists of his day.

"I was by a blessed hand," wrote Tillam, "guided to my most heavenly Br. Doctor Chamberlin, one of the most humble, mortified

souls, for a man of parts, that ever I yet met with, in whose sweet society I enjoyed the blessing of my God, by the laying on of their hands, and after a love feast, having washed one another's feet, we did joyfully break bread and concluded with a hymn: in all of which the singular majesty of Christ shined forth to the mighty conviction of some choice spectators."

The exact date of this letter is not known. At about the time it was written, Thomas Gower convinced the Coleman Street church that they should disown Tillam "and all that are in the practice of laying-on of hands." The church at Hexham then became divided on the issues that had been raised and Tillam's ministry there came to an end.

This final separation occurred, one supposes, in the spring of 1655. In February of that year, Tillam had, on behalf of the Hexham church, signed *The Representation and Petition of Christ's Servants, and your Highness's Loyal Subjects, walking in the profession of faith and baptism in Northumberland, Yorkshire and Derbyshire*, an address to Cromwell found among the papers of John Milton. Paul Hobson, it should be noted, was among those who opposed loyal addresses of this kind, being already among the critics of the Lord Protector.

Dr. Thirtle asserts that Peter Chamberlin became a Seventh-Day (or Sabbatarian) Baptist in 1651, so we may assume that it was his influence that caused Tillam to adopt similar views. Within a year or so both men were vigorously advocating the keeping of Saturday as the Christian Sabbath. Tillam's next pamphlet dealt not with this issue, however, but with the laying-on of hands and was part of his continuing controversy with Paul Hobson. He had meanwhile made his way to Colchester. There were considerable numbers of Dutch colonists in the town, some of them of Anabaptist sympathies. Tillam is said so to have impressed the Mayor of Colchester that he was allowed the use of the parish church. Within a short time he had baptized over a hundred persons. It is possible that while in Colchester he came to know the Rev. Theophilus Brabourne, a Norfolk clergyman who had earlier adopted Seventh-Day views. In July, 1655, Tillam staged a public debate "in the French school." The following year he began holding services in the parish church on Saturdays, but closed it on Sundays and urged people to carry on with their usual business. This brought him into conflict with the authorities and he was put in prison.

Like many other seventeenth-century prisoners, Tillam occupied himself in writing, sending forth from Colchester gaol his next and best-known work, *The Seventh-Day Sabbath sought out and celebrated: or The Saints' last Design upon the man of sin, with the advance of God's first institution and its primitive perfection*. This appeared in 1657 and was in form a reply to a pamphlet by William

Aspinwall, a leading Fifth Monarchist. In 1659 it attracted the attention of Edmund Warren, the minister of the Congregational church in Colchester, and also of George Fox. Twenty years later, Thomas Grantham alluded to Tillam's book in his *Christianismus Primitivus*, describing the author as an "apostate." There were, however, still sufficient Sabbatarian Baptists to secure its post-humous reprinting in 1683.

Tillam's pages are excited and confused. He refers incidentally to "a pretended conference at Peter's, Colchester," and quotes Thomas Shepherd's *Theses Sabbaticae* (1649) and John Rogers, of Dedham, as well as Aspinwall. In the dedication he mentions "the many brotherly favours and constant encouragements of that worthy instrument who first invited me to serve you"—presumably a reference to the Mayor. Tillam was already stirred by apocalyptic hopes. "The signs of his second coming who is the Lord of the Sabbath are so fairly visible that, although the day and hour be not known, yet doubtless this generation shall not pass, till new Jerusalem's glory shall crown obedient Saints with everlasting Rest" (pp. 1-2). But among the most interesting things to be found in the book are two hymns and a metrical version of Psalm 92. Benjamin Keach has come to be regarded as the pioneer of congregational hymn-singing in England, but it now appears that he had a number of predecessors. Keach's *Spiritual Melody*, a collection of three hundred hymns, did not appear until 1691, though many of his verses had been printed in the previous twenty years. In 1663 Katherine Sutton had published in Rotterdam a volume of religious verses, to which Hanserd Knollys, who was then on the continent, provided an introduction. If used at all in public worship, it would seem likely that these were sung by Katherine Sutton as solos. Tillam's productions claim notice because they appear to have been intended for general use, and because they date from 1657.

The first—consisting of six stanzas of four lines each—is headed "An Hymn celebrating the Lord's Sabbath, with joyful Communion in the Lord's Supper by 200 Disciples at Colchester, in profession of all the Law's Precepts, *Exodus* 20, and Gospel's Principles, *Heb.* 6." The second—consisting of seven four-line stanzas—is "An Hymn in honour of the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, *Acts* 2." The third is described as "That Psalm especially designed for the Sabbath." There are nine four-line stanzas and they are not unworthy of comparison with the versions of Sternhold and Hopkins and Tate and Brady. They are at least as good as most of Keach's verses. Six of the stanzas may here be quoted as a sample of Tillam's skill :

" To praise the Lord most thankfully,
it is an excellent thing,
And to thy Name, O thou most High
sweet Psalms of praise to sing.

To spread thy loving-kindness Lord,
 When Morning's glory springs,
 And all thy faithfulness record,
 Each Night with heavenly strings :

For thou hast made me to rejoice
 in work so wrought by thee,
 And I triumph in heart and voice
 thy handy works to see . . .

Those that within the house of God,
 are planted by his grace,
 In our God's Courts shall spread abroad,
 and flourish in their place.

And in their age much fruit shall bring
 delightful to be seen,
 And pleasantly both bud and spring
 with boughs and branches green,

The Lord's uprightness to express
 who is a rock to me,
 And there is no unrighteousness
 in him, nor none can be.

Tillam's Colchester imprisonment cannot have been very lengthy, for in 1658 he was in London again and shared with Dr. Chamberlin and Matthew Coppinger in a lengthy debate on the Sabbath question with Jeremiah Ives, one of the leaders of the General Baptists, and an inveterate controversialist. We have Ives's account of this disputation, which lasted for three days and took place in the Stone Chapel, which was a part of old St. Paul's.

By then, Tillam's lively mind had become dominated by millenarian hopes. Exactly what part he played in the excitement and confusion which followed the death of Oliver Cromwell we do not know. It is unlikely he remained inactive in those months of petitions and counter-petitions, plots and intrigues. When, in 1660, Charles II returned to England and replaced Richard Cromwell, Tillam, like a number of other Baptists, found himself in prison. Again he took up his pen. Describing himself as "a prisoner of hope," he produced *The Temple of Lively Stones, or The Promised Glory of the Last Days*, a work of 400 pages. It contains a greeting by Christopher Pooley, an East Anglian Fifth Monarchist and Sabbatarian, who had already become one of Tillam's closest associates and who was to join him in his activities during the next few years.

Again Tillam cannot have been very long in prison, for in July, 1661, he was at Lowestoft with Pooley, busy with a scheme to transport his Seventh Day friends and their families to the Palatinate. What turned his eyes in this direction? Perhaps he had had earlier connections with the continent. Certainly he must have known something of the Anabaptist and Mennonite communities in

the area of the Lower Rhine. It may even be that through one or other of his acquaintances he had heard of Peter Cornelius Plockhoy van Ziericksee, whom Troeltsch describes as belonging to "the moderate Baptist movement" and who, while in England in 1657 and 1658, talked of the Anabaptist settlements in Moravia, Transylvania and the Palatinate, using them as an example of the kind of settlement he thought might be usefully established in this country. In any case, the contacts between England and the Low Countries were far closer than Baptist historians have sometimes realised, while the dangers likely to be experienced by radicals who remained in England were considerable. In November, 1661, John James, one of the London Baptist ministers, was executed at Tyburn for Fifth Monarchy views judged to be seditious. Tillam is said to have become convinced that the personal return of Christ was imminent and that it would take place somewhere in Germany.

Tillam and Pooley became agents for an emigration campaign that may have resulted in as many as two hundred families crossing the North Sea. Much of their time must have been spent in dodging the authorities. There was considerable unrest in the country and a number of small, abortive risings took place, including an outbreak at Farnley Wood, in Yorkshire, in which Paul Hobson was implicated, and another at Muggleswick Park, in which some of Tillam's former friends were involved. These two outbreaks occurred in 1663. In 1664, Tillam was in Rotterdam and his behaviour was adversely commented on. Two years later he was in Ireland and apparently associated with the notorious adventurer, Colonel Blood. By 1667 Edward Stennett and some of the quieter and more restrained Seventh Day Baptists felt it necessary to disown Tillam in a pamphlet entitled *A Faithful Testimony against the Teachers of Circumcision and the Legal Ceremonies, who are lately gone into Germany*. But it is known that the following year another batch of recruits left Harwich to join Tillam. These folk came from both East Anglia and the North.

What happened to them? In the sixteen-sixties a considerable number of Swiss Anabaptists made their way into the Palatinate. There for a generation they had a limited, if uncertain, toleration. In 1689 the French armies ravaged the country. Early the following century a movement of refugees across the Atlantic began and Mennonite settlements were established in America. Some day, perhaps, a continental scholar will be able to unearth details of what befell the English families who went to the Palatinate. Tillam himself died about 1676, an intriguing and quixotic figure. His zeal was by no means wise, but he had laid the foundations of Baptist witness in the North and his liveliness, versatility and courage make us wish we knew more about him.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

The Ministry and Sacraments

TWO of the marks or tokens of the Church of Christ in this world are that the Word should be purely preached and heard and that the Gospel Sacraments should be administered according to the institution of Christ Himself.

Our conception of the ministry is governed by the fact that it is a ministry of the Church. It is the responsibility of the Church, and not just of a class or caste within the Church, to preach the Word and administer the sacraments. It is just here that Baptists, perhaps more than any other branch of the Christian Church, can rightly claim to be High Churchmen. Rightly understood and rightly practised, their conception of the Church is much loftier than that of the Roman or Anglo-Catholic. It gives a true dignity and a real authority to the Church as a worshipping and serving community.

As we shall see, we as Baptists give an honoured place to the minister and the ministry, but we refuse to believe that the absence of an ordained minister makes the preaching of the Word or the administration of the sacraments invalid or that it in any way makes these acts of less effect as a means of grace.

It is just at this point that we part company with those who maintain the doctrine of apostolic succession. To say that the ministry constitutes or guarantees the "validity" and "continuity" of the Church is, we believe, to reverse the true order; for surely, as J. S. Whale reminds us, it is "Christ in his Church alone who constitutes and guarantees the validity and continuity of the ministry." The Church comes before the ministry, and the Gospel before the Church.

There are occasions when the Church may deem it right and proper to authorize any member to exercise the ministry of Word and Sacraments among them. By so doing it underlines the fact that the minister has no priesthood different in kind from that of his fellow-members, nor can he claim exclusive title to the performance of the functions of his ministry, viz. the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments.

But lest we misunderstand the situation altogether, let this principle be emphasized that Baptists from the very beginning have had an exalted conception of the office of the Christian minister and regard it as a true ordinance of Christ in the sense that it is an expression of the will of Christ for His Church.

Now we Baptists have made much of the Reformation Principle of the Priesthood of all Believers, and rightly so. But perhaps we have not always understood what it means and have read into it meanings quite foreign to its nature. Surely this phrase refers to the competency of every individual believer to approach God the Father through the sole mediation of Jesus Christ: it does not mean, as has often been imagined, that all believers have an equal right or calling to perform the same spiritual functions.

