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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

incorporating the Transactions of the BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

MANY of our churches have church covenants. Most of these covenants are put into the hands of church members when they join the church. In few churches, probably, are the church members asked to set their name to the covenant to signify their acceptance of it. It was encouraging, therefore, to discover that, not only was this the practice at the Westgate Baptist Church in Bradford, but also that the original twenty-three signatories who set their names to the covenant on 4th December, 1753, are now followed by every church member's signature since then. And a fine array of signatures (and marks) it is. The list includes, for example, the name of John Fawcett, the author of the hymn "Blest be the tie that binds," who joined Westgate on March 11th, 1758.

The covenant itself is of considerable interest not only from the point of view of history, but also as a challenge to Baptist church life today, so we reproduce it here.

THE SOLEMN COVENANT OF CHURCH UNION

WE a small handful of the unworthy dust of Zion usually assembling for the worship of God at Bradford, and in obedience to the command of God and conformity to the example of JESUS CHRIST, and his faithful followers, recorded in the New Testament, Baptized with water, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST, having first given our own selves to the LORD. Are now met together with one accord to give up ourselves one to another, by mutual Consent

and Solemn Covenant according to the will of GOD; with deep Humiliation for our past Sins and earnest prayer to GOD for pardoning mercy and assisting preserving and persevering Grace, we say with our Hearts we are the LORD'S, and subscribe unto Him with our hands in manner following. Namely,

1st. We this day Avouch the ever blessed JEHOVAH, FATHER, SON, and HOLY SPIRIT, the one only true and Living GOD, for our new Covenant GOD and all-sufficient Portion and give up ourselves to Him alone, for His peculiar People in a perpetual Covenant, never to be forgotten.

2ndly, we receive and submit to the LORD JESUS CHRIST, as our alone SAVIOUR, PROPHET, PRIEST, and KING; in whom alone we trust for wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

3rdly, we devote and consecrate ourselves, as living Temples to the HOLY GHOST, our Sanctifier, Guide and Comforter, whose gracious operations and Heavenly Conduct, we desire daily more and more to enjoy experience and follow.

4thly, we take the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the only ground and rule of our Faith and Practise, desiring through the help of His GRACE therein promised, to be in all things conformable to the Holy Will of GOD therein revealed.

5thly, according to the Tenor of which Divine Oracles and depending for performance only on the Divine Help, and assistance therein promised as deeply sensible that we are not sufficient of ourselves but that all our sufficiency both to will and to do that which is good is of GOD; whose grace alone is sufficient to enable us to do the following things, through CHRIST strengthening us, in a single dependence on whom and as in duty bound, we now covenant with GOD each for ourselves, and jointly together.

1st, to worship GOD in Spirit and in truth, to observe His commandments and keep His Ordinances, as He hath delivered them to us.

2ndly, to be subject to that divine Order and Discipline which JESUS CHRIST our only KING and Law-giver, hath appointed in His CHURCH and not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together for the public worship of GOD, in its appointed Seasons, but to continue steadfastly in our Relation to one another; and to fill up our places duly in the House of GOD, and cheerfully maintain His worship therein to the best of our Capacity until Death; or evident calls of divine providence, shall separate us from one another.

3rdly, to love one another with pure Hearts fervently; and endeavour to keep a Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace; for the Honour of our GOD and our mutual good unto Edification.

6thly, We will also make it our care through the aforesaid help, to walk before the LORD in our own Houses with upright hearts and to keep up the worship of GOD therein, by daily prayer and praise to GOD and diligent reading the Holy Scriptures, that so the word of GOD may dwell Richly in us.

7thly, And as we have given our Children to the LORD by a Solemn Dedication, so we will endeavour through divine help, to teach them the way of the LORD and command them to keep it setting before them an holy Example worthy of their imitation and continuing in prayer to GOD, for their Conversion and Salvation.

8thly, We will also endeavour by the grace of GOD, to keep ourselves

pure from the Sins and vices of the times and places wherein we live; and so be Holy in all manner of Conversation, that none may have Occasion given, by our unholy lives, to speak evil of GOD's holy ways.

9thly, And all this under an abiding Sense, that we must shortly give up our Account, to him that is ready to Judge the Quick and the Dead; on to which Solemn covenant, we set our Hands in the presence of the All seeing Heart Searching GOD.

This fourth day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and fifty-three.

Many comments could be made on the covenant. We limit ourselves to one. It concerns the statement: "And as we have given our Children to the LORD by a Solemn Dedication...". Many readers may be surprised to find such a statement in an eighteenth-century church covenant. But it seems clear that both in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries some Baptists practised a form of Infant Dedication on the authority of our Lord's blessing of the children. What is further interesting—and very relevant in the discussions about Baptism—is that there is some evidence to suggest that our forefathers thought the children of Christian parents to be in a different situation "theologically" to children of non-Christians. By the nineteenth century, the practice apparently had fallen out of use and out of mind. We are glad to hear that the Revd. Michael Walker is engaged in research on this whole subject and look forward with very great interest to hearing the outcome of his work.

William Allen, Cromwellian Agitator and "Fanatic"

WILLIAM ALLEN'S political career lasted little more than a decade. He lived during the most turbulent period of English history, and although his share in the great events of the revolutionary age was a minor one, it is an example of two striking political phenomena of the Puritan Revolution: the awakening of the lower classes and the radicalism of the religious sects. His life also provides a good example of the changing position of many Cromwellian soldiers who faithfully followed their leader in the civil war, but broke with him over religious and political issues.

In an examination before the House of Commons Allen described himself as a Warwickshire man and a felt-maker (i.e., a hat-maker) by trade, practising in Southwark. His first military service was in Denzil Holles' regiment of the army of the Earl of Essex.[1] Holles' regiment, raised in the summer of 1642, was mainly composed of London apprentices who were eager to enlist under a prominent Parliamentarian. With Essex it took the field in August. For two months they marched about the Midlands, where their lack of discipline became notorious. But they conducted themselves bravely in the first battle of the war, at Edgehill, "every one fighting like a Lion with most glorious successe." As a speaker told the officials of London, "These were the men that were, ignominiously, reproached by the name of *Round-Heads;* but by these *Round-Heads* did God shew himself a most glorious God."[2]

Holles' regiment was practically destroyed at the battle of Brentford, November 12th, 1642, the soldiers being either drowned in the Thames or captured, as Allen was. He was a prisoner for seven days, and, as he later said, condemned to be hanged, but was freed on taking an oath not to resist the king. On his release he promptly rejoined the Parliamentary forces, this time in the regiment of Philip Skippon, also part of Essex's army. Skippon's regiment participated in the relief of Gloucester (August-September 1643), and at the battle of Newbury, September 18th, where Allen was wounded. The army was much depleted during the winter, and whether Allen remained with his regiment is unknown. Such as took the field in 1644 were cornered in the West and surrendered to the Royalists on condition of marching to Southhampton or Portsmouth before again taking arms.[3] In 1645 Essex's army was dissolved, the regiments being combined with those of the armies

of Waller and Manchester into the New Model. About April 1646 William Allen became a trooper in Cromwell's regiment of horse.

By this time the war was practically over, the king was a prisoner, and all attention was focused on the problem of a settlement. Parliament had voted the establishment of a Presbyterian church, and showed little inclination to implement a resolution of 1644 promising toleration. A quarrel with the strongly Independent army was inevitable, for Parliament proposed to employ part of the troops in Ireland and to disband the rest, without giving guarantees for the payment of the soldiers' arrears or for their indemnity for acts committed during the war. More fundamental, however, was the soldiers' fear that the constitutional settlement of the kingdom was to be achieved by a legislature totally unrepresentative of the nation, and without consulting those who had won the victory. Recriminations began to fly back and forth between army and Parliament. Their determination not to be excluded led the soldiers to choose representatives, or "agitators," from each regiment. Allen and Samuel Whiting being nominated for Cromwell's regiment. It was in this capacity that Allen first came to public attention.

In April, 1647 the agitators drew up a stirring appeal to their commanders. They had been protected by providence from many dangers, they said, but now that the Royalists were vanquished they were sensible of a more dangerous threat to their liberties and lives. This was from a group of intriguers in Parliament, who now denounced them as enemies and deprived them of legal protection from lawsuits. "Our fellow Soldiers suffer at every Assize for Acts merely relating to that war." They could defend themselves from an enemy in the field, "but it is another and a farre worse Enemy we have to deal with, who like Foxes lurke in their dens, and cannot be dealt with though discovered, being protected by those who are intrusted with the Government of the Kingdome." The Irish expedition was nothing but a design to ruin the army, "a mere cloak for some who have lately tasted of sovreignty, and being lifted beyond the ordinary spheare of servants seek to become masters, and degenerate into tyrants." Until the rights and liberties of England were vindicated they would refuse service in Ireland.[4]

The nomination of the agitators was unprecedented, and naturally aroused misgivings in many quarters. To the army leaders they represented a serious threat to discipline. To the Presbyterian majority in Parliament they represented sectarianism and mutiny: "Traiterous Mutineers by the *Law Martiall* and the *Common Law* of the Land," is Prynne's description.[5]

Thoroughly alarmed, the Commons, on April 30th, called before the House Allen and two of his fellow-signatories, Edward Sexby

and Thomas Shepherd. They willingly gave their own histories, but refused to enlarge on their recent declaration, "they being only agents."[6] Holles, Allen's old commander, thought their conduct outrageous:

> They were sent for, and carry'd themselves at the Bar in a slighting braving manner, refusing to answer such questions as the Speaker, by order of the House, ask'd them; saying they were employ'd by the Army, and could not without leave from thence discover any thing. Many the House resenting this high affront, were earnest to have them severely punish'd; but that Party stood as stifly for them, insomuch that the worthy Burgess of *Newcastle*, Mr. *Warmworth*, stood up and said he would have them committed indeed, but it should be to the best Inn of the Town, and good Sack and Sugar provided them, which was as ridiculous, as 'twas a bold and insolent scorn put upon the Parliament; at last even Mr. Skippon himself excused them, said they were honest Men, and wisht they might not be too severely dealt with: whereupon the House flatted, let them go without punishment, and by tameness encreas'd their madness and presumption. Whereas had they serv'd them as Mr. *Cromwel* afterwards did their fellows, hang'd one of them (they all well deserving it) it might probably have given a stop to their Career, and prevented a great deal of mischief, which has since befallen the Kingdom by their means.[7]

In the end the House sent a message to the army that they would provide "a considerable sum of money for them before their disbanding," and that an ordinance should be brought in for their indemnity. Such half-measures fell on deaf ears, and the agitators resolved, they wrote to the rest of the army on May 19th, "neither to take monie, nor march from one another."[8] Ten days later they drew up a petition to Fairfax, begging him to prevent the disbanding before their grievances were redressed. An ominous note was sounded in their warning that unless their leaders helped them to gain satisfaction they would take matters into their own hands.[9]

Fairfax and Cromwell were convinced that justice was on the army's side, although both were anxious to restrain the soldiers lest their actions provoke an open breach. On June 3rd, however, Cromwell left London and joined the army at Newmarket, having, as it is presumed, ordered Cornet Joyce to secure the king. Henceforth it was Cromwell who dominated the affairs of the army, the agitators, as Lilburne wrote, being unjustly deprived of their power.