It has been recognized among us from the beginning that special gifts and qualities are necessary for the discharge of special duties within the Church, and so on the principle of representative selection certain of our number, who themselves have felt the call of God to this work, are set apart for what we are pleased to call "the ministry of the Word and Sacraments."

We believe that there are some among us who are called "to live by the Gospel" because only in the full-time ministry can their gifts be fully used, and only by such a ministry can the faithful be adequately fed and the Gospel be adequately presented.

But in so doing we reject all appearance of sacerdotalism in which the ministerial function is to be performed by a select class of priests in a closely guarded hierarchical system whose authority derives from their privileged office within the Church. The minister occupies his position of responsibility and trust among his people because of the gift and calling given by God and not because of any official status or special privilege belonging to his "class" or "order." The gift does not grow out of the office, but the office out of the gift. The emphasis falls, as Dr. Wheeler Robinson reminds us, on "the inner, spiritual and intrinsic nature of Christian ministry" and not on its particular form or professed status within the Church. As the Presbyterians would say, the minister is "primus inter pares"—he is "first among equals" whose position among his brethren is based on calling and gift and trust and not on class or caste or order.

Our Baptist forefathers stood foursquare on the doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers and because of this rejected any idea of the ministry as a class of priests; but they at least saw no contradiction between this doctrine and the doctrine of the Christian ministry. Indeed they seem to have had a far more exalted conception of the ministry than we have today.

Many references could be given, both from General and Particular Baptist sources, to show that for the sake of order within the Church the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments should be the special concern of those men whom the Church had set aside as called and gifted for the work of the ministry.

Others went further than this and stated that the ministry was

not only expedient, for the sake of order within the Church, but was necessary for its true function. Take these words of Hercules Collins, for example, written in 1702: "There are necessary ordinances to be administered in the Church of Christ till the end of the world; therefore ministers are necessary. The Word of reconciliation is committed to them, the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

Whether they regarded the ministry as an expedient or a necessity, our Baptist forefathers gave it an honoured place among them and guarded it jealously as a gift of Christ to His Church. Is it not the case that we today have lost much of their concern and zeal and that in the years to come we may be in danger of letting this precious gift of the ministry go by default? What do many of our Churches care about the training of the ministry, for example, that our Theological Colleges have to rely very largely upon the benefactions of our forefathers and the payments of our Local Education Authorities to prevent them from closing their doors? What do many of our Churches care about ministerial stipends that very serious inroads are being made into the conception of the ministry as a full-time and life-long calling by ministers having to take on part-time work and ministers' wives having to go out to work to make ends meet? Perhaps they care a great deal. But by their fruits ye shall know them! The Baptist ministry in this land is in greater danger today than it ever has been. We owe it to our children and our children's children to see to it that they at least will not be deprived of this precious gift of Christ to His Church.

So far, then, we have seen that our ministry is the ministry of the Church and that we have seen fit, under the guidance of God, to set aside certain of our number for the adequate fulfilment of the functions of the Church. But where does the authority of the ministry and of the minister lie? The answer surely is: in the call of God's Holy Spirit in his own heart, attested and confirmed by the word of the Church.

"I hold with profound conviction," wrote Dr. Jowett, "that before a man selects the Christian ministry as his vocation, he must have the assurance that the selection has been imperatively constrained by the eternal God." No man dare accept so great an undertaking except at the imperative and irresistible call of God. Writing of his apostleship, Paul could say that it was "not of man neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead." This is what the Christian minister also must be able to say of himself. It is his Lord who has given him gifts for the work of the ministry and it is He who has seen fit to call him to this task. The call to and the sanction for his ministry comes from above; it is of God and not of man.

It is true that the Churches ought to seek out and to encourage

gifted men for the work of the ministry and make it possible for them to train for their life's work; but it is God in Christ who must call and it is He alone who can make a man a minister. It is He and He alone who can empower a man to speak in His name.

But it is just here that we Baptists must take seriously that High Churchmanship to which we referred earlier on. There have been times when our independency has run riot and we have forgotten that the ministry is not just a personal service which the individual can take upon himself in his own right, and that the minister is not just a free-lance preacher who can exercise his ministry in a purely individual capacity. He is the leader of a fellowship, the Church, and speaks in the name of that Church. His is a Church ministry which must take its representative function seriously. His sphere of ministry is within the Church to the Church and within the Church to the world; in either case it is within the Church that he has to preach the sovereign Word of God and administer His sacraments.

The minister's authority, it is true, comes from Christ; but it comes to him through the believing community and as a member of the believing community. This is a task which no man, however gifted or talented can lightly take upon himself. A man can be mistaken about his personal sense of call, and if he is wise he will seek the attestation and confirmation of his fellow believers within the Church. "Though it is most true," wrote Hercules Collins again, "that the Holy Ghost makes men overseers of the Church and that gifts and graces are from Christ (which is His internal call), yet he ought to have an external call by the Church to ordain him to office." The minister must know his personal sense of call to be endorsed by the believing fellowship, the Church. This confirmation will be sought from his own home Church, his local Association, the Council of his College or the Ministerial Recognition Committee and, where the work to be undertaken is that of the pastoral office, by the congregation among whom he is to exercise his ministry, that congregation acting in the name of a much wider fellowship of Churches of which for the moment it is the visible expression.

This ministry which we have received as a precious gift of Christ to His Church we must allow none to impoverish or take away from us; we must cherish it and honour it as our fathers did before us and so shall we glorify the name of our Lord.

THE SACRAMENTS

But not only is it a ministry of the Word; it is also a ministry of the sacraments. Our sacramental doctrine, as evangelicals, is based on the conviction of God's sovereign grace in redemption, a grace which is appropriated by faith and mediated supremely in the Word. We refuse to believe that the sacraments are an addendum to the Word about Christ's finished work in the sense that

they add something to that Word which was not there before. They are not a different or alternative vehicle of grace; far less are they a substitute for it. To quote some words of Dr. J. S. Whale: "The Lord's Supper" (and *we* should add 'Baptism') "and the preached Word are alike 'the Monstrance' of the Evangel which is prior to both." The act of preaching is the demonstration of the Gospel in telling word; the act of the sacraments is the demonstration of the Gospel in vivid action. We walk on dangerous ground when we set the sacraments over against the Word as a different or alternative or better means of grace. For this reason we do well, both in our thinking and in our practice, to keep the Word and sacraments as close bound together as possible. Our Baptist practice of the Communion Service following the main service has perhaps tended to bring about an undesirable separation of Word and sacrament. If there must be some separation of the services for convenience's sake, let there be a real sense of continuity lest the sacrament, by not having the preached Word behind it, be left incomplete and perhaps even become for some a delusion and a snare.

We have said that the sacraments, like the Word, are demonstrations of the grace of God. From there we must go on to say that, as such, they are first and foremost God's acts. It is true to say that they are memorials of Christ's death and resurrection and that, as such, they are a means whereby we can not only remember but express our faith. But surely they are much more than that. First and foremost they are God's acts upon us and not our acts upon God. To accept the sacraments as mere symbols (*nuda signa*) of our faith is to impoverish the Church and to blur the revelation of God in Christ. They are no less than acts in which God in Christ is indeed present and active among His people and in which great spiritual realities are portrayed whose benefits may be received by repentance and faith.

Let us look at the bearing of this, first of all, on the Lord's Supper. Here we have a memorial of our Lord's Passion which seals anew the covenant of forgiveness and grace established by Christ crucified. But such a sealing by God's Spirit, by bringing us the news of the grace of God, brings also the experience of it. Every bit as strongly as the Roman Catholics, though in a totally different way, we assert our belief in the "real presence" of our Master at the Table. We may not leave an empty chair in the centre to symbolize his presence as the Moravians do, but we believe He is there all the same, giving Himself to the faithful that their souls may live. Because He is there in our midst this sacrament becomes for us not only a demonstration but a realization of His Gospel of grace and forgiveness in all our hearts.

As with the Lord's Supper, so also with Baptism. We Baptists have always laid great stress, and rightly so, on the confessional

and evangelising value of this sacrament as a declaration and demonstration of the very heart of our Christian Gospel. But to stop short there is to rob it of its greatest value and importance. To describe it, as many have done, as "an outward sign of an inner experience" and as "a symbol in which the individual pledges himself to a newness of life" is to emphasize the manward side of the sacrament to the detriment or even the exclusion of its Godward side. Must we not say that, above all else, this sacrament is God's act which He invites you and me to experience. It is not just a symbol, it is a sacrament; it is not just a declaration of faith, it is an experience of grace through the Spirit. The evidence of the New Testament is not always clear when we try to find the exact relation between Baptism and the gift of the Spirit, but the relation is there. It is an experience in which the Holy Spirit, who was given to us at our conversion, deepens still further the experience of God's grace.

But we hasten to add that the sacraments are spiritual experiences which are ethically conditioned, i.e. their benefits are received by the response of repentance and faith.

We stoutly deny the claim made by certain branches of the Christian Church that the sacraments can be effective *ex opere operata*—by the mere performance of the act, provided that the act is suitably and correctly performed, without any necessary reference to the faith of the participant. Neither can we accept the view that the benefit of the sacraments must be mediated through a particular sacramental system or a peculiarly ordained priesthood. To us such a practice smacks of magic rather than of religion, of paganism rather than of Christianity. As Baptists we believe that the sacraments, like the sermon, are efficacious to the believing soul and that through them the grace of God is appropriated by faith.

This goes for Baptism as well as for the Lord's Supper. We part company with those who distinguish between conversion and regeneration and who see Baptism as the means whereby this latter is brought about. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is an unethical act and is to us anathema. We part company too with those who would substitute the faith of others for the faith of an innocent babe, for this also, we believe, is strictly an unethical act in our understanding of it. Baptists may be inconsistent about many things, but in this at least they are not. To both sacraments alike they apply the principle of ethical sacramentalism and maintain that the grace of God comes by faith in the crucified and risen Lord.

We have already referred to the fact that Baptists, whether they like the expression or not, are High Churchmen in the truest sense of that term, because they believe that the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments are acts of the Church. On this ground Baptists have argued strongly against any

priestly prerogatives in this connection; but the positive side of their argument has not always been equally strong. Indeed it is doubtful whether they have given as much thought as they might have done to the sacraments as Church ordinances and have tended, in the case of the Lord's Supper, to sectionalise this sacrament, and in the case of Baptism, to individualise it. Let us be quite clear about this; by the very nature of the case, there can be no such things as "private sacraments"; and that applies to Baptism as well as to the Lord's Supper.

In recent days the practice seems to have arisen of sectional Communion Services—for Sunday-school teachers, for deacons, for young people, for Summer Schools, and so on. Such a practice may have certain practical advantages. But such tendencies are to be deprecated, lest the Church of God be divided and lest this sacrament becomes something less than it was meant to be—a token of communion, of fellowship, of unity, of oneness in Christ. This sacrament is a sacrament of the family of the Church in which no section of the Church and no individual in the Church has rights or claims greater than another.

As with the Lord's Supper, so also with Baptism. Strangely enough it is just here that we have shown the greatest measure of inconsistency. There have been instances of people being baptized who had no intention of identifying themselves with the local fellowship of the Church, either there or elsewhere. It is the common practice, moreover, for our Churches to be strict over the matter of membership, appointing visitors for the purpose, but some of them regard Baptism in such a light that they are prepared to give the minister a perfectly free hand in the matter of whom he baptizes, as if membership were a matter for the Church and Baptism a matter for the minister. We need to remind ourselves again that both sacraments are sacraments of the Church and are not the property of a priestly caste or of any particular section of the Church or of any particular individual within the Church, however honoured and esteemed that individual may be.