On June 14th the agitators issued another declaration, reaffirming their determination to insist on a satisfactory settlement of the liberties and peace of the kingdom, "which is that blessing of God than which, of all worldly things, nothing is more dear unto us or more precious in our thoughts, we having hitherto thought all our present enjoyments (whether of life, or livelihood, or nearest relations) a price but sufficient to the purchase of so rich a blessing."[10] Again, on July 15th, they asserted their determination to stick together and to aim at "the glory of God, the just preservation and safety of the Kings Person, the just privileges of Parliament, the redeeming of the Lives and Liberties of the Free-People of *England*, from Tyranny, Oppression, and Injustice; the maintenance of just Lawes, and the necessary support and defence of this Kingdome, together with the free and impartiall distribution of Justice to all."[11] A similar appeal to the navy appeared about the same time.[12]

Henceforth the agitators began to direct their efforts less towards satisfaction of their immediate grievances and more towards the achievement of a constitutional settlement. The Leveller doctrines of John Lilburne had begun to find many converts. Various views were canvassed in the momentous debates in the army council in July, 1647, and there William Allen was a frequent speaker. Like many of the soldiers he chafed under Cromwell's restraint, urging an immediate march on London, and declaring "wee should take power out of men's hands."[13] Again, when Cromwell argued that force ought to be used only in the last resort, Allen replied that although the soldiers appreciated their commanders' efforts to achieve a settlement, "truly wee have waited soe longe as our patience is expended."[14] In subsequent speeches Allen argued that the army's friends were losing out in Parliament, and that the estates disavowed the soldiers but permitted them to be "traduc't, revil'd, and rail'd uppon both in pulpitts and presses."[15] If they delayed others would contrive a settlement without them. Cromwell immediately refuted Allen, and succeeded in postponing a decision long enough to transmit the soldiers' desires without a demonstration such as the agitators demanded.

On July 17th Henry Ireton, Cromwell's son-in-law and most intimate political ally, presented his constitutional scheme to the army council. The Heads of the Proposals provided for a renewal of Government by king and Parliament, but transferred sovereignty to the latter. The plan was ahead of its time in providing for toleration and for the bringing of Parliament under popular control, but as Ireton was thought to have allowed the king to suggest some changes it was natural that the agitators should be distrustful. Allen's suspicion was immediately aroused. Let this programme be well considered and debated, he urged. Most of them

were "butt young Statesmen, and nott well able to judge how longe such thinges which wee heare now read to us may bee to the ends for which they are presented."[16]

Yet Allen was closer to Ireton and Cromwell than to the Levellers. Indeed, he was soon to be repudiated by his fellow-soldiers. In August the agitators addressed Fairfax with new proposals. They asked for a free and legal Parliament, from which the usurpers should be excluded.[17] For the moment the army leaders had turned to the possibility of negotiation with the king, but they soon became convinced of the unlikelihood of success in this direction, and in August at last gave way to the urgings of the agitators and occupied London. Weeks of fruitless exchanges followed, during which the soldiers lost patience with both their leaders and their representatives, and inclined more and more towards the schemes of Lilburne. In October five regiments, including Cromwell's and Ireton's, cashiered their agitators and elected new spokesmen, styled "agents," who presented the Leveller manifesto, "The Case of the Armie Truly Stated." The suggestion in this, that pressure had been put on the old agitators "to betray the trust the Regiments reposed in them," and other charges, that by Ireton's dissimulation "many of them are corrupted," and that they "did more consult their own advancement than the public settlement," explain the soldiers' decision to seplace Allen and his colleagues. Lilburne, in fact, specifically denounced Allen as Cromwell's "officious and extraordinary creature."[18]

Allen was thus repudiated by his fellows. Henceforth he identified himself with Cromwell and Ireton, and his promotion to a captaincy about this time doubtless reflects his political orientation.[19] As to a constitutional programme, he shared Cromwell's doubts on the difficult choice facing the commanders. He seems to have been readier to dispense with the monarchy, although hopeful that a settlement with the king could be reached. He still yearned for unity on the part of the soldiers, but in the General Council, while Goffe called for a delay until God should speak to them, Allen urged that the question be put to an issue: "As first, concerning the King. You say you will sett uppe the Kinge as farre as may be consistent with, and nott prejudiciall to the liberties of the Kingedome; and really I am of that minde [too]. If the setting uppe of him bee not consistent with them, and prejudiciall to them, then downe with him; but if hee may bee soe sett uppe—which I thinke he may—[then set him up]."[20] The next few days showed that the Levellers were gaining in the Council of the Army, and that there was considerable sentiment in favour of bringing the king to justice. The threat to discipline led Fairfax to dismiss the junior officers and agitators from head-

quarters, and to summon the regiments to a rendezvous. Here, at Corkbush Field, the commander reminded the soldiers of the efforts he and the general officers had made on their behalf, and promised to try to procure redress of their grievances, an end to the present Parliament, and provision for future Parliaments which would be equally representative of the people. His insistence that the settlement as a whole should be left to Parliament was unacceptable to one regiment, however, and order was only restored after the ranking officer had been arrested and one of the mutineers shot.[21]

The ranks closed in December, 1647, as a result of the king's refusal to accept the Four Bills and his signing the Engagement with the Scots. The army was now convinced that no confidence could be placed in him. A great prayer meeting took place in the Army Council, where Allen was observed to have sought God "sweetly and spiritually."[22] The outbreak of the second Civil War led to another such meeting at Windsor Castle, of which Allen wrote a detailed account some years after. In this he explains the perplexities of the army at the failure of their negotiations with Parliament and the king. "We in the army [were] in a low, weak, divided, perplexed condition . . . some us judging it a duty to lay down arms, and quit our stations, putting ourselves into the capacities of private men, since what we had done, or was yet in our hearts to do, tending, as we judged, to the good of these poor nations, was not accepted by them." First, however, they determined to seek the Lord. Three days of prayer took place, on April 29th, 30th, and May 1st, 1648. On April 30th Cromwell proposed "a thorough consideration of our actions as an army, as well as our ways particularly, as private Christians, to see if any iniquity could be found in them." This they did, and were rewarded on May 1st, when they discovered "the very steps (as we were then all jointly convinced) by which we had departed from the Lord, and provoked him to depart from us; which we found to be those cursed carnal conferences, our own wisdom, fears, and want of faith, had prompted us the year before to entertain with the king and his party." All were tremendously moved, and agreed to fight against those enemies, and to "call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for that blood he had shed."[23]

To some extent this account may be coloured by Allen's subsequent religious conversion, but in the main it is accepted as a faithful description of the most momentous decision in the history of the New Model.

William Allen accompanied Cromwell to Ireland in 1649, and spent the next five years there, as a captain (later lieutenant-colonel) and adjutant-general of the English forces.[24] In the Cromwellian army the adjutant-general's duties were not well defined, but they seem to have involved general assistance to the

commander, both of an administrative and a tactical kind, and Allen engaged in both types of activities. He and Henry Cromwell were sent by Ireton with a party of horse and foot against the enemy in King's County, where they reduced the stronghold of Ballybawn. A little later in 1651 he was with Ludlow at the taking of Clare Castle.[25] He also negotiated some of the most important treaties by which the enemy surrendered.[26]

The correspondence of Allen and his comrades is highly revealing of the attitude of the godly party toward the defeated race. At first they were convinced that their victories were a sign of the distinction God had made between them and the Irish. Later the outbreak of sickness in the English garrisons, which "laid heapes upon heapes," profoundly stirred them, and convinced them that the Lord was displeased with their complacency. "But at last, by all these sad stroakes from heaven, wee were raised out of that sleepy secure condition to call upon his name, seeke his face, and begg to know his minde in these judgements, which while wee were doing he both discovered the sinn which was our departure and back-sliding from him, forgetting him and the things hee hath done for us growing cold, and dead in our dutyes one towards another, as alsoe towards his worship and service, together with our love of the world, and too much conforming to the fashions of it, not distinguishing ourselves from, but pertakeing with the natives of this countrey in their sinn, an soe pertakeing in their judgements."[27]

Thereafter the Puritans determined to govern themselves more strictly, particularly with reference to the enemy. Allen signed the notable letter to Parliament in May 1652, deploring "our general aptness to lenity towards and composure with this enemy." The "bloodguilteness" of the Irish, and God's revealed intention to pursue them with "farther severity," led the officers to urge harsher rather than more lenient terms for the conquered land.[28]

Allen was one of the parliamentary commissioners in Ulster, where the large Scottish population was hostile to the Republic. The Scots were "more or less perverse according to the temper of their respective ministers," reported the commissioners, who accordingly proposed a scheme of transplantation, by which the Ulster Scots would be removed to some other part of Ireland.[29] Although welcomed by the government, the idea was eventually abandoned when the Scots proved willing to give security for their peaceable behaviour. The plan was, however, the origin of the transplantation of the Irish which the Puritans later pursued with such drastic consequences. The Cromwellian settlement of Ireland more than fulfilled his demands for severity, and by 1654 a note of remorse appears in Allen's correspondence: "Pray for us, that now we come to possess houses we have not built, and vineyards

we have not planted, we may not now forget the Lord and his goodness to us."[30]

Allen was married to Elizabeth Huish, daughter of a Devonshire man. She brought her family to Ireland in 1651.[31] Her sister married Quartermaster-General John Vernon, and the two brothers-in-law were much in each other's company.[32] All were ardent members of the Baptist congregation at Waterford, under Thomas Patient, and Allen's outlook from about 1651 was dominated by the principles of the group which he now embraced. An incident in which he was involved illustrates significantly the religious divisions among the Puritans. In 1651 the Council of State sent over John Rogers, an Independent preacher, appointed to the pulpit in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin. The congregation included a number of Baptists against whose tenets Rogers pronounced strongly. News of this came to Waterford, and Patient and his followers determined to rebuke the Baptists at Dublin for backsliding. Allen and Vernon carried their message:

> We hear you do not walk orderly together, but are joined in fellowship with such as do fundamentally differ in judgment and practice, to wit, such as agree not with you about the true state of a visible church, nor the fundamental ordinances thereof . . . The end of church fellowship is the observation of all Christ's commands, but this your practice crosseth in that you agree to walk with such as have not, nor practice, the Ordinance of dipping believers, and by your communion with them in church administration you are made guilty of their sin of disobedience.