The Church and the Ministry, the Word and the Sacraments; we do well to remember that behind them all there stands the eternal Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. At our own grave peril we exalt any of these means of grace and give it the foremost place in our Christian devotion. The Gospel itself is primary and all these are the vehicles of the Good News of salvation. Out of the Gospel they came; back to the Gospel they point; into the experience of the Gospel they lead when with repentance and faith we yield ourselves again to the matchless grace of God.

D. S. RUSSELL.

The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679

(Continued)

2. STEPHEN DAGNALL, bookseller, was elder of the church at Aylesbury and one of the Twelve Confessors. Edwards in the third part of his *Gangraena* (1646) mentions "one Dagnell, a Bookseller, a map of errors, who to a godly minister denied original sin, and maintained many other wicked opinions." At this time the Baptists were the most extreme sect in Buckinghamshire, but they were soon assailed by the wild antinomian sect of Shelomethite Ranters, whose centres were at Uxbridge and Abingdon.²¹ In October, 1650 Dagnall published Raunce Burthall's *An old bridle for a wilde asse-colt* to expose their practices. They claimed to be restored to such perfection that they could not sin; they were above and beyond the Scriptures; Christ was a Ranter, and they were Christ; private property was a devil, and all things were common. "Oh what quicke returnes have they in their journeyes to such places, and houses, where their lanck bellies, and purses, are made Plump." In fact they had "no more Religion than a wild Bull"; they would "drink, and tittle and swear like mad." John Bunyan was sorely troubled by Ranters of this sect at about this time.²²

In February, 1651, Dagnall published *Severall Proposals for the generall good of the Common-wealth*, a radical pamphlet which began moderately enough with a defence of the existing courts of judicature, though with some criticism of their uncertain and excessive fees. Dagnall then warmed to his task and denounced a strange variety of abuses. Unpaid and often unwilling parish officers should be replaced by paid permanent officials with well-defined duties and emoluments. The statute-book should be revised and freed from obscurities. Every man's estate should be liable for the payment of his debts. Measures should be taken "for prevention of abuses daily committed by guardians," and no married woman should be a guardian, since her husband may "strive to raise his fortune by the Infants ruine." The trustees of all charities should be made accountable to commissioners. Schools should be erected for "the children of the poorer sort whose ingenuities shall make them capable thereof," and such free schools should be associated with particular colleges. Tithes should be abolished, with compensations to impropriators out of general taxation, and the parochial ministry maintained in "some other inoppressive way." Each parish should elect its own incumbent, subject to some check on scandalous appointments. Dealing with economic policy, Dagnall attacked customs duties as a source of revenue; they increased the cost of living disproportionately, and should be replaced by direct taxes "which are the easier to be born in regard they are brought in at a certaine, and cheap rate, and the collectors thereof more subject to a strict acctmpt." He admitted that protective duties might be retained to secure "the ballancing of Trade with foreign States," but preferred to safeguard home manufacturers by direct prohibition of imports when necessary. Coastal fishing by foreigners should be forbidden. Rogues and vagabonds should be set to work or transported to the plantations. To prevent the increase of landless labourers, no cottage should be built without sufficient land to supply its occupants' needs, and excessive rents should be

reduced. All tenants should be entitled to compensation for improvements. Dagnall expressed sympathy with the Levellers' demand that where commoners or owners of "vast circuits of ground lying waste" refused to improve their land, liberty should be given to any others to do so. His suggestions follow *A Declaration of the Wel-affected in the County of Buckingham* (1649) which claimed to represent the views of "the middle sort of men" in the Chiltern Hundreds and part of Aylesbury hundred. "All wel-affected persons that joyn in community in God's way, as those *Acts* 2, and desire to manure, dig, and plant in the waste ground and Commons, shall not be troubled or molested by any of us, but rather furthered therein." Other local grievances included the custom by which certain parishes intercommoned on each other's land (this had caused trouble in Bucks. since the fourteenth century), the claim of some commoners to turn out an unlimited number of beasts (this persisted into the nineteenth), the planting of warrens and diversion of watercourses. Commissioners in each county should enquire into such general nuisances. The repair of highways leading to market-towns should be a liability of the frontagers, "for commonly such waies are made defective by the meanes of those that border thereupon, and therefore the more fit to be repaired by them." Fairs should be held on fixed days of the month. Sales of horses should be registered in the toll books to prevent theft. The whole pamphlet, which is quite temperately written, is a significant indication of the true nature of contemporary radicalism. Its underlying theme is that the advantage of the commonwealth must outweigh particular interests, and that the State should intervene to protect those who cannot protect themselves. In some respects Dagnall was remarkably moderate; he was not opposed to titles of honour, and did not favour a widening of the Parliamentary franchise.

Dagnall signed the Humble Representation and Vindication, and in 1659 he and Francis Smith published the second edition of William Jeffery's *Whole Faith of Man*. In 1661 Dagnall alone issued Joseph Wright's *Testimony for the Son of Man*, an attack on the "bundle of equivocations, confusions and hypocrisies, in those who call themselves preachers of, and to the Light within all men." The Quakers had been active in Aylesbury and the neighbouring villages for some years, and regarded the Baptists as "deceived people of the world."²³

The imprisonment, trial, sentence and pardon of Monk, Dagnall and ten of their flock have already been described. Dagnall's previous Arminianism may have been modified by the thought that he owed his life to the good offices of the Calvinist William Kiffin. In the Clergy Returns of 1669 Dagnall is reported from Bierton, Drayton Beauchamp, where he preached to a small congregation at the house of Robert Clarke, husbandman, and Wingrave, where he and William Smart of Walton taught the "middle and meaner sort of people." From the Quarter Sessions records it appears that in 1684 Stephen and his son Matthias or Matthew Dagnall also lived at Walton, the eastern suburb of Aylesbury; both were indicted for absence from church. Stephen had probably died or retired by 1688, when his son was among the booksellers who subscribed to the folio edition of *Paradise Lost*. In the same year Matthew was constable of the Lord's Fee in Aylesbury. His later life is obscure. One Matthew Dagnall of Haddenham registered his house for public worship in 1689 and was juror in 1706, 1708 and 1710. Matthias Dagnall of Aylesbury was churchwarden there in 1701-2 and was accused by his successors of procuring an illegal rate at a clandestine meeting. The Court set aside the rate, yet he was again churchwarden in 1703. He is probably the Matthew Dagnall of Aylesbury, gentleman, who was accused in 1709 of accepting payment for a warrant appointing new surveyors of the highways at Stone, and escaped by pleading an Act of Indemnity. It seems impossible that the extortionate churchwarden of

Aylesbury can be the Haddenham dissenter, and in none of these records is Matthias or Matthew called a bookseller: but in 1709 Matthew Dagnall, stationer, and Stephen Dagnall, both of Stone, stood sureties for five victuallers to keep good order in their alehouses. In a similar record of 1712 they are called Matthew and Stephen Dagnall, both of Aylesbury, stationers. Stephen, who was presumably a younger son or grandson of the elder of the church at Aylesbury, had moved to Chesham by 1719, when he published the important tract *A Word in Season*, by J. H. (almost certainly Joseph Hooke) defining the orthodox General Baptist view on subscription to creeds. Not all the family adhered to that connexion: John Dagnall represented the Haddenham Particular Baptists at an Association at Markyate on Christmas Day, 1690, and provided a site for their meeting-house in 1734²⁴; and Mary Dagnall was admonished by the church at Cuddington in 1704 and later excluded for worshipping with these Calvinists.

3. RICHARD YOUNG of Hudnall in the parish of "Edgborow" or Edlesborough, near the junction of Bucks., Beds. and Herts., seems to have been politically active as early as 1647, when he was one of the promoters of the petition called the "Husbandman's Plea" signed by 5,000 farmers and others in and around Hertfordshire. This radical manifesto demanded the abolition of tithes, and claimed for the farmer the full produce of his outlay, including compensation for improvements. "The husbandman's labour is envied him; and others, by a state policy, live upon his labour." Among the 94 principal signatories may be noticed such Baptist surnames as Garret, Monk, Dover, Goodson and Babbe. Under the Commonwealth Richard Young was one of the Hertfordshire trustees "for providing maintenance for preaching ministers and for uniting of parishes." By 1662 he had begun to frequent conventicles, and in 1669 he was holding a Baptist meeting at his house (see No. 38) and was also a leading member of a conventicle at Redbourn (see No. 39). In 1682 he was one of nine members of the Berkhamsted church who agreed to bear equal portions of any fine that might be levied on any member on account of religion. The others, according to Taylor (i. 231) were John Russell, Henry Baldwin, George Catherall, John Garrett and Robert Catlin, all mentioned below, F. Lewin (probably Francis Lewyn of Chesham), Charles Edge and T. Laird. Taylor's inference that this church suffered greater persecution than its neighbours is not supported by the records. Young attracted attention outside the denomination: in 1690, when he was preaching at Wycombe, he was one of the few Baptists mentioned by the Presbyterian compilers of a review of the Pedobaptist dissenting interest,²⁵ and in *A Monitorial letter* (1699) "Mr. Yong" is listed as one of the twenty-four leading Baptists.

4. JOHN TRULOVE was probably a Bedfordshire man. On 17th January, 1695 the Buckinghamshire justices confirmed a warrant removing John Trulove, junior, from Soulbury to Leighton Buzzard, Beds., which was his place of legal settlement and presumably his father's home. It was then very difficult for a poor man to acquire a fresh settlement in another county. Soulbury was a General Baptist centre; in 1669 nearly a hundred, all men,²⁶ worshipped at Henry Keach's home²⁷: their leaders were Joseph Keach, bricklayer, Thomas Mead, blacksmith, and John Hall. Other references to the name Trulove are scarce. William Trulove was an Aylesbury Baptist in 1662. The church at Newport Pagnell resolved in 1829 that the short ends of candles should be Brother Trulove's perquisite.²⁸

5. JAMES FENNE is so far unidentified, but may also have come from Bedfordshire. John Fenne, a hatter of Bedford who assisted John Gibbs,

was preaching in 1669 to two hundred at Widow Tears' house in Olney, and was licensed in 1672 to preach at Stagsden. Other clues are that on 17th January, 1684 Richard Fenne of Stewkley, where there had long been a Particular Baptist church, stood surety for John Holland of Granborough (No. 22 below); and that in 1702 Francis Fenn of Northall near Edlesborough registered his house for worship. In 1697 Matthew Fenn of Coggeshall published *A few lines touching baptism*, and at the General Association in 1699 Daniel Fenn of Deptford asserted the independence of the local church, which most General Baptists then rejected. James Fenne, however, has eluded enquiry.

6. JOSEPH COOPER attended the Assembly of the Five Churches (Aylesbury, Berkhamsted-Chesham, Cuddington-Ford, Wing, Winslow) at Bierton in 1690, and signed the agreement which reconciled the swearers and non-swearers (see No. 29 below). A year later Sarah Cooper, widow, registered her house at Great Horwood for worship. Other North Bucks. Dissenters of the same surname prosecuted in 1682-85 included Henry, Thomas (draper) and Edward Cooper of Newport Pagnell and Thomas (grocer), John and Elizabeth Cooper of Olney. It may also be noted that Thomas Cowper was a Lollard leader in 1521 at the hamlet of Woodrow, later a Baptist centre from which Amersham Lower Meeting sprang. William Cowper, the poet, although born at Berkhamsted, was not of a local family.