Put bluntly, "the Jews," they said, "might as well had admitted uncircumcised persons to eat the Passover."[33] The upshot was a schism in the congregation at Dublin, which was eventually taken over by the Baptists, Rogers giving up his pulpit and returning to England after six months' preaching.

Another group was more obstinate. The Presbyterians in Ireland ran foul of the Commonwealthsmen for their refusal to subscribe to the Engagement. This was an oath required of all persons, to be faithful to the revolutionary government, without a king or House of Lords, and this the Presbyterians refused to swallow. They were therefore directed to send two of their number to Dublin to satisfy Fleetwood and the council of officers for their obstinacy. After some debate it was urged that if ministers expected protection from the state they should be willing to promise fidelity. One of the Presbyterians replied that this might be true for those who refused the Engagement out of worldly and political considerations, but that the Presbyterians refused "merely in con-

science," and that as they were numerically inconsiderable the government should not insist. To this Allen objected, "Papists would and might say as much for themselves, and pretend conscience as well as they." The reply was a non-sequitur, but nonetheless crushing in a group which included a number who had acquiesced in the events of 1649: Papists could kill Protestant kings but Presbyterians not. The effect was "a great silence." Eventually the officers abandoned the attempt to enforce the Engagement, especially after Cromwell's coup in 1653.[34]

The Presbyterian who described this incident complained that "the Anabaptist faction carried most sway." The influence which Allen and his co-religionists exerted in Ireland was certainly strong. Politically it verged on extreme republicanism, and explains the dismay with which they viewed Cromwell's assumption of the Protectorate. Looking back on this event some years later Allen was convinced that it constituted a fatal lapse on the part of the army. In the civil war God was with them, their enemies fled. Then in 1647 they faltered: instead of trusting in the Lord they yielded to human motives, particularly in their negotiations with the king. These led into labyrinths, "out of which nothing but the wisdom of the Lord directing to seeking him, and consulting your duty according to His Word could extricate you." Resort to prayer brought them back to the path, and from 1648 to 1653 the army was led by the Lord. The dissolution of the Rump was justified, because the members were "men not spirited for the further work of the Lord in that day." The Nominated (Barebones) Parliament, by "discouraging the bad, countenancing the good, attempting to break and remove oppressive yoaks, and to assert the liberty of the poor people of the Lord, as well as others," prosecuted the true ends of government better than any parliament before or since. In establishing the Protector, however, the army raised up a king, in nature if not in name, imposed the Instrument of Government on the nation, and imprisoned those who dissented[35]

This was Allen's later view. In 1654 he was less outspoken, and attempted to persuade Cromwell of the Baptists' loyalty. Protesting against rumours of their disaffection he wrote:

> Wee can noe sooner Speak (though in never so peaceable and Christian a way) of these things but we are in England Judged Enemies to the government, ready to rise, nay, up in Arms against it, and what not. Oh my Lord, have you knowne us soe long and yet suspect us soe soone; have we been adictted to such things as these? . . . If God bring you a day of distresse when freinds may best be knowne, you will find most of those that have been tearmed the most dissatisfied

> one here stand by you and your authority . . . and in the mean time, though you may not find them with the multitude shouting you up in your titles in the streets, yet will I trust be found Supplicating at the throne of grace for that wisdom for you from above which is first pure and then peacible.[36]

To a private correspondent, however, Allen expressed serious misgivings. "As to the person in chief place, I confess I love and honour him, for the honour God hath put upon him, and I trust will yet continue; I mean that of uprightheartedness to the Lord, though this last change with his [its?] attendancies hath more stumbled me than ever any did; and I still have many thoughts of heart concerning it."[37] To another friend, who had recently resigned his commission, Allen expressed sympathy but explained that "though things are not as I wish they were, yet I do not judge that a call to leave a station in which I am by providence set."[38]

Certainly there is no evidence that the Baptists in Ireland were prepared to rise against the Protector. They had had blood and war enough, wrote Allen.[39] Yet they could not acquiesce in setting up a new monarchy without the consent of the people, and Allen's stern conscience demanded an accounting. Toward the end of 1654 he returned to England and sought and interview with the Protector himself. Cromwell heard a frank expression of Allen's dissatisfaction, and the two parted "in a huffe," Allen going down to the West Country to his wife's family. Here he threw himself into activity with the Baptists, at whose meetings he was said to have criticized the government roundly. "All the country rings of his dissatisfaction," wrote an informant.[40]

The time was critical. Knowledge of Royalist, Leveller, and Fifth-Monarchy plots made imperative the crushing of disaffection in the army. Cromwell was actively purging all officers whose loyalty was suspect, and could hardly tolerate public criticism such as Allen indulged in. Accordingly Allen was put under confinement in his father-in-law's house at Sand, in Devon. It is noteworthy, however, that the most searching inquiries failed to reveal evidence of treasonable activities on Allen's part. The worst that could be discovered was that he had highly commended the Republican Ludlow, and that he had declared that Cromwell might have ruled in the interest of honest men without taking so much power to himself. A letter from Cromwell, justifying his action, provoked a sweeping denial by Allen, who went on to reproach the Protector for his own backsliding. "What my esteem hath been of you in some vertical forsaking days I believe you can remember; and I can truly say, if I have erred, it hath been, I fear, in esteeming too highly of you." This was an ill reward for thirteen years' faithful service. "The Lord grant you may find more

mercy from him in the great day, than I have had from you in this."[41]

Allen found a defender in Charles Fleetwood, Lord Deputy of Ireland, who was well known for his conciliatory outlook, and who wrote urging Allen's release, he having promised not to act against the government.[42] Accordingly, about the spring of 1655, Allen came out of confinement and removed to London.

From the capital Allen maintaintd a busy correspondence with Ireland which brought him into disrepute with Henry Cromwell, Fleetwood's successor as Lord Deputy. Since Allen was "representing things in the worst sense," the Deputy urged that he be sent back to Ireland, where he was returned in October, 1655, after making a promise of fidelity to the Protectorate.[43] Almost immediately fresh accusations of sedition were brought against him. Allen's presence, wrote one of Thurloe's correspondents from Dublin, was responsible for "divers unfit speeches and practices,"[44] and even at the funeral sermon preached for Allen's wife the Baptists were full of their persecution.[45] Henry Cromwell reported that Allen was not apt to forgive nor forget injuries. He went on to complain that Vernon, his brother-in-law, at a morning lecture in December, 1655, castigated the Deputy, preaching "that it was a great judgement for the people of God to be under young or wicked governors," who were apt to believe lies against the poor saints. Though their rulers pretended to be for the lambs of Jesus, "yet it as as Pharaoh was for Joseph, and as Herod for John Baptist, only to serve their ends upon them."[46] Not until the two brothers were "well disposed of," wrote the Deputy, was there hope of quietness.[47]

Matters came to a head in December 1656, when Vernon, Allen, and two other Baptist officers resigned their commissions. Not having been employed lately, they told the Deputy, they could no longer conscientiously accept their pay. At a subsequent meeting, "subtle and grave Mr. Allen brought up the rear, and was more ingenuous than the rest in declaring that the ground of his dissatisfaction took its rise from the first change of the government [Cromwell's dissolution of the Rump], forseeing that they should be no way able to answer the end for which they first engaged; and being now more fully convinced of it, and looking upon himself as formerly discharged by his highness, he thought it best for him to draw to a more retired condition." Henry Cromwell accepted their resignations, and on the whole subsequent events justified his satisfaction that there was little to fear from the Baptists henceforth.[48] Their resignations did the officers credit, and seem amply to confirm that they had no intention of plotting against the government. Had they been conspirators it is unlikely that they would have left the comparative security of their military posts.

In the spring of 1657, when the Parliament's offer of the kingship to Cromwell was in the air, there appeared the famous pamphlet *Killing No Murder,* showing the lawfulness of assassinating the Protector, to whom the pamphlet was ironically dedicated. Although Silius Titus lent stylistic help, in the main the piece was the work of Edward Sexby, who, as an agitator in 1647, had stood before the bar of the Commons with William Allen, and who was now the recognized leader of the Levellers. He placed Allen's name on the title-page, and forty years later the story was told that Oliver sent for Allen and asked him if he was the author. "Allen desired to see the booke, which Oliver lent him to read; and then Allen told him, that he knew well enough that he had not the capacity enough to be the author; but that if he had been able to have writ it, he would with all his heart have done it."[49] Before long Sexby was captured and confessed to the authorship, but the government continued to keep Allen under surveillance, intercepted his correspondence, and maintained spies among the Baptist groups which he and Vernon visited. The two brothers-in-law were busily engaged in the south-west, where, about this time, they founded a Baptist church at Dalwood.[50] In 1658 they issued a strange tract which well exemplifies the Baptist spirit. *The Captive taken from the Strong* was an account of the conversion of their sister-in-law, Deborah Huish, whose soul-sufferings and spiritual torments had after fourteen years been set at rest by an inward awakening. Allen apologized for the "homely dress" of the pamphlet, thinking "its own natural simple attire would best become it." Yet with all its crudities, the work has an air of conviction not unworthy of Bunyan himself.[51]

In May 1658, Allen and Vernon attended a general meeting of Baptists at Dorchester, where there was a great debate about the state of the church, and where the leaders also discussed privately the prospect of union with the Fifth-Monarchy party.[52] The decision was put off, but Oliver's death (September 3rd, 1658) aroused new apprehensions in the government. An officer whom Thurloe had detailed to spy on Allen and Vernon wrote, "there was never more necessity to watch them than at this ticklish posture of affaires . . . The contrariety they possesse against his highnesse's interest ingageth me to mind his late highnesse and your commands. I have, I hope, already indifferent good spies among them . . . Certainly they are persons of as much venome and revenge as any whatsoever, and will not spare to adventure on anything, that may give them the least hope of sucesse."[53]

It is certainly difficult to reconcile these charges with the other evidence relating to Allen's conduct, although the breaches which now existed between old comrades of the civil war are amply illustrated. It was at this juncture that Allen published his *Memorial*

of the meeting of officers at Windsor in 1648. As regards the present crisis, this was harmless enough, for Allen's remedy for the divisions of the nation was to seek the will of the Lord in prayer, as they had done a decade earlier. But it was damning that he should have spoken of a revival of "the old dying cause," which implied a restitution of the rule of the saints disturbed in 1653.[54]

For a short time his hopes were realized. The dissolution of Richard Cromwell's Parliament (April 22nd, 1659) was followed by the recall of the republican Rump. Much to the disgust of the officers, the Rump restored a number of Baptists to the army, including Allen, who was given command of a regiment of horse in Ireland.[55] Rather than join them, however, Allen remained in England and engaged in writing and politics.