7. WILLIAM HOWES or House of Oving, yeoman, also bore an old Lollard surname. In 1662 he was a "reputed anabaptist" with two children unbaptized, and was holding a conventicle at his house "for people of several families to resort unto under pretence of preaching, prayer, etc." The 1669 returns also mention a meeting at his home, taught by him and John Hartnoll, thatcher, the Messenger in North Bucks. Howes and John Mountague (see No. 30) also assisted Hartnoll at his house at North Marston, where thirty or forty "mean people" assembled. After the Toleration Act Howes at once took the new oaths and registered his farmstead as a meeting-house. No proceedings against him are recorded; indeed, he served as juror when the last persecution was approaching its height. Another branch of the family at Bierton included several Popish recusants, among whom was one of the king's lifeguard. John Howse of Kimblewick is often mentioned in the Ford records during 1705-20.

8. DANIEL COX's identity is uncertain. On 19th March, 1714 John Cook, Daniel Cox and four others certified that the house of Thomas Matthews of Coney-street in the parish of St. Stephens was "designed for a public meeting for the Baptists to solemnise the worship of Almighty God."²⁹ This meeting, a branch of the Berkhamsted-Chesham church, was connected with an earlier cause at Bedmond Pond, mentioned by Evans and Urwick but overlooked in *The Baptists of London*. Cox was such a common Baptist surname that the identification is doubtful. Another possible clue is that Bridget Cox, widow, registered a meeting-house at Princes Risborough in 1689. The Cuddington-Ford church resolved "That Bro. Lawley is to be acquitted from keeping a meeting at his house . . . for soe Long time till the meeting has gone round or may goe round at the houses of Bro: J: o: ny Bro: Delafield and Sister Cox."³⁰ In 1703 her son Richard Cox was asked to send a letter commending a member to "our sister-churches in London"; he represented Cuddington at the General Association 1700-04, but was suspended next year for marrying out of the connexion. Edward and Robert Cox, glovers, were preaching at Haddenham in 1669, and Richard Cox's house at Wallingford was licensed in 1672. Others against whom proceedings

were taken in 1682-85 included John Coxe of Cuddington, glover, and his wife Margaret, Thomas and Mary Cox of Calverton, John Cox of Sherrington and John Cox of Astwood. Was one of these the John Cox who later distracted the Northern churches by seeking to revive the whole law of Moses? Francis Cox (1735-1803), yeoman of Cranwell, who came from an old Baptist family at Nesbury House, a farm at Shenley Brook End, was a leader of the revival in Buckinghamshire; he built and endowed the historic meeting-house on Waddesdon Hill where the Bucks. Association was founded.³¹ There was another Baptist family of Cox or Cocks in Northamptonshire; Cock is a frequent variant in South Bucks. and elsewhere. In 1690 Joseph Symonds of North Marston was indicted for attempting to bewitch Elizabeth Cox; this gives some indication of the dark superstition with which Hartnoll had to contend in his own village.

9. NICHOLAS RENNOLD is not known in Buckinghamshire; Dr. Whitley, no doubt on good authority, places him at West Hendred, an old Lollard centre. If so, he was the only representative from Berkshire; that county had been among the fifteen or sixteen represented at the General Assembly at Aylesbury in 1659,³² but Jeremiah Ives found it unfruitful soil,³³ and by 1679 it was strongly Calvinist. The only General Baptist church in Berkshire to survive long was a cause at Maidenhead, overlooked by Evans, last represented at the General Assembly in 1742 and omitted from its minutes after 1747.

10. HENRY BALDWIN of the Berkhamsted-Chesham church was delated to the Bishop in 1669. In 1682 he was one of the nine members who guaranteed payment of fines (see No. 3). His name occurs in a list of signatories of the Brief Confession of 1660, sent in 1696 to the Doopsgezinden of Amsterdam, and preserved in the Mennonite archives. An earlier Henry Baldwin, a Puritan churchwarden of Watford, was ordered to do penance in 1599.³⁴ In 1669 Daniel Baldwin, a fuller, was teaching ten people, "mostly silly women," in his own house at Bledlow. Six other Baldwins, four of them called Richard, were presented at Bucks. Quarter Sessions for absence from church during 1683-86.

11. WILLIAM GLENESTER cannot be distinguished from William Glenister (No. 41). William Glenister, junior, of Pightleston (now Pitstone, Bucks.), gentleman, was appointed county treasurer for the King's Bench and Marshalsea in 1699, and several times served as juror. William Glenister, gentleman, not distinguished as "junior," was churchwarden of Pitstone in 1703-4; another (or the same?) was churchwarden of Cheddington, 1705-6, and yet another from Amersham served as juror in 1701. Which of these signed the Orthodox Confession is quite uncertain; none of them was presented or indicted for absence from church, but they were of good position, and few parish constables would bring in a presentment against their social superiors; the persecution was mainly directed against day-labourers and small tradesmen.

12. JOHN CARTER was an ostler at Newport Pagnell, presented at Quarter Sessions for absence from church in 1685, together with John Gibbs, the "lean, lone, Pagnell saint," formerly vicar, ejected in 1659-60. In 1698 Carter registered his house at Olney for public worship; two years later the congregation, a branch of Gibbs' church at Newport, registered a barn which had been purchased in 1694 from John Foster and others and vested in John Carter and others as feoffees in trust, subject to the condition that no person should be permitted to preach there but such as should be of the

same judgment in respect of doctrine, discipline and worship as John Gibbs, clerk, pastor of the church. Gibbs' opinions may be gathered from his own works, his preface to Bunyan's *A Few Sighs from Hell*, and from Richard Carpenter's lively tract *The Anabaptist washt and washt and shrunk in the washing*,³⁵ which also refers to Baptist activity at Aylesbury. Like Bunyan, who was probably his schoolfellow at Bedford, Gibbs was an open-membership Baptist with a passion for souls and a deep concern with judgment and eternity. He did not sign the Orthodox Confession, but would have had no objection to Carter's doing so: a moderate Calvinist or Baxterian might well have accepted Monk's careful formulation of the doctrines of grace, which satisfied Ivimey but perplexed Adam Taylor. Gibbs kept in touch with the General Baptists, and in 1698 published a sermon on the death of his kinsman William Hartley, apothecary, a General Baptist leader at Stony Stratford since the Civil War. The Olney church was originally called Independent, and seems to have included Arminians and Calvinists, Baptists and Pedobaptists; but such a United Free Church was in advance of the age, and soon after Gibbs' death in 1699 the Congregationalist members, led by Matthias Maurice (later pastor at Rothwell) withdrew to the Lower Meeting. Carter and others rallied the Baptist members, but during his later years the cause declined. In 1707, several members of Gibbs' former church at Newport asked John Moore's church at Northampton whether they ought to begin their church state anew.³⁶ In 1711 Joseph Palmer was frequently preaching at Olney, but he had left by 1715 and next year seven members wrote to the College Street church at Northampton complaining of "want of soul-food." Soon afterwards the church split into two sections, presumably General and Particular. In Northampton, the Particulars outnumbered the General Baptists by six to one, but at Newport Pagnell and Stony Stratford there were undivided churches under General Baptist ministers. The church at Olney was so weak that John Evans' informants did not think it worth mentioning. Carter died soon after, and according to W. Andrews³⁷ a stone in one of the aisles of the Upper Meeting bore the inscription: "John Carter, a minister, lies buried in this place: died 1720, aged 88." The next pastor soon removed to Northampton Green, and the cause seems to have become a branch of Walgrave near Kettering. These were Strict Communion churches, and in 1738 Olney was reorganised by Moses Deacon as a distinct church on the same lines, in spite of the trust deed. In 1741 a rigid Calvinist from Princes Risborough was settled as pastor, but Olney did not quite forget its earlier and more liberal traditions; John Newton found its worship acceptable, Sutcliff revived its interest in missionary endeavours, and through his personal influence the church called William Carey to the work of the ministry and sent him out to preach the Gospel wherever God in His providence might call him.

13. HENRY GOSSE, senior, of Dinton, married Anne Somes on 12th February, 1643; he was not then a Baptist, for their son Roger (d. 1667) was christened on New Year's Day, 1645. In 1653 Gosse (or possibly a cousin of the same name) was "sworne Register for the Parish of Dynton" by Simon Mayne the Regicide under an Act for the civil registration of births, marriages and deaths. He opened a new book, in which christenings were not recorded until 1662, so that no inference can be drawn from the birth in 1655 of his daughter Mary (d. 1681). In the Church Book of Ford, Gosse cannot always be distinguished from his more prominent son (No. 42), but two entries certainly relate to him. On 17th April, 1689 he was asked to collect contributions in the Vale of Aylesbury for "a poore brother that is of considerable vse amongst Gods people who now is in a state of Indigence." Three years later the two Gosses were deputed to admonish William Bate (No. 18) to attend the next church meeting to give satisfaction for

his excess in drinking. Henry Gosse who registered his house in Dinton for worship in 1689 was probably the father. He and his wife Anne were both buried on 15th May, 1693, soon after their golden wedding, "and Affidavit was deliuered in according to ye Act for burring in wollen."

14. JOHN RENNOLDS is identified by Dr. Whitley with John Reynolds who was preaching at Horne in 1669. The surname was common among General Baptists; William Reynolds, one of the seven who signed *Sion's Groans*, was Messenger in Leicestershire, and Thomas Reynolds was a leader in Lincolnshire in 1660. Another Thomas Renolds of Lee Common was excluded from the church of Cuddington or Ford in 1703 for swearing, threatening to murder his wife and other misbehaviours. The only admissible John Reynolds in Buckinghamshire appears to be a yeoman of Kimblewick, whose name is associated with two Goodchilds in a list of recognisances discharged in 1693; but there is nothing else to suggest that he was a Baptist.

15. R. BURNAME was probably Richard Bonham or Bennam of the Cuddington church; he was preaching at Long Crendon in 1669, signed the Bierton resolutions (see No. 29) on 24th April, 1690, and later that year was requested to go with Clement Hunt and others to Haddenham meeting "on ye occasion of Br. Cokers case." In 1692 Brother Burnaham was sorry that he had grieved the brethren by cutting the common woods, and promised to cut no more until it was tried whether it was his right: this minute may, however, relate to Thomas Burnham of Princes Risborough, tailor, who took the oaths in 1689 and was later suspended for drunkenness but restored upon his repentance. The surnames Burnham, Bonham, Boneham were common in the Vale of Aylesbury. Dr. Whitley was inclined to identify R. Burname with Robert Burnam, who in 1645-6 published *A remonstrance; or, a necessitated vindication of R. B. against two false Scandalous Libells, maliciously scattered in the name of Elizabeth Burnam his Wife . . . or, the plaine Mans Declaration against Conjugall separation, wherein as in a Mirror or glasse, you may lively behold the vast difference betweene a good wife and one transcendently bad*. Burnam lived in Westminster, c. 1632-8, and then moved to Coventry, leaving his wife in the City, where he took her a house and a chandler's business. On his return, she turned him out and accused him of threatening, beating and trying to strangle her. This Burnam, however, was a Calvinist; he would only pray for his wife under the condition that she was among the elect.

16. ROBERT IONY, whose usual signature was Robert J :o :ny, was a barber-surgeon of Princes Risborough and a somewhat unstable pillar of the church of Cuddington or Ford. In 1688 he was preaching at Wendover with Nehemiah Neale of Frithsden; presumably the old dispute about ministers' right to maintenance (see No. 39) was resolved. At the Midsummer Sessions in 1689 Jony subscribed the Articles, whereupon Clement Hunt suspended him from communion but allowed him to preach at Bishopstone. He was restored to fellowship on his repentance and submission, and was nominated deacon, but in June, 1690, he was again under church censure "touching some Disorders." By December he had "submitted to the Church Authority touching the difference of the former fast," and next year he represented the church at the Easter meetings at Aylesbury. In 1692 he was admonished for absence from the Lord's Table and for not having "demeaned himself soe orderly as becometh a Christian Conversation." Yet at the same meeting he was asked to assist Widow Dancer of Princes Risborough to make terms with Joshua Lock, to whom she owed £20. The church had guaranteed

£10 of this, and on 5th October Hunt, Jony and others wrote to Lock as a Christian brother, accusing him of slighting the church and "pressing vpon the poore Widow with the greater seuerity or exactness." They admitted an obligation to support insolvent church members, but not to discharge their debts in full, "neither doe wee know of any precedents in other Congregations that are otherwise." Nine months later the widow's debt amounted to £52, but Lock finally accepted £30 which the church agreed to raise in four months "according to each pticular members temperall capacity." Jony subscribed £2 and no one contributed more; evidently bloodletting was profitable. Later he was sent to exhort John Lawley, who had refused to subscribe, to "Enlarge his hand to ye poor and to take heed of Coveteousness and over much Springness of the Good Things which God hath lent him and for which he will one day require an Account of his Stewardship." In 1693 the Church resolved that Jony should bring in his bills at the next monthly meeting and receive his money "or else to be foreclosed and never to expect it to be any more taken care of by ye Church." He was also to take his turn in accommodating the Risborough meeting, but it does not appear that his house was ever registered for this purpose, and only one church meeting there is mentioned. In 1694 Jony was preaching at "the Coomes" (Coombe near Ellesborough) and at Wycombe with Hunt. Next year he was again raising money in the Chiltern parts, where wage rates were higher than in the Vale, and on 30th January, 1699 he was asked to "perfect ye free will offering against ye next church meeting and bring an account of what he hath done." The post of church treasurer was not yet clearly defined. Later that year he is called a "gifted disciple" and authorised to edify the church, but not to preach at funerals without "ye Authority of ye Higher Powers." This followed a decision of the Five Churches (see No. 6) to reserve funeral sermons to their elders. In 1700 Jony and others were summoned to show cause why they withheld their collection. Jony abjured the Pretender in July, 1702, made his will 18th January, 1703 and probably died soon after.

Another Robert Jony, probably his son, also took the abjuration in 1702, and is constantly mentioned in the Ford minutes from 1707; he was nominated deacon in 1721, attended the General Assembly at Stony Stratford 1728-30 and, after the reunion, in London 1731-34, was ordained elder in 1739 by Messengers Stanger and Drinkwater, and is last mentioned in 1743, after which the minutes are fragmentary until 1820. In 1758 John Iony represented Glasshouse Yard at the General Assembly; the elder there was Benjamin Treacher, of an old Lollard and General Baptist family from Buckinghamshire (see No. 39).

17. THOMAS HEADACH was a grocer of Monks Risborough in 1689, of Princes Risborough by 1701, and of the church of Cuddington or Ford throughout. During the persecution which preceded the first Indulgence he was entrapped by an agent-provocateur, one John Poulter of Salisbury, called the Trepan, and accused of treasonable words, which might have led to a capital charge; but Poulter was himself accused of "some wretched practices" and disappeared, and the testimony of his fellow-informer Lacey of Risborough was insufficient. This Poulter had previously tried to pass as a Quaker, and to prove his contempt for infant baptism had blasphemously christened a cat.³⁸

In 1688 Headach was directed to admonish members who had refused to contribute on behalf of sister Somersby in accordance with a church agreement. He subscribed the Articles at Wendover in 1689 as the Toleration Act required, but later said that he acted inadvisedly and would not do it again. He signed the Bierton resolutions which ended this controversy, and was appointed elder (elect) for the "uphill" or Chiltern parts of the

congregation. Presumably he could not be ordained immediately, as no Messenger was available; Clement Hunt was beginning to act in that capacity, but his own position was not regularised until 1698. Headach helped to arrange Hunt's visits to other churches and took part in the negotiations with Haddenham, but his main concern was with church discipline. In 1698 he and Gosse were "appointed to followe with Admonishion" one Edward Dover who went to "Towne fesstes"³⁹ and neglected meetings thereby. Next year Headach and Coker were asked to compile a full church roll for the scattered Vale meetings. In 1701 a church meeting at Headach's house warned members not to worship with Edward Hoare and Thomas Norris, who had established their own Calvinist meeting at Princes Risborough. Hoare was not excluded, however, and until the final breach in September, 1702, Headach still sought to persuade him to give satisfaction to the church. The following April fourteen other members were excluded, and Headach was directed to inform those living in and below Risborough how far the church had proceeded against them. In 1704 he represented the church at the Buckinghamshire Association, which was being distracted by Pelagian as well as Calvinist errors, and on 12th March, 1707, he was appointed to admonish "ower Troblesome brother Theophilus Delafield"⁴⁰ who had denied the imputative righteousness of Christ. Headach's daughter Mary had married a Delafield; the strict General Baptist rule against mixed marriage tended to turn every dispute into a family quarrel. He was no more successful in this than in former cases, yet this painful duty was still entrusted to him, and his warnings in 1708 to John Parker, junior, who was keeping ill company, gave Dr. Whitley the opportunity for the headnote *Headach Admonishes a Drinker*. In 1711 he admonished Abraham Ransome for breach of promise and for neglecting the meetings. In 1713 he was making enquiries about the suitability of Joseph Jenkins for the office of Messenger, and the financial support he might expect. We last hear of Headach on 25th January, 1716, visiting an erring sister King who had married out of the fellowship. He was evidently a simple-hearted man, loyal to his church and creed and implicitly trusted by his bishop and his fellow-members. He deserved to have lived in quieter times.

18. WILLIAM BATE was a labourer of Dinton and deacon of Cuddington. He married Susan Bishop in 1655. Clement Hunt was preaching at his house in 1669. On 9th May, 1688, the church sent Bate to preach at Aylesbury "next first day." He did not take the new oaths after the Revolution, but he signed the Bierton resolutions. On 13th April, 1692 he was suspended for excess in drinking, but soon restored. In 1693 he objected to Clement Hunt's altering the time and place of church meetings, but the church supported Hunt. At the next meeting Hunt himself was accused of excessive drinking and Bate was somewhat tactlessly sent to cite him to appear and answer; Hunt was naturally incensed and after several cross-charges the accuser was himself suspended. On 4th March, 1696 Bate was required to produce an account of the disposal of £5 given by the late brother Saunders, and when the matter was raised again in September he "seamed to Evade an Answer." He had in fact little capacity for business, and in 1699 John Hunt was appointed to assist him in the deacon's office; Bate was to help with the money and advice, but before he could do so he was again suspended for overmuch drinking. He was restored to fellowship by 1701, when Henry Gosse (No. 42) charged him with perverting the sense of *Isaiah* lxiv. 6, "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousness are as filthy rags." Gosse held that the prophet did not include himself, but spoke only of the wicked. The church upheld Bate's exegesis, but next year pronounced him disorderly in some things and suspended him

for overmuch drinking as heretofore. This time he was not restored for over a year, after which he preached at Westlington. He is last mentioned on 28th March, 1705, involved in another dispute about some accounts. He was an honest and obstinate old man, much esteemed by the church because of his constancy during the years of persecution; but he should not have been entrusted with church office.

19. WILLIAM GILES, senior, shopkeeper, later called gentleman, was assisting Hartnoll in 1669, when he preached to "not above twenty mean people" at George Deverell's farmhouse at Swanbourne.⁴¹ Giles lived in a house overlooking the market-place in Winslow, in which he set up two rows of stalls from 1661 to 1677, when the Duke of Buckingham (Dryden's Zimri, Pope's "lord of useless thousands") claimed the sole right, as lord of the manor, to place and let stalls, his bailiffs receiving the profits to their own use. The Duke accused Giles of attempting to suborn a witness whom the steward of the court leet had examined six years before concerning the stalling.⁴² Whatever the outcome, Giles continued to prosper (unlike the Duke, who died in the utmost misery in 1687) for he was chief constable of the Three Hundreds of Cottesloe in 1682. During his year of office Thomas Smallbones, labourer, pleaded guilty of stealing from him a turkey, valued as sixpence, and a duck, fourpence, and was sentenced to be whipped in the gaol "until his body be bloody," and then discharged, paying his fees. Shortly before leaving office Giles was charged with absence from church; perhaps he had made enemies, for Cottesloe was fairly safe for Dissenters. He was not troubled again, however, and after the Revolution, he was sworn in as constable of Winslow, took the oaths and registered his house for public worship. He was apparently still living in 1699, when his son was still called "junior" in the rolls of the manor court of Winslow, but was probably dead by 1702. The court roll of 1686 gives his wife's name as Mary.

20. WILLIAM GILES, junior, wool merchant and woollendraper, later called gentleman, was presented on 11th January, 1683, for absence from Winslow parish church, together with his father and eight others. He took the oaths in 1689 and represented the Winslow Baptist church, of which he was elder, at the General Assembly in 1692 and the General Association in 1702. He was county treasurer for the maimed soldiers in 1693, and was succeeded by Daniel Giles; their accounts were not in order, but the irregularity was traced back to one of their predecessors. In the same year we find William Giles lending money on mortgage. The court rolls record his acquisition of copyhold land near Winslow, including some at "West Well in Demoram feild." On 16th January, 1696, he was prosecuted by Joseph Glenister⁴³ and John Seaton for obstructing the road to Adstock at a place called The Pickles (qu. Pightles?) by making a ditch and hedge. Later that year Jane, wife of John Inwood of Stewkley, wheelwright, was indicted for stealing 1½ yards of serge and two pairs of stockings from Giles, and sentenced to be whipped by the executioner. During Queen Anne's reign, Giles took the abjuration, served as juror for the body of the county and later as juryman for Winslow, and was nominated chief constable of Cottesloe but did not serve. He attended the Upton debate on the Gosse-Delafield controversy (see No. 42) and signed the agreed conclusions, and preached at Risborough in 1708 and Ford in 1709. In 1713 he and John Chawke purchased the rectorial tithes of Padbury from the Baldwin family.⁴⁴ The General Assembly had resolved in 1697 that though it might be lawful for a Baptist elder to receive tithes, it was in all cases very inconvenient; but at least three are known to have done so.

A later William Gyles, who owned land at Winslow, was active at the

General Assembly from 1731 until 1742, when he was elected Messenger although he had never been ordained presbyter. The Assembly had ruled in the similar case of William Allen that this was permissible; this decision was reversed in 1768.