The confusion following the fall of the Protectorate was the heyday of the constitution-framers, and Allen was no exception. With nineteen other Baptists, Fifth-Monarchists, and Levellers he issued *An Essay toward Settlement upon a Sure Foundation,* denouncing government by a single person, urging the removal of tithes, and demanding liberty of conscience.[56] Like other constitutional schemes of that season this came to nothing. Allen's own momentary eminence ended in January 1660, when General Monck wrote to the Speaker, deploring his recent appointment in Ireland, and styling him "noe good friend of yours." He was accordingly, removed from his command.[57] The Long Parliament's dissolution (March 16th, 1660) and the plans for a general election foreshadowed new divisions, and Allen made his last plea for a republic of saints. In *A Word to the Army, touching their Sin and Duty* he implicitly recognized the army as one of the estates of the nation. To reveal to the officers and the rank and file how they had strayed from the path of righteousness would make possible "their recovery to that path of unfeigned repentence." Adopting a historical treatment, he showed how the army had prospered so long as they had asserted God's design by the gradual exaltation of the Lord Jesus. The death of Oliver, he wrote, should have led them to consider well their errors and their next steps, but they set up another Protector, deposed him, then called the Rump back into existence, which in turn had now dissolved itself. While these crimes were planned by the commanders, the soldiers had a share in the sin, having executed the will of their officers and having concurred in the Protectorate, in violation of earlier declarations against government by a single person. The only remedy was to acknowledge Jesus as king and saviour, and to seek the Lord: "Yea, this were the way to lay such a Magna Charta as would stand more sure against alterations than any you can lay."

In all this, like many another adherent of "the good old cause,"

Allen deified an earlier age and lost sight of reality "in a web of fantasy spun from the apocalyptic visions and violent history of an earlier chosen people."[58] His pamphlet was too much for the Council of State, already jeopardized by the recent mutiny under Lambert, and in April, 1660, Allen was committed to confinement in Lambeth House for endeavouring to debauch the soldiers from their obedience.[59] He was still in custody of the sergeant-at-arms of the Commons in September, and in prison in December, being then described with his fellows as "very hearty and . . . takeing a great deale of joy in their affliction."[60] Possibly he enjoyed a short period of freedom, but a "Will. Allen" was taken prisoner in the general seizure of Anabaptists and "fanatics" in January, 1661, after the Fifth-Monarchy rising under Thomas Venner.[61] The Baptists denied any share in Venner's plot, and Allen was probably released, for in April, 1661 the former Adjutant-General was again ordered to be apprehended, and was lodged in the Gatehouse, where on June 19th his and Vernon's release was finally ordered, they giving security of £1,000 to leave the kingdom within fifteen days.[62] Whether they complied is not known, and the brothers-in-law almost disappear from the records henceforth. The last mention occurs in 1667, when Allen and several others contributed to an elegy on Vernon, who died on May 29th of that year.[63]

Thus, like so many who had been thrust to the forefront, Allen was swallowed by obscurity. The vision of the millenium which he and so many of his fellows entertained was consigned to oblivion. Yet he grasped that government must ultimately rest on the consent of the people and that toleration must ultimately prevail. He deserves remembrance as a zealot who defied the most powerful ruler of the age, and whose religious fervour was guarantee of the survival of dissent in the more hostile atmosphere of the Restoration.

[1] *The Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth, I (1891), pp. 430-431.

[2] G. Davies, "The Parliamentary Army under the Earl of Essex, 1642-5," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XLIX (1934), pp. 37, 54.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[4] The letter is printed in *A Declaration of the Engagements, Remonstrances, Representations, Proposals, Desires and Resolutions from His Excellency Sir Tho: Fairfax, and the Generall Councel of the Army* (London, 1647), p. 9, and in Henry Cary, *Memorials of the Great Civil War* (London, 1842), I, pp. 201-5. I quote from the version printed by William Prynne, *The hypocrites vnmasking* (London, 1647).

[5] Prynn, *The hypocrites vnmasking*, p. 4.

[6] John Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, VII (London, 1701), pp. 474-475.

[7] *Memoirs of Denzil, Lord Holles* (London, 1699), pp. 89-90.

[8] *Clarke Paper,* I, pp. 87-88.

[9] Rushworth, *Historical Collections,* VII, p. 498.

[10] William Haller and Godfrev Davies, eds., *The Leveller Tracts, 1647-1653* (New York, 1944), pp. 51-63.

[11] *A Declaration from the Agitators* (1647), quoted in Sir James Berry and Stephen G. Lee, *A Cromwellian Major General: The Career of Colonel James Berry* (Oxford, 1938), pp. 42-44.

[12] *Ibid.,* pp. 35-38.

[13] *Clarke Papers,* I, pp. 180-181.

[14] *Ibid.,* pp. 189-190.

[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 193-194, 199-201.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 213.

[17] *The Humble Address of the Agitators of the Army to his Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax* [14 Aug., 1647] (London, 1647).

[18] A. S. P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty* (London, 1938), p. 442; Haller and Davies, *The Leveller Tracts,* p. 68; *Clarke Papers,* I, xlvii; Don M. Wolfe, *Leveller Manifestos of the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1944), p. 42.

[19] Sir Charles Firth and Godfrey Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army* (Oxford, 1940), II, p. 614.

[20] *Clarke Papers,* II, p. 247.

[21] Firth and Davies, *Regimental History,* II, pp. 457-458.

[22] *Clarke Papers,* II, p. 247.

[23] *A faithful memorial of that remarkable meeting ... at Windsor Castle* (London, 1659), in *Somers Tracts,* VI (London, 1811), pp. 498-504. Allen was in some sort of attendance on the king during his last months of captivity, and carried to Bishop Juxon the king's request that he should wait on him after he had been sentenced (*William Lilly's History of his Life and Times* (London, 1822), pp. 144-145; *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow,* ed. C. H. Firth [Oxford, 1894], I, p. 218).

[24] I infer that he was on Cromwell's staff during the Irish campaign, because when Cromwell left Ireland in May, 1650 Lord Broghill announced he would obey no one but Ireton and Allen (Richard Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts and during the Interregnum,* II [London, 1909], 267).

[25] James Caulfield, ed., *Cromwelliana* (Westminster, 1810), p. 102; *Memoirs of Ludlow,* I, p. 290.

[26] Negotiations for the surrender of Limerick (John T. Gilbert, A *Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652* [Dublin, 1879-1880], III, pt. ii, pp. 243-244); agreement with the Irish brigade in Tipperary and Waterford (*ibid.,* pp. 296, 299); Kilkenny (*Memoirs of Ludlow,* I, p. 315; Robert Dunlop, ed., *Ireland under the Commonwealth* [Manchester, 1913], I, pp. 185-186, 201, 202; Gilbert, *Contemporary History,* III, pt. i, p. 94); surrender of Viscount Muskerry in Munster (Dunlop, *Ireland under the Commonwealth,* I, pp. 224, 228). In July, 1652 the officers in Ireland employed Allen, with Colonel John Hewson, to carry a message to the Council in State, requesting "that a competent maintenance might be speedily provided for maimed soldiers and the widows and orphans of those who died in the service of Ireland" (*Memoirs of Ludlow,* I, p. 528; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series,* 1651-52 [London, 1878], p. 347; *Commons Journals,* VII [n.p., n.d.], pp. 162-163).

[27] Ireton, Allen, and others to Cromwell, 10th July, 1651, pr. in John

Nickolls, *Original Letters and Papers of State addressed to Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1743), pp. 72-74.

[28] *Memoirs of Ludlow,* I, pp. 512-513.

[29] Dunlop, *Ireland under the Commonwealth,* II, pp. 329-332.

[30] *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe,* ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), II, p. 215.

[31] A. H. A. Hamilton, *Quarter Sessions from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne* (London, 1878), p. 160; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series,* 1651 (London, 1877), p. 554.

[32] Another connection in Irish official circles was James Standish, Receiver-General of Ireland, whom Allen addressed in correspondence as "uncle."

[33] St. John D. Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland* (1647-1661) (Oxford, 1921), pp. 23-24; Edward Rogers, *Some Account of the Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy Man . . . John Rogers* (London, 1867), p. 29. Under Fleetwood's government Allen and Vernon were members of a committee to achieve "the effectual preaching of the Gospel in Ireland, but efforts to attract preachers were unsuccessful" (Seymour, *Puritans in Ireland,* p. 61).

[34] Patrick Adair, *A True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland,* ed. W. D. Killen (Belfast, 1866), pp. 195-196.

[35] *A Word to the Army, touching their Sin and Dutie . . . by William Allen . . . an unfeigned seeker of their souls welfare* (London, 1660).

[36] Louise Fargo Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth-Monarchy Men* (Washington, 1912), pp. 142-143, quoting British Museum Harleian MS. 4106, f. 226.

[37] *Thurloe State Papers,* II, pp. 214-215.

[38] *Ibid.,* p. 215.

[39] *Analecta Hibernica,* No. 1 (March, 1930), p. 18.

[40] *Thurloe State Papers,* III, pp. 140, 143; W. C. Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937-47), III, p. 45. That Allen seemed to go about in disguise aggravated his offence.

[41] *Thurloe State Papers,* III, pp. 140-141.

[42] *Ibid.,* pp. 183, 246.

[43] *Ibid.,* p. 744; IV, pp. 55, 108.

[44] *Ibid.,* IV, pp. 192, 197.

[45] *Ibid.,* pp. 327-328.

[46] *Ibid.,* p. 328. In the same year the father-in-law of Allen and Vernon was committed to the Devonshire assizes for saying that the Protector was a rogue (Hamilton, *Quarter Sessions from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne,* p. 160).