21. JOHN HENDLY was probably John Henley, gentleman, of Shipton in Winslow, whose house was certified as a public meeting-house at the Epiphany 1692-3 Sessions. In 1668 he mortgaged his copyhold property to an Oxford barber, and in 1698 exchanged land with William Lowndes; the court roll gives the name of his wife, Katherine. Henley was a county treasurer for the maimed soldiers in 1704-5, and one of the seven jurymen of Winslow in 1711, with Daniel and William Giles. Another John Henly of Olney was indicted in 1684 with thirty others for riot and unlawful assembly; the presence of Isaac Henly and John Asprey makes it almost certain that this was a conventicle, but only seventeen of the thirty-one were fined. The position of Hendly's name in the list of signatories points, however, to the Winslow rather than the Olney man.

22. JOHN HOLAN has been identified with John Holland, licensed in 1672 to preach at Faringdon in Dorset. The Dorset General Baptist churches, which deserve further study, were orthodox and adhered to the General Association, but we need scarcely look so far afield. John Holland, senior, a farmer of Granborough near Winslow, constable there in 1681, was bound over in 1684 for his good behaviour with Richard Fenne of Stewkley as surety, and after the Toleration Act Widow Holland registered her house at Granborough for public worship. Holland is quite probably the "John Holl" at whose house in "Greenborough" forty Baptists of Hartnoll's flock met in 1669; but Holl may be John Hall, reported from Soulbury.

23. HUGH GLINISTER is unknown but should probably also be sought in the Winslow area; cf. No. 53 and note 43. The Fenstanton church book⁴⁵ mentions a sister Glinister, at whose house in Royston Henry Denne preached and conferred until late in the night on 10th November, 1653, during his missionary tour.

24. LEONARD WILKINS, grazier, of Lee in Quainton, registered his house for worship as soon as the Toleration Act became law, in order to accommodate a branch of the church at Winslow. He represented that church at the General Association in 1700, was elected its elder in 1701, took the oaths and signed the Association in defence of King William III, abjured the Pretender on Anne's accession and again represented his church at the General Association in 1702-04. His name occurs thrice in the church book of Ford: as a signatory of the Bierton agreement (see No. 29) and of the Upton conclusions (see No. 42) and as preaching at Kingston Blount in Buckinghamshire in 1714. In 1721 the Buckinghamshire Association sent him and Nathaniel Widmer, elder of Berkhamsted and later Messenger, to ask Stony Stratford to release its elder, John Brittain (1660-1733) to serve as Messenger in Bucks. in succession to Clement Hunt. A list written between 1760 and 1775 at the end of the Bucks. Association book⁴⁶ gives George Wilkins as elder of Winslow in 1722, but this is probably an error, as Leonard Wilkins attended as elder in 1722-26; the transcriber may have read Leo. as Geo.

25. JOHN HOBBS, senior, of Great Horwood near Winslow, was twice presented for absence from church in 1682-83, and registered his house there for worship in 1689. Dr. Whitley was inclined to place Hobbs at Amersham, but although there were Lollards and General Baptists of that

surname there, no John Hobbs occurs, and in any event the Amersham church regarded the Orthodox Confession with suspicion; it was not in touch with Clement Hunt until 1692 and did not join the Bucks. Association till 1725. The family was well known in the eighteenth century; Joseph Hobbs, elder of High Wycombe in 1725, succeeded Brittain as Messenger in 1734, and another Joseph Hobbs (1764-1840) became an elder of Berkhamsted, Chesham and Tring in 1802 and led that church into the New Connexion in 1809; he was also influential at Ford, which followed in 1819, with Wendover. His death was occasioned through sitting in wet clothes at the opening of a new chapel at Northchurch. He was in effect the last of the old Messengers, though the title was no longer used in Buckinghamshire. After his death his churches began to loosen their denominational ties and to cultivate relations with the Particular Baptist churches springing up around them, many of which were scarcely more Calvinist than the General Baptists themselves had been in 1679.

26. ANGEL MANTLE had a Norman surname, well known since Domesday near Chesham and Little Missenden. He served as juror for the body of the county at Aylesbury on 16th January, 1679, a fortnight before signing the Orthodox Confession, and was summoned again a year later. Richard Mantill, alias Miles, was brother-in-law to Henry Larimore, a leading member of the church of Cuddington, who was excluded in 1668 for mixed marriage and soon afterwards perjured himself recklessly during the trial of Robert Hawkins, in which Mantill and his son William gave evidence.⁴⁷ Was the son, under the name William Miles, one of the Twelve Confessors of Aylesbury?

27. ROBERT CATLIN, husbandman, of Whelpley Hill near Chesham, was one of the nine members of the church at Berkhamsted and Chesham who agreed in 1682 to bear each an equal part of any fine levied on a fellow-member for nonconformity. After the Revolution, Catlin took the oaths and registered his house for public worship. The cause at Whelpley Hill was maintained first by Chesham Broadway and later by Hinton; it was not strong and flickered out some ten years ago. It is tempting to associate Robert Catlin with the London bellfounder of the same name, whose first known work was cast for a church at St. Albans in 1739 and who was responsible for several South Bucks. bells in 1742-47.⁴⁸

28. JOHN BABB has not been identified, but was probably related to Nicholas Babb, weaver, who taught a congregation of "Jewes" (really Seventh-day Baptists) at Sarah Grimsell's house at Amersham in 1669. This was probably the Buckinghamshire Sabbatarian congregation mentioned in the Llanwenarth records⁴⁹; it was in touch with similar groups at Chorleywood and Bledlow, and with the Amersham General Baptist church. William Babbe signed the "Husbandman's Plea" (see No. 3) and in 1659 joined in nominating a lecturer for the parish of Berkhamstead St. Peter.

(To be concluded)

ARNOLD H. J. BAINES

NOTES

²¹ C. E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism* (1931), p. 273.

²² *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*, s. 45.

²³ Jeane Bettris, *A lamentation* (1657), pp. 1-4.

²⁴ G. Loosley, *Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1912), iii. 37-8.

²⁵ *Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1918), vi. 60.

²⁶ The women no doubt met elsewhere, a practice condemned by Bunyan in his rare tract, *A case of conscience resolved* (1683).

²⁷ Presumably Stableford Mill: see A. A. Reid, *Baptist Quarterly* (1940), x. 68.

²⁸ F. W. Bull, *Baptist Quarterly* (1930), v. 140.

²⁹ Wm. Urwick, *Nonconformity in Herts.* (1884), pp. 156, 219.

³⁰ As late as 1765 the Shelfanger church was making payments to a member "for troubling his house": M. F. Hewett, *Baptist Quarterly* (1948), xii. 332.

³¹ G. Lipscomb, *Hist. and Antiq. of the County of Buckingham* (1847), i. 512-3: *Baptist Magazine* (1812), iv. 360, (1828), xx. 613: R. Gibbs, *Bucks. Miscellany* (1891), p. 129.

³² *The humble Petition of the Baptized Congregations assembled at Ailsbury* (1659); L. F. Brown, *Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men* (1912), p. 180; W. T. Whitley in *Baptist Quarterly* (1926), iii. 34, cites the Dalwood Church Book.

³³ E. A. Payne, *The Baptists of Berkshire* (1951), pp. 34-46.

³⁴ Urwick, *op. cit.*, p. 351.

³⁵ The Angus Library copy, which belonged to John Read, has the MS. date 1650, but the date 1653 assigned by the British Museum seems preferable, as Gibbs was probably not appointed minister until 1651. See M. F. Hewett, *Bapt. Quarterly* (1927), iii. 315-22.

³⁶ J. Ryland, *Bapt. Register* (1802), p. 717. Churches in this area seem sometimes to have formally dissolved when they were too weak to support a constant ministry, though the members continued to meet for worship and re-enchurched when they could again "uphold a church state."

³⁷ *Bapt. Magazine* (1822), xv. 163. The misprint Castor for Carter was corrected at p. 201, but is inadvertently repeated in a useful note on Olney in *Bapt. Quarterly* (1927), iii. 199.

³⁸ *Quaker Minute Book for the Upperside of Bucks.*, ed. B. S. Snell (1937), xiv-xv; Ellwood's *Autobiography* (1714), p. 276; Crosby, ii. 236-8; Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, ii. 75-7.

³⁹ i.e. village feast-days. In the Bucks. dialect, any village was a town, and feast (pl. festes) = *fešta*, the "Sunshine Holyday" to which the "upland Hamlets" invited Milton. The first hundred lines of *L'Allegro* appear to contain many Chiltern allusions.

⁴⁰ In 1695 Theophilus Delafield, scrivener, had been appointed "Scribe or Register of the Churches acts and to be paid for soe doing." His Pelagian tendency became apparent in 1700.

⁴¹ George (1614-1685?) was the son of John Deverell, churchwarden in 1658, who allowed Thomas Deverell, a Cromwellian major, to set up a pew 5ft. square before the pulpit: *Swanbourne Registers*, ed. R. Ussher (1915). Thomas and William Deverell, churchwardens in 1662, presented other dissenters but not their kinsman George, though there is a significant blank at the head of their list.

⁴² *Victoria County History of Bucks.* (1925), iii. 467, citing Exch. Dep. Mich. 29 Chas. II.

⁴³ This Joseph Glenister, a Winslow grocer, was public-spirited almost to excess; we find him serving as constable, bringing in recruits for Marlborough's armies, assisting the county gaoler to convey prisoners to Buckingham assizes, and standing bail for a surgeon, who absconded.

⁴⁴ *Vict. C.H. Bucks.* (1927), iv. 214, citing Feet of Fines, Bucks., Hil. 11 Anne.

⁴⁵ *Fenstanton Records*, ed. E. B. Underhill (1854), p. 80.

⁴⁶ *Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc.* (1913), iv. 217.

⁴⁷ *The Perjur'd Phanatick* (2nd edn. 1710), p. 3.

⁴⁸ A. H. Cocks, *The Church Bells of Buckinghamshire* (1897), p. 140.

⁴⁹ E. A. Payne, *Baptist Quarterly* (1951), xiv. 165.

The Appointment of Deacons:

NOTES FROM THE SOUTHWARK MINUTE BOOK, 1719-1802.

THE following extracts from the Minute Book of the Southwark Church, which met first in Goat Lane and then in Carter Lane, were sent to me by Mr. E. A. Gurney-Smith, of Sevenoaks, a descendant of William Lepard, Junior, who was probably responsible for making them.* The Church came into existence in 1719 when, following the death of Benjamin Stinton, there was a split in the old Southwark Church, of which Benjamin Keach had been pastor. John Gill became the first minister of the new church and, as the notes record, was followed in 1773 by John Rippon.

It is interesting to notice the method by which deacons were chosen and the use of phrases such as "ordination and setting apart" and "ordained and installed into office." It will be seen that in 1777 the newly elected deacons were given "the right hand of fellowship"; that in 1791 a proposal that those chosen "be initiated into their office by laying on of hands" was rejected; but that in 1803 a group of deacons, which included Andrew Fuller's friend, William Burls, were "set apart by Prayer and laying on of Hands." Rippon continued minister till his death in 1836.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

1719 Nov. 17—

Agreed that on Thursday Nov. 26 the Church should meet together and after some time spent in Prayer, 4 Deacons be chosen to take upon them the administration of the affairs of the Church.

Nov. 26—

Being the day appointed for Election of Deacons, the Church met together and after some time spent in Prayer, chose Thos. Stone, John Jones, John Smith and Thos. Crosby to the office of Deacon.

1724 April 21—

Agreed that Tuesday next being the 28th of this inst. be kept in fasting and Prayer for the nomination and choice of two Deacons.

* Mr. Gurney-Smith also sent me a small treasurer's account book relating to the Carter Lane Church and covering the years 1824-28. It was kept first by Mr. Benjamin Lepard, one of the deacons elected in 1802, and from July, 1826 by a Mr. Evans. Enclosed in it is a list of the contributors to a fund of £411 12s. 6d. raised in 1824-25 for the repair of the Carter Lane Meeting House, for the repayment of monies owing to Mr. Burls and for the law expenses arising from the handing over to the Church by John Rippon, of Almshouses erected in 1803.

- April 28—
Being the day appointed for the nomination and choice of two Deacons the Church accordingly met and after some time spent in Prayer and a Word of Direction given respecting the nature of that office and the qualifications of persons for it, the Church proceeded to the nomination of four Persons viz. Bro. Turner, Bro. Deale, Bro. Kelly and Bro. Whorley out of which the two former were chosen by a majority.
- 1727 May 16—
It was agreed that the 30th of this instant be appointed a day of prayer for the ordination and setting apart of Bro. Deal and Bro. Turner to the office of Deacons in this Church which was done accordingly.
- 1741 July 10—
This being a Meeting of Prayer appointed by the Church for the choice of Deacons Bro. Anderson, Bro. Sharp, Bro. Davis and Bro. Davenport were elected into that office and Friday the 24th of this instant was fixed for the installment of 'em into it.
- 1741 June 24—
The 4 Deacons Bro. Anderson, Bro. Sharp, Bro. Davis and Bro. Davenport were ordained and installed into that office.
- 1743 May 2—
Upon the dismissal of Bro. Anderson, a motion was made to choose another Deacon in his Room and Bro. Lepard being nominated was unanimously chosen and Bro. Davis and Bro. Davenport were appointed to acquaint him with it and to desire his acceptance and this day fortnight is appointed to lay the affair before the Church in general and to install him into his office.
- May 15—
Lord's day. The Church being stayed it was reported that Bro. Lepard had been chosen into the Office of Deacon at the last Church Meeting and both Brethren and Sisters were desired to signify their assent to it which was unanimously done and accordingly Thursday May 26th was appointed for the ordination of him on which day the Church met and he was ordained into his office.
- 1751 March 11—
The next Church Meeting was appointed to begin at 3 o'clock precisely for the choice of two Deacons, Prayer being to be exercised on the occasion.
- April 8—
The affair of fixing a time for the choice of Deacons was postponed to a consideration of the Church after next breaking of Bread.
- April 14—
It was agreed that Monday fortnight be appointed to spend some time in prayer for the choice of 2 Deacons to begin at 3 o'clock.
- April 29—
The Church met together and having spent some time in prayer proceeded to the nomination and choice of two Deacons when Bro. Ribright and Bro. Robinson were chosen and that day 6 weeks was appointed for the said Brethren's answer and the installment of 'em into their office.
- June 10—
The Church met according to appointment and having recognized the choice of Bro. Ribright and Bro. Robinson to the office of Deacons and they being called upon to signify their acceptance which they did,

were solemnly ordained into and invested with the said office and the whole was concluded with Prayer and a Sermon on that occasion.

1769 March 27—

Agreed that this day fortnight be appointed to spend some time in prayer for the choice of three Deacons to begin at 3 o'clock.

April 24—

The Pastor having declared the Reasons why the Agreement of the last Church Meeting in regard to the choice of Deacons had been passed by and after further consideration it was proposed and agreed that this day fortnight be appointed to spend some time in prayer for direction in the choice of two Deacons to begin at 3 o'clock.

May 7—

Lord's Day. After the Ordinance had been administered the Pastor acquainted the Church with their Resolut at the last Church Meeting in regard to the choice of two more Deacons and desired if they acquiesced thereto that they would signify the same by the lifting up of their Hands which was unanimously agreed to.

May 8—

The Church met together and having spent some time in prayer, proceeded to the nomination and choice of Deacons when Bro. Warne and Bro. Button were chosen and that day fortnight was appointed for the said Brethren's Answer and the installment of 'em into their office.

1771 Oct. 13—

Dr. Gill died.

1773 Nov. 11—

Mr. Rippon ordained.

Decr. 16—

It was proposed and agreed that on Wednesday next this Church do meet to spend some time in Prayer for direction in the choice of Deacons to begin at 3 o'clock.

Decr. 19—

Lord's Day Evg. the Church being stayed the affair of the choice of Deacons was reconsidered when it was the unanimous determination of the Church that there should be 3 of the Brethren chosen to the office of Deacons amongst us on Wednesday next.

Decr. 22—

Some time having been spent in prayer, the Church proceeded to the nomination and choice of Deacons when the Brethren Flight, Sharp and Carrole were chosen and the next Church Meeting in course was appointed for the said Brethren's answer and the installment of them into their office.

1774 Jany. 10—

Brethren Carrol and Sharp having accepted the call of the Church to the office of Deacons they were accordingly invested into the said office. (N.B. Bro. Flight co^d not be prevailed upon to accept the office.)

1777 March 17—

Resolved that at our next Church Meeting a nomination be made of some of the Brethren out of whom two to be chosen on some future day to the office of Deacons to this Church.

April 21—

The follg. Brethren being proposed by one of the Members and seconded by another were nominated for two of them to be chosen to the office of Deacon, viz. :

Brother Wm Lepard Junr. John Sword
 John Putley Stephen Misnard
 John Cooper

Resolved that the above choice be by ballot on the 15th of May next in the afternoon.

May 15—

Each of the Brethren's names proposed for that purpose at our last Church Meeting being printed on slips of paper the Church proceeded to ballot at the close of which the Majority appeared for

Brethren Wm. Lepard Junr.
 Stephen Misnard

on which they were declared duly elected to the office of Deacons to this Church and they were desired to give their Answers at our next Church Meeting but one in course.

July 21—

The Church having recognised their call of our Brethren Wm. Lepard Jr. and Stephen Misnard to the office of Deacons they were each of them separately called upon by our Pastor to declare their minds relative to their acceptance thereof and which they did in the affirmative. They were then invested into that office by our Pastor in the name of the Church giving them the right hand of fellowship. Agreed that Thursday next at 3 o'clock in the afternoon be appointed to spend time in Prayer on the above occasion.

1791 Jan. 17—

The Church thinking it very proper to make an addition to the officers came to the following Resolution that any Brethren's name mentioned and seconded be put down to the number of 4 in order that two out of the said 4 Brethren be chose by ballot to the office of Deacons at our next Church Meeting :

<i>The Brethren nominated</i>	<i>By whom</i>	<i>Seconded by</i>
Robt. Westley	Bro. Giles	Bro. Lepard
Jas. Norton	Westley	Swaine
Robt. Davies	Giles	Westley
Philip James	Halloway	Westley

March 21—

The Church proceeding to take the ballot for the choice of Deacons on casting up of which the numbers appeared as follows :

Bro. Davies	40
James	16
Norton	133
Westley	108

Our brethren Norton and Westley were declared by our Pastor duly elected Deacons to this Church.

Bro. Giles proposed that the Deacons now chose be initiated into their office by laying on of hands which being objected to by the present Deacons and several other members of this Church, a warm discussion being likely to take place, he was desired to withdraw his Motion which he did.

Adjd. to this day fortnight for receiving the Answers of our Brethren now chosen into the office of Deacons to this Church.

April 4—

Brethren Westley and Norton having declared their readiness to accept the call of the Church to the office of Deacons they initiated into it by our Pastor in the name of the Church by the right hand of fellowship.

1802 Nov. 8—

Resolved that it appears expedient to choose 3 persons to the office of Deacons in this Church. The follg. persons were put in nomination:

Bro. Burls	Bro. Hudson
B. Lepard	Coxhead
Medley	Chas. Robinson

Agreed to meet this day fortnight to elect 3 persons out of those nominated to fill the office of Deacon.

Nov. 22—

The Church proceeded to ballot for Deacons on casting up which the numbers were for:

Bro. Burls	98
B. Lepard	91
Hudson	89
Coxhead	63
Medley	34
Chas. Robinson	17

the three former were declared duly elected. Agreed to meet this day fortnight for prayer and setting apart the Brethren now elected to their office.

Dec. 6—

Agreeable to the Resolution of the last Meeting the Church met for prayer and the Brethren chosen to the office of Deacon were set apart by Prayer and laying on of Hands by our Pastor.

1823 March 17.

All that Jesus Began, by R. H. Copestake. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.).

This is another book by, presumably, a younger writer, which attempts to give in non-technical language the results of modern Biblical scholarship in regard to the mission and message of Jesus and the beginnings of the Church. The book is divided into three parts—The Church's one foundation; The Church of the New Testament; The Message of the New Testament Church. It is clearly and simply written, and would serve as a useful introduction for those desirous of a fuller understanding of the New Testament. There are a number of statements in this book which give the impression of immaturity. Would Paul have ardently persecuted the early Church if he had merely "despised" it? (p. 69). What does the writer mean by describing Philip as being "of the type that receives independent guidance"? (p. 70). Were the first Christians baptized "as a sign of admission to the Church"? (p. 70). There are printing errors on pp. 20 and 81.

The Great Realities, by Samuel H. Miller. (Longmans, Green, 10s. 6d.).

The fact that this book has been printed in this country after being first published in the U.S.A. in 1955, where the writer is a Baptist minister, indicates something of its worth. It is a mature book, full of spiritual insight and picturesque language, showing evidence of wide reading, long experience, deep thought and a lively faith. The "great realities" dealt with are—Man, God, Prayer, Worship, Faith, Love and Peace. This is a book to buy, over which to linger and to which to return. It is fresh in its treatment, stimulating to mind and heart, and takes account of the thought and outlook of modern man.

L. J. MOON

Reviews

Kingdom and Church, by T. F. Torrance. (Oliver & Boyd, 16s.).

The main object of this study is to show how the leading Reformers restored the Apostolic expectation of "a new age in which an earthly future figured as prominently as a heavenly," and also how this perspective determined their differing views of Church and State. Dr. Torrance divides his work into three "Eschatologies"—that of Faith (Luther), of Love (Bucer), of Hope (Calvin). The Kingdom is entirely future, but we live in its "overlap." It is not the destruction of creation (except for Luther) but its re-investiture in *our* time. The Church, her ministry of the Word, her sacraments and her doctrines are only meaningful in the light of this event.

Divergences start over the problems of the "time between." Luther found the State evil and the Church impure. But Christ would soon come. He would then destroy the State and sift the Church. Bucer and Calvin, under longer perspectives, gave Church and State creative roles. One of the most rewarding features of the book is the exposition of how they did this, and why. The Church through its preaching, sacraments and discipline brought up men in grace, spread Christ's rule in the world, and evoked those "works of love" which make ideal community life possible. Bucer and Calvin were not content with a merely formal or technical righteousness—a man must live the love in which he belongs to Christ. The State is the area of this activity, and therefore really becomes the religious community in its secular calling. As such, the State had its sanction in the Bible, and was to be served in Christ's love. This rests upon something foreign to Baptists—the concept of a *Volkskirche*, a people's Church, of which the State is merely the civic dimension. Both would then constitute what Bucer calls the *Christian Commonwealth*. There is no question of failure. The Church would grow, because she shared by election in an event God had already designed. By their very nature both Church and State looked forward to their ultimate perfection in the coming Kingdom, which was both grace and order. And the fact of this election obviously changes the complexion of Faith. It merges into Hope.