[47] *Thurloe State Papers,* IV, p. 433.

[48] *Ibid.,* V, pp. 670-672, 729. Allen and Vernon continued to hold meetings in Dublin (*ibid.,* VI, pp. 222-223).

[49] C. H. Firth, *The Last Years of the Protectorate* (London, 1909-1910), I, pp. 229-230.

[50] A. C. Underwood, *A History of the British Baptists* (London, 1947), p. 74.

[51] *The Captive Taken from the Strong* (London, 1658).

[52] *Thurloe State Papers,* VII, pp. 138-140; Brown, *Baptists and Fifth-Monarchy Men,* pp. 132-133.

[53] *Thurloe State Papers,* VII, p. 385.

[54] *Somers Tracts.* VI, pp. 498-504.

[55] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series,* 1659-1660 (1886), p. 13; Godfrey Davies, *The Restoration of Charles II* (San Marino, California, 1955), p. 245.

[56] Brown, *Baptists and Fifth-Monarchy Men,* p. 189 cf. H. G. Tibbutt, *Colonel John Okey, 1606-1662* (Bedfordshire Hist. Rec. Soc., 1955), p. 98.

[57] *Clarke Papers,* IV, p. 252; Firth and Davies, *Regimental History of Cromwell's Army,* II, pp. 594, 613-614.

[58] A. H. Woolrych, "The Good Old Cause and the Fall of the Protectorate," *Camb. Hist. Jour.,* XIII (1957), p. 160.

[59] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series,* 1659-60, p. 573.

[60] Berry and Lee, *A Cromwellian Major General,* p. 262.

[61] *London's Glory, or the Riot and Ruine of the Fifth-Monarchy Men* (London, 1661).

[62] Berry and Lee, pp. 262-263; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series,* 1661-62 (1861), p. 12.

[63] *Bochim. Sighs poured out by some troubled Hearts* (n.p., n.d.).

P. H. HARDACRE

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

P. H. HARDACRE
Professor of History, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

BASIL S. BROWN
Professor, Victoria, Australia.

N. CLARK
Minister, Amersham, Bucks.

ROBERT BROWN
Minister, Hearsall, Coventry.

Reviews by: J. F. CARRINGTON, A. GILMORE, N. S. MOON, G. W. RUSLING.

The Australian Japanese Mission

Australian Baptists have always been keenly interested in missionary work overseas. At the beginning they sent gifts to London for the Baptist Missionary Society in days when, crippled by heavy chapel debts and unable to make the most of the many opportunities of their own home mission, they seemed least able to afford it. Before long there was a demand that they themselves should engage in a mission to the heathen.

One notable attempt to do this was made in the seventies of the last century.[1] A young Baptist pastor, Mr. William Hack, who had pioneered work at Hilton in South Australia,[2] felt a strong call to missionary service. He applied in 1870 to the South Australian Baptist Missionary Society for service in Faridpur. Here the South Australians were supporting native workers engaged by Baptist Missionary Society agents stationed at Dacca. Hack was rejected on the grounds of ill-health. Undeterred he made two further applications to the Society in the following years, but his offers of service were declined.

In the meantime his interests were attracted towards Japan, a mission field now opening after the favourable treaties between this country and some of the Western Powers in 1858. Hack now made a new approach to the committee of the South Australian Baptist Missionary Society, seeking support for a mission to Japan which he personally would undertake. He suggested that the committee give priority to Faridpur " and *afterwards* to give Japan what was left of their funds." No work could be sustained in such a fashion, so that the committee had little choice but to decline his undertaking.

The intrepid enthusiast now sought the aid of private persons. While some strongly opposed his venture, others rallied to his support, so that within a few weeks the sum of £350 had been subscribed. Encouraged by these gifts, Hack, his wife and three small sons, Miss Stonehouse (his wife's sister), Mr. and Mrs. Clode, Mr. Baley and a children's nurse left Australia in November, 1873 for the Land of the Rising Sun.

The party disembarked at Nagasaki on January 12, 1874. Hack rented a house previously used as a printing office. Clode, who had some experience in the printing trade, had speculated on the journey over whether this might be useful in Japan. The answer to these questionings came when, a few weeks after the arrival, the plant was offered to the missionaries. Gifts from Australia at this

juncture made purchase possible. The group engaged in job-printing and produced a secular paper named "The Rising Sun" in order to support themselves in their labours. The proceeds were small, but the party persisted in their mission, determined that their printing house should be primarily a mission press. They issued tracts in English for seamen visiting their port, and others in Japanese "consisting of the Lord's Prayer, 24th Psalm, 67th Psalm, and one on Miracles." It soon became evident that the poverty-stricken Japanese could not afford to buy such literature. To be effective, tracts had to be distributed free of cost. ". . . many times," wrote Hack, "I have been nearly dragged to the ground by eager hands stretched out to receive the 'crumbs' of eternal life and truth which I had to distribute in the shape of tracts." Thus began the ministry of what Hack claimed to be the first mission press Japan had known.

Soon after arrival, a large room in the house was opened for preaching. The missionaries were disappointed when few Japanese could be induced to attend the services held there. However, seamen from British and American vessels in port came in encouraging numbers. In addition to these services at the mission house, the missionary band visited the sailors on their ships, holding meetings on board whenever opportunities presented themselves. Hospital visitation also became a fruitful avenue of service. In all this work they sought to distribute the tracts they were producing. They were overjoyed by conversions among the sailors.

They were rewarded when on September 27, 1874 they were joined in their mission by one of the seamen. Mr. John D. Clark was a Christian of some standing and came to them highly commended by his superior officer, Commander Bax of H.M.S. Dwarf. He was appointed to assist Mr. Clode at the mission press.

In the meantime, Hack, leaving control of the press in Clode's hands, secured a position as teacher of English at Hiroshima in order to provide support for himself and his family. Hiroshima then had a population of 100,000, and was the centre of a great agricultural district. Hack took with him a Japanese servant who had a fair grasp of English to act as interpreter. About a month after arrival, he opened his house for preaching. In contrast to the former experience at Nagasaki, the response of the Japanese here was good. Hack worked through his interpreter. His own efforts to communicate with the Japanese through a Romanized version of the Fourth Gospel were far from satisfactory "as the quaint pronunciation of different words would raise a smile and often a laugh." But the discussions which he encouraged at these meetings gave promise of success, even though Hack found it all but impossible to communicate clearly the truths he was seeking to present in a language he himself could not speak. However, he believed

that some good was being done. Seed was sown and appeared to be taking root.

A further step was taken in September, 1874 when Hack secured the services of a more proficient interpreter, a Japanese gentleman named Minoi. A month later Mr. Yuba, the former interpreter who had accompanied Hack from Nagasaki, declared his intention of becoming a Christian. As he was about to go to Tokio, arrangements were speedily made for his baptism. Then on the day determined upon, Sunday, October 10, Hack's eldest child died after a brief illness. Though deeply distressed, Hack baptized his first convert a few hours later.

Such courageous witness for Christ made a deep impression upon the Japanese. Almost immediately, one of Hack's servants named Shimpe declared himself a follower of Christ. Early in November a Buddhist priest named Hirota came begging instruction in the Christian faith. He had previously been under Christian influence at Osaka, and little instruction was required to lead him to a commitment to Jesus Christ. Thereupon he declared his determination to preach Christ everwhere. Hack allowed him to preach on the following Sunday and was greatly impressed both by his eloquence and by the content of his message which was related to him afterwards by his interpreter. Subsequently Minjoi the interpreter, Hirota and Shimpe were baptized, and a church constituted on November 26, 1874. This appears to have been the first church in Japan outside an open port.

Hack now judged the time ripe to transfer the leadership of the preaching services to the Japanese. As a result of this step, the number of the inquirers increased rapidly. Hirota proved to be a most energetic worker. Three baptismal services were held in December, and by the end of January, 1875, the native membership of the Hiroshima Baptist Church had increased to fifteen.

The missionaries were convinced that for the continued success of their venture, more adequate backing was needed. In the proper sense of the word they were not "missionaries," for nobody sent them. They were dependent for financial support upon the gifts of a few interested people. In order to put the mission on a better footing, Hack left the field and made his way to Britain where he spent some time in the years 1875 and 1876. Wherever he told his story, his enthusiasm won subscribers to his cause.

Unfortunately Hack soon became seriously ill, doubtless as a result of his labours in Japan and of that weakness that had hindered him from becoming the first Australian Baptist missionary in India. Hence he was at length forced to return to Japan with the extensive deputation programme he had planned largely unachieved. During an absence of eighteen months, only £1,530 : 10 : 3 had been received by the mission, of which

£702 : 15 : 3 was raised in England, and the remainder in Australia. Hack had been able to remit only £990 of this to the field.[3]

When reports of what had been achieved in Japan reached Australia through English religious periodicals, the work caught the imagination of the Baptists. Churches pledged support to the mission and contributions were made by Sunday Schools.[4] The Melbourne Baptist Ministers' Fraternal meeting in September, 1876 brought a recommendation to the annual meetings of the Baptist Association of Victoria held two months later

> "that the Baptist Foreign Missionary Society[5] be requested to take over the Mymensing Mission Station so that the Victorian churches may unite their efforts on the Japan Mission; and that should the society consent to this, steps be taken by this association to secure joint action on the part of our churches in the various Australian colonies for the purpose of forming and sustaining an Australasian Baptist Mission for Japan."[6]

The resolution was received by the Association, and remitted to its Executive Committee for further consideration before being implemented. Information was sought from South Australia.[7] Had the action suggested been taken, the whole course of Australian Baptist missionary endeavour would have been changed. Japan, instead of East Bengal, India, would have become its field.

But just when Australian Baptists had become aware of his mission, Hack was making his way back to Japan, where he discovered that the affairs of the Australian Japanese Mission were in a distressing state. During his absence dissension had arisen between the brethren labouring at Nagasaki and, without sufficient aid from outside, they were faced with dire poverty. At the same time the native church at Hiroshima was in confusion. Many of the members were scattered, and the pastor had been compelled to enter secular employment in order to live.

In such circumstances Hack found it necessary to wind up the work. He returned to Australia heavily in debt, possibly at the beginning of 1877.

The Australian Japanese Mission had failed. The reasons for this failure are not difficult to discover. The mission itself was an enthusiastic venture without the backing of the churches. The long absence of its leader from the field led to a slackening of control with consequent dissension among the mission staff. Responsibility was given into the hands of native leaders before they were ready to assume it. Converts received inadequate instruction before baptism. Had the work continued a little longer, it is possible that the Australian churches may have accepted the responsibility for it, and have been aided by English Baptists.

The venture should not be forgotten, for it is an illustration of early Australian Baptist missionary enterprise. The story is in truth a preliminary chapter in the record of the Australian Baptist Missionary Society which today labours in India, Pakistan, New Guinea and the Netherlands New Guinea.

NOTES

[1] The story is told in an account written by Hack published in *The Baptist Magazine,* LXVIII (January, 1876), pp. 22ff.

[2] H. Estcourt Hughes, *The Story of Our First Hundred Years. The Baptist Church of South Australia* (1937), p. 103.

[3] Letter in *The English Freeman* of May 25th, 1877. Reprinted in *The Victorian Freeman,* I. 9 (August, 1877), p. 139.

[4] E.g. the Sunday School of the Fenwick Street, Geelong (Victoria) Baptist Church reported that it was making monthly missionary collections, part of which was devoted to the Japanese Mission. *The Victorian Freeman,* I. 5 (April, 1877), p. 78.

[5] i.e. the Baptist Missionary Society. Victorian Baptists were supporting native evangelists in the Mymensingh district employed as helpers of Rev. R. Bion, a B.M.S. missionary.

[6] Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Session of the Baptist Association of Victoria, held on November, 6th, 7th and 8th, 1876.

[7] Baptist Association of Victoria, Executive Committee Minutes, November 27th, 1876.

[8] *The Victorian Freeman,* I. 9 (August, 1877), p. 139.

BASIL S. BROWN.

In The Study

THE problem of biblical interpretation is still far from being solved. It is true that we can handle Scripture with far more confidence than was the case even twenty years ago. It is equally true that the overwhelming majority of the books that claim to show us how to understand and use the Bible attain what clarity and assurance they possess only by ignoring or submerging some basic unresolved issues. For this reason a book[1] that shows awareness of our real predicament and which attempts to expose the skeletons and wrestle honestly with the serious dilemmas must be of more than usual interest.

What is the relation between exegesis and exposition? What is to be our theory of hermeneutics? What is the nature of the unity of Scripture, and wherein does it consist? Is there a rightful use of typology, allegory, analogy? Is it meaningful to talk of the inspiration of the Bible? In what terms is the authority of Scripture to be understood? Where is "biblical theology" going, and where ought it to be going? These are the questions that preoccupy Dr. Smart and which lead him to pay considerable attention to the work of Bultmann and of Barth. What we are given is not a systematic thesis that moves methodically from a stated opening via an ordered path to a rounded conclusion. It is rather a sustained attack from many directions upon a most elusive target.

So it is that a large proportion of this enquiry is devoted to presentation and criticism of the views of twentieth-century scholars. This is ably and perceptively done. Implicit assumptions are revealed for what they are; and current dogmatisms wither under the icy blast of a relentless analytical gale. The result is a real shaking of the foundations—the essential preliminary to a firmer building and a more adequate construction. But that we still await. For Dr. Smart deals not in solutions but in prolegmena. This is partly strength, partly weakness It is strength in so far as it is a reflection of the true understanding that the Bible controls us, not we the Bible. It is weakness in so far as it reflects the confused situation within which the Church still stands. For the problem, though it must constantly be referred back to the theologian, in fact comes

[1] *The Interpretation of Scripture,* by J. D. Smart. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 35s. 1961.

alive most vividly for him who proclaims the Word of God. This study is rightly placed by its publishers in The Preacher's Library. It is a book for the working minister who seeks by learning from the past and understanding the present to fulfil his calling more faithfully and truly in the coming days.

Such a minister will do far worse than turn at once to a recent translation of a commentary on the Book of Genesis.[2] Seldom has there been a finer example of what a twentieth-century commentary should be. Literary criticism has ploughed this piece of biblical soil to pieces; and many, despising the barren inheritance and reacting against the tools that despoiled it, have turned with mingled relief and hope to what seemed more fascinating and sophisticated ways. But von Rad is wiser. He knows his debt to the Graf-Wellhausen labours, and delicately and discerningly he makes use of what has already been provided. Similarly he is discriminating debtor to Gunkel and the form critical harvest, and even more obviously to the historical perspective associated with Alt and Noth. Creatively he presses all these insights into service. He grapples closely with the text but never loses sight of the wider horizons. He acknowledges the aetiological motif but carefully refrains from riding it to death. He reckons with layers of tradition but ever seeks to make room for the final word that Scripture would speak. He is concerned not with the making of contemporary applications, but with the unfolding of Genesis' own living message.

The introductory section is short but valuable. The hermeneutical question is finely discussed in terms of the true definition of saga and the allied problem of historicity, and the distinctive emphases of the narrative sources, J, E, and P are delineated. But von Rad is at his best in his preoccupation with the credal basis of the Hexateuch and supreme artistry of the Yahwist in his handling of the primitive crede. Upon the basis of the old cultic confession—the plan of sacred history from patriarchs to conquest—and by the incorporation of diverse traditions (whether of Sinai, of the patriarchal period, or of primaeval history), he forged a unified presentation of tremendous and enduring power. To understand Genesis involves a primary appreciation of the strange genius we call the Yahwistic narrator. Von Rad's contribution at this point cannot be overemphasised.

The exposition which occupies the remainder of this volume is, in the best sense, theological commentary. Seldom have I received a stronger impression of being confronted at every point with exegesis rather than eisegesis. It is the work of one who has listened to the text with patience and sensitivity. Perhaps the word that comes most obviously to mind is empathy. When this is combined with fine scholarship, it results in exposition that at times rises to

[2] *Genesis*, by G. von Rad. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 50s. 1961.

real heights. This book was not intended solely for the expert. It is to be hoped that its purpose will be realised, and that it will circulate widely.

It is the same kind of empathy that is required for fruitful dealing with the Scripture of the first century A.D., for the New Testament abounds in images rather than logic. Its writers are incessantly pointing towards realities that break language and defy classification. Naturally this is to us a source of exasperation. We want answers to contemporary questions, solutions to modern problems, and we fail to find them. So we force the shifting images into an alien mould. We talk of mere metaphor or, more grandly, of ontological realism. We strive to pin down the Church of God within the descriptive categories of precise ecclesiology, and we claim Scriptural sanction for our constructions. So we remain divided. It is the measure of the debt we owe to the work of the Faith and Order department of the World Council of Churches that it is from the heart of its continuing ecclesiological study and debate that there has emerged a work[3] that materially assists deliverance from our impasse. Probably it could have come from no other milieu.

Professor Minear brings under review the vast range of New Testament pictures of the Church and plots their interdependence. Minor images are not left out of account. But more considered attention is directed towards three clusters of images which point to the conception of the Church as the People of God, the New Creation, and the Fellowship of Faith. The one group relates the Church to the historical covenant community of Israel, the second sets it in its universal and cosmic context, the third points to its inner solidarity and mutuality. Thus the way is cleared for an examination of the images that cohere in the term Body of Christ, and for a final endeavour to relate the major pictures to each other by thinking them together and to draw some significant conclusions that may bear on the ecumenical predicament.

At the end we are left still posing many of the perplexing questions with which we began. The author is aware of this. He will not foreclose where the images leave open. But he will leave us with the dawning conviction that some of our questions are the wrong ones and that many of the others must be restated from a new perspective. This book may easily be underestimated because it is (like the images) suggestive rather than definitive. But this is precisely its strength. It speaks to us of the Church in her grandeur and her lowliness. More important still, it directs our eyes away from the Church herself, to her ground in the eternal life of the Triune God, to her purpose in the world of God's creation.

It is in harmony with this emphasis that we are constantly being

[3] *Images of the Church in the New Testament*, by P. S. Minear. Lutterworth Press. 30s. 1961.

reminded in our day of that New Testament commonplace that the Church exists for the world. Christian citizenship is accordingly a phrase much upon our lips. Whether this salutary preoccupation is rooted in factual knowledge and deep understanding or expressed in much relevant action is, however, a more open question. For that reason, many will feel that two significant volumes[4] now before us are long overdue. The one seeks to comprehend science and technology both in themselves and in their relation to social life. The other seeks to examine that social life in certain key areas and to relate to it the ideal of equality. Both are concerned with the consequent imperatives laid upon the Christian community in its life, task, and witness.

Dr. Cunliffe-Jones quotes all the right people. If anything this slim volume suggests overmuch a series of jottings filled out with a catena of illustrative quotations. Yet this has its advantages in that it aids the reader to follow the logical progression of what is always a close-knit argument. The comment in a field where too much Christian nonsense is solemnly and regularly presented is unusually perceptive. Rightly understood, science ministers to a concern for the truly personal. Rightly used, technology nourishes healthy social life. Dangers and abuses abound; but the way through is the way forward. Science must be thought through until its implications for mature human living shine clear. This study is most satisfying when it is exploring science at depth, least satisfactory when it attempts to plot necessary church reform in a technological society.

Dr. Cunliffe-Jones sees the relationship between the primary disciplines or departments of thought in terms of an equality (there is no one Queen of the Sciences) wherein each supplements other by contributing its own distinctive excellence Mr. Jenkins also seeks to define his ideal of equality through the category of excellence rather than that of quantity or uniformity. There is an equality of uniqueness which needs to be emphasised and given expression over against all philosophical egalitarianism. It is from this perspective that the social life of contemporary Britain must be brought under criticism and survey. But equality is a slippery concept. It is not easily patent of meaningful definition. We are not quite clear that Scripture is really at home with it—and certainly the Conservative Party is not. Indeed, this book comes out of the radical tradition and must be read in terms of it. It is none the worse for that, even if from time to time we suspect that it is really talking not about equality but about human worth and the nature of truly human community.

However this may be, Mr. Jenkins has some acid but constructive things to say, as he moves from industry to incomes, from class to

[4] *Technology, Community and Church,* by H. Cunliffe-Jones. Independent Press Ltd. 16s. 1961. *Equality and Excellence,* by Daniel Jenkins. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 21s. 1961.

education, from British society to Britain in relation to the wider world. He is good on management, not so good on trade unions; excellent on schools, awful on Oxbridge; and nowhere on ecology. But from first to last he is dealing with real issues which should be attracting a weight of Christian comment, study, and action. He has provided some basic material and much stimulating criticism. His trenchant examination is worth more than a truckload of contemporary booklets and pamphlets.