Dr. Torrance rightly apologises for the brevity of the Bucer section. Its seventeen pages do little justice to this extraordinary man, who provided the groundwork for Calvin, gave us our doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and was congenial enough to the English Reformers to be invited to a divinity chair at Cambridge.

References to Anabaptists are few. Calvin linked them with the Pope as those who lost the Word in extravagant views of the Spirit. He also made the now—threadbare—accusation that they destroyed the historical continuity of the Church.

The book is well-documented, and meets the need of those who want a reliable digest of Reformation thinking. The scheme of the three "Eschatologies" is a good one, and, although strained in the case of Bucer, it enables Dr. Torrance to present a fresh and intensely relevant exposition of themes we are always talking about—for the Reformers are *us*—but are loath to read in the original, cobwebbed tomes.

G. H. PRICE

Prophecy and Religion in Ancient China and Israel, by H. H. Rowley. (University of London, Athlone Press, 21s.).

In these the fourth series of the Jordan Lectures, given in the University of London in 1954, Professor H. H. Rowley seeks to bring together the prophets of the Old Testament and the great thinkers of ancient China in the three centuries 530-230. This is a task which few scholars could attempt, and fewer still succeed with the success which Professor Rowley has achieved.

By means of six chosen themes, whereby the Israelite prophets and the Chinese sages are considered as statesmen and reformers, or whereby their teaching concerning the Golden Age, Worship, and God are set forth, he portrays the prophets and the sages in the context of their own cultural heritage. The various summaries of the Old Testament material in the book are models of brevity and comprehensiveness. No doubt, as the documentation shows, the same is true of the material from the Chinese side. At the same time the reader must be warned that the Chinese material suffers by comparison, for it is not so familiar, or so passionate or so theocentric as the Israelite material. The comparisons are instructive, though, more often than not, the points of comparison are freely admitted to have become points of contrast. In respect to their understanding of worship and of God, the contrast between the sages and the prophets have become virtually a chasm. Indeed one wonders at times whether Professor Rowley's advocacy of the prophetic character of the sages is not somewhat strained, and whether a truer point of approach would not have been through the 'Wise' in Israel and Judaism rather than through the prophets.

Of the boldness, the interest and the success of these studies there can be no question. We are indebted to our author for throwing light on those great contemporary movements of life and thought in Judaism and in China, which with the movement of the also contemporary Greek Philosophy surely constitute together one of the precise epochs of the ministry of the Holy Spirit in the divine education of our race. Thus the real significance of Professor Rowley's work is that it is another step forward in the understanding of man's spiritual history and unity.

A Companion to the Communion Service, by W. Robinson. First printed by the Oxford University Press, 1942. Reprinted by the Berean Press, 1955. 5s.).

This is a devotional manual for use with the Communion service written from within the Reformed Tradition. The book is made up of a number of short paragraphs dealing with various topics relating to the preparation for, and the understanding, the structure and the celebration of the Communion Service. Selections of readings and prayers are given by way of example, and there is also a section giving quotations from the writings of Reformed Divines concerning the Lord's Supper. The book is reverent, helpful and judicious, and there are occasions when its joy approaches rapture. All who use it will find it very helpful. In the paragraph on the Communion Principal Robinson rightly emphasizes that: "We are at the point where *action* is supreme." There is no need to emphasize that point to Baptists, for we are still on our guard lest elaborate verbal forms crowd out the action. There is, however, one statement which is a little strange. On p. 32 Principal Robinson says: "We have very little in the New Testament to indicate what was the actual structure of the service. . . ." I find this statement difficult. Does it mean that our author was looking for evidence of the more ecclesiastical elaborations? He will find none of those. Surely what Paul says is sufficient direction for the ordering of the Communion service of any church. Why and by what authority do we go beyond what the Apostle required of his followers?

G. HENTON DAVIES

Between Two Miracles, by Stuart Craig. (Independent Press 6s.).

The best comment on this book is that when it was taken up it had to be finished in one session. Mr. Craig writes of his seven-month tour of L.M.S. mission stations in the South Seas. It is a fascinating picture of the spread of the Gospel over these scattered island communities. The first miracle is the change wrought in the life of these communities by the coming of the Faith. The story is told vividly but realistically. The author is not so carried away by his theme as not to be conscious of the frailties of the young churches in these lands and their need for a more mature Christian experience and of the dangers that beset them. The second miracle is, to the author, still in future, though he sees varied signs of its coming—it is the work of the Holy Spirit in “carrying the Gospel into the deepest levels of Christian experience.” Mr. Craig has given us a stimulating and heartening little book.

Adventure in Christian Obedience. A Handbook on Christian Citizenship.
Edited by Clifford Cleal. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 5s.).

The roots of this book reach back some years, to the discussions in the Temperance and Social Questions Committees of the Baptist Union, in which the members of both were gradually led to the attempt to unify the various problems with which they were engaged. Ultimately the Department of Christian Citizenship issued its “Rule of Life” (perhaps a somewhat misleading title). To augment this and to inspire further discussion in Christian groups, Mr. Cleal has gathered a team of six who are responsible for this work.

While it varies in quality, as is to be expected in a composite work, we cannot but be grateful to Mr. Cleal and his colleagues for this stimulus. No attempt is made at dogmatic assertions. That some may dissent at various points is of less moment than that the book should stimulate individuals and groups to further discussion of the vital problems of Christian citizenship which it sets forth.

Though this is a Baptist publication, there is nothing distinctively Baptist about it, which is as it should be in this connection. Many besides Baptists should find it a most useful handbook for thought and discussion. Stewardship, Work and Leisure, Family Life, The Christian and Politics—these are a few of the themes discussed. It is a vigorous and healthy exposition of the true aim of Christian education—the complete Christian citizen and his witness in the community.

Who is Jesus Christ? by Stephen Neill. World Christian Books, No. 14.
(United Society for Christian Literature, Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.).

No Christian zealot for the missionary task of the Church can fail to be thankful for the enterprise of the United Society for Christian Literature in seeking to present the Christian faith in a series of booklets which are to be translated into many languages. This volume is No. 14 in the series.

The editor, Bishop Neill, has given himself one of the hardest tasks in endeavouring to present in such small compass the centrality and significance of Jesus Christ. In its limits, the work is well and lucidly done.

Bishop Neil emphasises the vital place of experience in the building of the faith, as Christians conscious of His abiding presence and authority came to find increasing significance in His life and words. The problems which they faced in the proclaiming of their faith in Him are frankly dealt with and the successive conflicts on the Person of Christ lucidly explained. The book ends with suggestions for the Christian witness in face of rival

religions and modern substitutes for the faith, with the promise of further books on the great religions and "substitute religions."

This and the companion volumes are intended primarily for use in other lands, but this volume could be used with profit for the guidance of our young people in the essentials of our faith.

W. S. DAVIES

The Gospel of Matthew. A Teacher's Commentary, by Richard Glover. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 15s.).

The sub-title hardly does justice to the store of spiritual insight and wisdom which is offered in the pages of this notable volume. In describing it as "a preacher's gold-mine," Professor H. R. Mackintosh was absolutely right, for so it is. But its use should be by no means confined to ministers or teachers, for here also is a devotional commentary of considerable value which will enrich the spirit of anyone who studies *Matthew* with Dr. Glover as his guide. The problems in which scholars delight are here set aside. After a brief introduction the author plunges into a verse by verse commentary which is studded with comments distinguished by their depth of understanding both of the Gospel and the human heart and by mature practical wisdom, and often expressed with epigrammatic terseness. The publishers have done well to make available to a new generation of readers, so excellent a help to the understanding of *Matthew's* message. For Baptists the book has particular interest, for the author of this stimulating and edifying volume was the Richard Glover of Tyndale, Bristol, fame.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES

The Self-taught Country Organist and Choirmaster, by Marmaduke P. Conway. (Canterbury Press, 8s. 6d.).

A most interesting and well-planned book, which will be of very great assistance to students of organ playing and choir training, working without a teacher. Particularly noteworthy in Part 1 are the chapters on practical work for manuals and pedals, containing in a remarkably short space a course of self-instruction which would soon result in technical freedom if carefully and thoroughly pursued. Dr. Conway amplifies his remarks on expression, phrasing and registration by many useful hints. Part 1, dealing with the choir, also contains valuable suggestions on voice training and the singing of psalms, canticles and hymns.

F. DODSON

Richmond Hill Story, by J. Trevor Davies. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.).

What makes a great church? The answer lies in this highly interesting account, written by its present minister, of the rise and progress of Richmond Hill Congregational Church, Bournemouth, which recently celebrated its centenary. Unlike so many churches these days this one has no nostalgia for former glories, for with a membership of nearly 1,000 and a weekly attendance of 2,000 and the ability to continue its splendid record of church extension by financing to the tune of £14,000 a new Congregational church to mark its centenary, Richmond Hill is obviously as full of vigorous life as ever. It was a happy thought to include a sermon by each of its last four ministers. These remind one that although the success of the church has doubtless been due to having been on a rising tide, not a little of it is to be accounted for by great preaching. Richmond Hill was not built by the school-hall chats to which so many congregations are nowadays subjected. Dr. Davies, as many know, holds a skilful pen and the story he here tells will be followed with interest and enjoyment by every reader.

The Church on the Air, by Edwin H. Robertson. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 2s. 6d.).

"Some thoughts on Religious Broadcasting" are here offered by a former Assistant Head of the Religious Broadcasting Dept. of the B.B.C. The Department's developing policy, the various types of broadcast, hints on preparing the script and the congregation, the powerful new medium of television, are among the subjects dealt with. To those who listen as well as those who broadcast this booklet will prove of considerable interest and help. Those who may be facing a broadcast for the first time should find it particularly useful.

What Every Congregationalist Should Know, by Francis Gibbons. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.).

No one having read this well-written and interesting account of Congregationalist belief and practice could plead ignorance of any of the salient features of British Congregationalism. Mr. Gibbons has admirably fulfilled his purpose of supplying information of which every member of a Congregationalist church should make himself aware and at the same time of explaining to members of other communions what Congregationalism stands for, how it is organised and where it stands in relation to overseas missions and the ecumenical movement. It was a happy inspiration to add a third section showing how God is blessing the denomination's witness today. Here are given nine examples, drawn from widely differing situations, of how Congregational churches old and new are living up to the finest traditions of the past and proving today the power of the Word and the Spirit. As a complete but concise guide this could hardly have been bettered.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES

Reading the Bible, by A. Gilmore. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 8s. 6d.).

The purpose of this book is to explain, in terms that the untrained layman can understand, the results of Biblical criticism. Mr. Gilmore does this clearly and helpfully and in an interesting and positive way. This book should help many towards a deeper understanding of the Bible and a fuller appreciation of its message. There is a most comprehensive and useful bibliography.

While we appreciate the laudable aim of the writer we wonder whether he overstates his case on occasions, sometimes giving the impression that only those with a knowledge of Biblical criticism can really read the Bible with understanding. What about the great teachers and saints of the past centuries for whom it was a mine of spiritual truth and inspiration? We would have thought that with not a few of the Psalms the date matters little for an appreciation of the abiding spiritual truth they express. (p. 37). We are not happy about the parallel drawn between the sermons of today and the "Word of God" spoken by the prophets. (p. 27). On two or three occasions "comprise" is mis-used. (e.g. p. 83).

L. J. MOON