Slowly and painfully we are learning to associate worship not primarily with ritual and ceremonial but with theology and reformation. It is never easy to subject ourselves, our lives, our practices to Scripture and dogmatics; most difficult of all when they grind mercilessly upon our exposed nerve, the religious man's most vulnerable spot. There will be much travail and heartache before the cleansing and renewal are accomplished. Meanwhile, if we are wise we shall welcome all tools that sharpen our vision and enlarge our understanding, which prompt us to ask the right questions and construct at least tentative answers. We shall seek to learn again of Scripture, of tradition in its fullness, of our own past, of our separated brethren, and to add application to illumination. It is because of this that five recent studies[5] should command our attention.

What do we know of Christian corporate worship within the New Testament period, and what were the motives and comprehension that governed practice? Any answer to such problems will involve enquiry into background and origin, will demand keen attention to any linguistic material that bears on ritual, will presuppose alertness to all pointers to non-sacramental observances, as well as to baptism and the Lord's Supper. Professor Moule is aware of all this and quarries the right terrain. No better guide could be selected. For what is required here is not simply competence, but a certain sanity and sobriety, a judicious spirit, a refusal to move too quickly beyond the probabilities. It is fatally easy to make the facts support the preconceived theory, precisely because in this field the facts are so few and so malleable. But of all New Testament scholars Professor Moule is the least likely to outrun evidence, to offer the neat schemes and the inspired intuitions. He is content to confess ignorance, to leave issues open, and to follow where the signs dictate even when it means conflict with the accepted positions. The value of his essay is not that it presents much new material but that it is an eminently trustworthy chart. It asserts that "the

[5] *Worship in the New Testament,* by C. F. D. Moule. Lutterworth Press. 8s. 6d. 1961. *Christian Worship,* by T. S. Garrett. Oxford University Press. 15s. 1961. *Worship and Theology in England,* 1690-1850, by Horton Davies. Oxford University Press. 42s. 1961. *The Eucharistic and Liturgical Renewal,* ed. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. Oxford University Press. 21s. 1961. *Teach Yourself to Pray,* by S. F. Winward. The English Universities Press Ltd. 6s. 1961.

Christians of this period saw the worship of God as the whole purpose of life," and that in the New Testament "Baptism is essentially *death* and *burial*—not mere *washing*." Such dogmatic pronouncements are rare. When they are made they can be accepted.

But worship belongs to the developing community life. We are not New Testament Christians. We had best stop trying to act and live as though we ought to be. We must reckon with the inheritance of nineteen centuries of liturgical tradition, must seek to understand it, and it may be to enter into it. T. S. Garrett provides us with the summary guide, writing from within the Church of South India, and rightly and inevitably betraying his background in his emphases and his preoccupations. Baptism, ordination, and the Christian year are not outside his purview, but in the main his concern is with the eucharistic liturgy down the years. Once more we shall not find much new material, though a tremendous amount of detail is in fact presented, which includes not a little for which recourse would normally have to be made to the large technical works. The "received" position is almost always followed in matters both of history and of interpretation. But in a text-book this is an advantage, and Mr. Garrett is the essence of reliability. Occasionally he ventures a judgment which would provoke an extended debate, as when he offers defence of the treatment of Morning or Evening Prayer as a valid form of Ante-Communion. But this is a rarity in a book which supremely fulfils its purpose.

Since Mr. Garrett is basically concerned with formulated liturgy, he has little to say about the Puritans, their heirs and successors. It is just here that Dr. Horton Davies provides the extended supplement that we need, in a volume which covers the period in England from Watts and Wesley to Maurice and which will eventually form part of a comprehensive series tracing worship against the background of thelogy. This procedure is particularly helpful, for it recognizes and does justice to the extent to which Christian worship is theologically determined in every age. The author has made this field peculiarly his own, and provides some three hundred pages which are packed with a combination of source material and shrewd judgment. He discerns three main divisions: the period 1690-1740 which is marked by the dominance of rationalistic moralism and is in general a time of decline from classic Reformation positions; the period 1740-1830 which is governed by evangelicalism and the life and innovation it carried with it; the period 1830-50 which is the era of traditionalism as focused most obviously in the Oxford Movement. Illustrative plates are inserted and a generous bibliography appended. The result is a handsome volume which goes a long way towards filling a gap in available literature.

It has but one major weakness. The proper balance of the relevant material is not preserved. Quite disproportionate space is

allotted on the one hand to the preaching of Wesley and Whitefield and on the other to the teaching and beliefs of F. D. Maurice. It is not easy to avoid the conclusion that the lengthy excursus on the great Methodist figures was inserted partly because the author had the material to hand and wished to use it; and a saving of space here might have enabled us to have an extension of the final section. The complaint is not that Maurice is an unimportant figure. He is pivotal—at least from the standpoint of our own age. Nor is it to be denied that the Oxford Movement dominates the second quarter of the nineteenth century. But what we seek and what we lack is a delineation and discussion of the worship of Dissent at this point, in the context of the Tractarian renewal. It may be that this will follow in the succeeding volume, and would be regarded by Dr. Horton Davies as strictly falling beyond the confines of his present task. Nevertheless, something should have been provided at the close of this volume. For in one sense the story of Nonconformist worship at the middle of the nineteenth century is the story of reaction to the Oxford Movement. The two belong together.

This influence of the worship of the Church of England upon that of the Free Churches whether positively or negatively is one of the continuing factors in the historical scene. For this reason if for no other many will welcome any opportunity of learning what contemporary insights and emphases are abroad in the Anglican Communion. The collection of addresses delivered at a liturgical conference and edited by Massey Shepherd represents, of course, the American situation. But the liturgical revival knows no frontiers, and most of this material has its relevance to our own situation. Unity is given by a common theme, for most of the contributors are in the end concerned with "the meaning of the Eucharist in all its manifold, social, and practical implications." Free Churchmen have their own understandings which may fit somewhat uneasily into this frame of reference. But if they have something to give, they have also much to receive.

If all this leaves the simple believer somewhat bewildered and feeling the need for some clear directives, he will be able to turn with relief to S. F. Winward. This author is wisely determined to make as few assumptions as possible, to start always from first principles, to state the elementary if that is what most needs to be said. He discusses the various aspects of prayer, its private practice, its corporate background, its context which is nothing less than life itself, and by way of illustration he adds a month's diary of personal prayer for morning and evening use. The whole presentation has a concealed profundity which will ensure that it will prove itself serviceable to a wide and varied audience.

If there are weaknesses, then they emerge from the heart of those features of the work which in principle constitute its greatest strength. It has a simplicity which is in no way akin to superficial-

ity. Yet, just occasionally, the simplicity becomes a way of obscuring or bypassing the problems which are real—as in the short section on persistent petition. It has also a certain timeless quality which suggests that it could have been written at any time, at least since the Reformation; for it draws on the distilled wisdom of centuries of Christian spirituality. Yet, from time to time, this results in a lack of necessary attention to the modern scene and the contemporary situation within which *we* have to pray. I say "we." I had more accurately said "the laity." For there is just a suggestion here of the parson projecting his own experience on to his congregation, and through his own coloured spectacles subtly misinterpreting their lives. This is not basically a criticism of Mr. Winward. It is a regretful recognition of the rather obvious fact that ideally this book should have been written by a layman.

N. CLARK

Review Article

Metaphysics: Its Relevance and Restoration. Prospect for Metaphysics, Essays in Metaphysical Exploration, edited by Prof. Ian T. Ramsey (Allen and Unwin, 240 pp. 25s.).

This volume of essays seeks to probe the ground upon which a satisfactory metaphysics can be built today. Partly because of the unverifiable speculations of Hegelians and chiefly because of the widespread return to a thorough-going empiricism which such speculations prompted, metaphysics has been a virtually forbidden study in this country for the past twenty-five years. The very laudable and typically British desire to stick to facts and commonsense has meant the exclusion of anything which claimed to deal with that which is "beyond" or "other than" or "more than" sense data. Hence metaphysics has been outlawed and, of course, with it most serious philosophy of religion. And if such a metaphysical area of study as the philosophy of religion is declared to have no intelligible meaning because it has no verifiable checks, then all the systems of Christian doctrine are cut loose from any relevance to everyday life.

For some this has been no loss and Christian doctrine has been enjoyed for its own sake as a privileged area guaranteed by divine revelation, a charmed circle within which to work regardless of what unbelieving philosophers are saying. This attitude has much to commend it. It does justice to the radical distinctiveness of Christianity. The importance of Christian doctrine is very great, providing as it does an objective formulation of the Truth as it is in Christ. It preserves Christianity from vagueness and gives it a definite outline. But once doctrine is divorced from firm empirically-rooted facts it ceases to have appeal and relevance and becomes the source for hair-splitting heresy hunts. The great Reformation doctrine of Justification by Faith had the merit of being relevant to the feelings of many in the late medieval church who felt their guilt and unimportance before God. The theology of the Reformers was effective because it gave expression to Christian metaphysics at the point where the metaphysical question impinged upon ordinary people. It is therefore seriously unwise today to ignore the challenge to the very existence of metaphysics as an intellectual discipline and valid area of study.

On the other hand there are those who, having faced the problem of the challenge to metaphysical assertions decided it was

easier to yield up all claim to them. In so doing they have exchanged Christianity for a pale moralism, and now have a religion without God. It is very easy for moral activism to replace a concern for Christian doctrine, and the dividing line between Humanism and Christianity becomes very difficult to define—still more to defend. In fact this response to the contemporary challenge has produced a renewed interest in practical Christian ethics which is in itself a rebuke to the majority of Christians who are complacent about current ethical problems. But such a commendable concern must be buttressed by a clearly Theistic and Christian metaphysical system and not just a Humanistic one, a system which can give full support for a genuinely Christian contribution to moral problems. The current rapprochement between Christians and Humanists needs testing by the adequacy of the metaphysics to which each adhere.

This somewhat lengthy introduction will serve to show that the need to rehabilitate metaphysics is not simply an obscure academic question, but one which is intimately related to Christianity today. The very severe difficulties which are inherent in Christian philosophy have been brought out into the light of searching criticism and discussion during the past two decades. This has helped Christians to see more clearly what it is that they really wish to claim and to say. Any criticism rightly accepted helps to clarify one's mind upon an issue. The threat to remove the metaphysical substructure of Christianity has made Christian philosophers see more clearly just *why* they need one, and also more precisely where such metaphysics must begin. Despite all prohibitions against metaphysics there remains an uncomfortable demand within a Christian thinker to go on asking ultimate questions. The first step then towards a restoration of metaphysics is to locate the whereabouts of this demand in our experience, once this is done we have found the point at which the eternal touches the finite. This is the point at which a religious view of life is most clearly found, and where metaphysics begins. The chief single merit of this volume is that it isolates and defines this point for us in opposition to all empirical attempts to deny its existence.

The essays that form this volume were read at a conference held during Easter Week in 1959 at Downside Abbey. The twelve contributors include Roman Catholics and Protestants, moralists, Thomists, a Platonist, as well as those who derive their inspiration from more recent philosophical thought. The editor is Professor Ramsey, the Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion of Oxford. As well as contributing one of the most interesting essays in the book, Professor Ramsey also writes a most valuable introduction which ought to be read before and after reading the essays. It draws out the salient points in each essay

and serves to link together their common themes. The essays themselves are of varying interest and merit, but on the whole there is a remarkable sense of unity, a positive approach and development throughout from the first essay to the last.

The first two essays are on ethics. This subject has suffered in many ways as theology has done from the prohibition of metaphysical thinking. But at the same time it has proved more adaptable to a through-going empirical interpretation. Dr. Rees writes a specialist paper on the recent history of ethical thought. He shows the complex nature of many standard ethical concepts. His positive point is that certain moral attitudes are only intelligible in the light of certain metaphysical schemes. In other words, a metaphysical system may be presupposed by a morality, and at the same time may suggest a certain morality. In much the same way people's lives often presuppose a natural theology which in turn entails appropriate behaviour. Dr. Rees tends to become rather vague at the crucial points, a tendency to which many are prone when they leave their specific field for its implications in other spheres. Dr. A. C. Ewing writes on the autonomy of ethics, showing that one simply cannot move straight from the ethical "ought" to the Divine imperative. This is a subject for which another contributor, Professor H. D. Lewis, is also noted. Mr. J. S. Dickie makes explicit the assumption, which many of us vaguely have, that the epistemologies of both science and theology are basically the same. His study of both ancient and also modern scientific thought illustrates his point that science preserves one from ontologism, but that it does not necessarily lead to a mechanistic view of the universe.

Mr. Howard Root's essay "Metaphysics and Religious Belief" takes us an important step forward. He examines and criticises the plausible view, put forward by Alasdair MacIntyre in "Metaphysical Beliefs," that "to acquire religious belief *is* to become 'converted'." In other words, that religious belief is "sui generis," and can neither be proved nor disproved. Nothing can count against it, and no effective apologetic can be made for it. It is his kind of epistemology that lies behind much contemporary continental and American theology. Mr. Root's point is that it is a quite untrue account of how in fact people do come to belief, how people change beliefs, and sometimes give up belief. Reasons play an important part in conversions, and they are not always rationalisations. MacIntyre's central position was "the point in the world at which we worship." He did not develop this, though. The significance of Mr. Root's essay is that he shows how this is *the starting* place for reasoning and metaphysics and not a substitute for it. Any metaphysics that we do try to build, to explain this basic need to worship, must do justice both "to our desire for a

Natural Theology, and also to our religiously inspired distrust of Natural Theology."

Ninian Smart's essay "Revelation, Reason and Religion" develops the metaphysical implications of themes he has written about elsewhere. He examines the various reasons that can be given for adhering to the Christian revelation as opposed to the doctrines of other religions. This follows on well from Mr. Root's essay, for it shows that reasons for certain beliefs spring from a basic apprehension. The new point is that all religions should be brought into the area of investigation to find out the common point at which metaphysics begins amongst all religious people.

Professor Hilary Armstrong's essay on "Platonism" is disappointing, just when we would have expected a vigorous and positive contribution from this much neglected line of thought. He spends too much time on meandering attacks upon modern Thomism and its Aristotlian origins. Another disappointing essay is by Dom Mark Pontifex on "The Question of Evil." It suffers from the disease common to nearly all who try to solve this knotty problem; that is the attempt to justify and explain the ways of God. Dom Mark in effect sets himself up as God's public relations officer, when in fact no one can know why God permits evil. A common conclusion to discussions on this problem is to say that the religious person is best able to face suffering and to bear it. But this is not the answer; it ought rather to be the starting point for the answer to the problem. We cannot start from God's end; the lesson of the empirical challenge is that we must start from our end and begin by analysing the affirmations which the believer makes which enable him to overcome evil by faith. The lesson of other essays in the book is that it is the point at which we worship or have a disclosure or an intuition which is the starting point for metaphysical solutions.

Canon D. J. B. Hawkins asks the question: "Granting that we need to talk of God, what word in our language can we use significantly of Him?" He suggests (as a good Thomist) the notion of "being." "Being" is too often left today in the hands of the logician, says Dr. Hawkins, when in fact the logic of "being" is not at all the same as ontology. The trouble today is that metaphysics is fed into the mill of logic, whereas in the Middle Ages the trouble was that logic went unaltered into the realm of metaphysics. Dr. Hawkins expresses the feeling of many today when he protests against the reduction of the most fundamental experiences to so much logical data. From this point on the essays begin to expose the weakness inherent in the empiricist position and to build upon the ineradicable basis for a true metaphysics.

Dom Illtyd Trethowan makes a very penetrating and seemingly valid criticism of the first two chapters of Professor A. J. Ayer's

"The Problem of Knowledge." Ayer, like Hume in the 18th century, concludes that there is an element of doubt or uncertainty in all knowledge. It is this epistemological scepticism which forms the basis of his rejection of knowledge of the Self as more than sense data. Hence Dom Illtyd's essay is an important piece of basic criticism which needed doing before any hope of restoring metaphysics can be entertained. The chief criticism he makes is to show that Professor Ayer has falsely dissociated "having an experience from knowing that one has it." In fact we recognise that knowledge *is* experience and is therefore certain. Professor Ayer is to modern philosophers of religion what Hume was to Christians of his day. For this reason it is vital that his assumptions should be tested. Dr. C. B. Daly performs another valuable task in opposition to Professor Ayer by exposing his totally inadequate account of the "Self." As Dr. Daly rightly says, "It would seem that to exclude discussion of the Self from philosophy, is to exclude discussion of God from philosophy too." It was Hume's inability, and one which he admitted, to deal with the fact of the Self that permits penetrating criticisms of some of his views now. The same is true of Professor Ayer. Professor Ramsey draws attention as he did in his book *Religious Language* to the logical relatedness of "I" and "God." He says that an adequate metaphysics must build upon the one certain metaphysical fact, that of the Self. These points are the subject of the last three essays in the book.

In his essay "Metaphysics and the Limits of Language," Dr. Daly gives a valuable and brief survey of metaphysics in recent British philosophy. He then goes on to uncover the fact that the reduction of "I exist" by logicians to a merely indicative statement which gives no knowledge about oneself, is the cause of the contemporary ban on metaphysics. The "Self" is made into a mere logical construction out of objective sense data. Dr. Daly exposes Professor Ayer's inadequate misinterpretation of Descartes' "cogito," which is not a logical but an existential starting point. This short section of the book, pages 178-193, is invaluable and ought to be read by anyone who wishes to be an informed modern apologist. Dr. Daly fully acknowledges the importance of the theistic existentialism of Gabriel Marcel as a protest against the modern depersonalising tendencies of society, and the whole task of metaphysics is seen in this light.

The last essay is by Professor H. D. Lewis on the subject "God and Mystery." It is longer than the other chapters, and perhaps unnecessarily so. The concept of mystery as something inexplicable in all our experiences is an important one to which several recent Christian philosophers have drawn attention, notably Marcel and M. B. Foster. The chief point that Professor Lewis makes is

that this mystery is like, though not altogether the same as, the mystery involved in our knowledge of other persons. They are "other," and we have to model our understanding of them and their intentions upon our own understanding of ourselves. Similarly, the mystery which is God is one which we intuit and there is not nor can be a direct knowledge of Him. The mystery in God's case is a total one, but a total mystery offers no hold to the mind. This mystery "presents itself to us in certain circumstances and associates itself with certain other insights and experiences and makes them its own. Out of these come the content of specific beliefs, sometimes confused and distorted, and sometimes more plainly discerned."

We turn to Professor Ramsey's own essay last because it is in many ways the most interesting, comprehensive and constructive one in the volume. It is entitled "On the Possibility and Purpose of a Metaphysical Theology." Professor Ramsey knows fully what the contemporary challenge is, and what its implications are; moreover, he has an answer to it which is the product of very considerable study and reflection. His two books *Religious Language* and *Freedom and Immortality* are the application of his understanding of metaphysical theology to common problems of the philosophy of religion and Christian doctrine. It is good, therefore, to have here in a brief space his view of metaphysics and his programme for metaphysical thinking. Professor Ramsey has been subjected to criticism for his supposed over-simplification of long-standing and knotty problems. But in fact it is the clarity of view of one who has gone back to the source of the problems and solved that, only to return with a solution for problems whose insolubility has almost become an article of faith. He fully accepts the need to start with and stay with the evidence of experience; in this sense he is a true empiricist. He has made the great 18th century empiricists a source for penetrating study and found in them many insights relevant for today, notably in Bp. Berkeley.

Professor Ramsey sees metaphysics as the attempt to draw a rough but illuminating map which will unify the diversities of human experience. For example, when we see a stick in the water we see it bent, but the evidence of touching it says it is straight. A physicist unifies these contradictory or diverse experiences by theories of light rays and refraction. This theorising makes it possible to speak of the stick as "bent" and "straight" at the same time. The theory is a map which explains and illuminates a problem. Metaphysics seeks "integrator words" which, like a map, will give our bearings amidst the confusion of multiple experiences. Science has gone a long way towards this amongst physical things. "Such logically diverse areas as light, heat and magnetism and electricity, for example, have been integrated by concepts such as

mass, velocity, energy." Beyond this such integrator concepts as Matter or Evolution have been used to unify everything, and these words have in turn been used in the past to sponsor ethical and theological theories. But science cannot really supply satisfactory metaphysical integrators for that which comes from within the physical cannot be expected to unite the physical; hence the need for meta-physics. A concept is needed which is more than spatio-temporal. It is our use of "I" which justifies the recourse to that which is more than sense-data. Such integrators as "Being" and "Absolute" are sometimes suggested, but they are impersonal and are known only mediately. Hence the importance of the "Self" in modern Christian philosophy. Professor Ramsey holds that "God" is the word which is the integrator *par excellence,* "which provides the most simple, far-reaching and coherent metaphysical map." The word "I" unites for me all scientific and other descriptive assertions about myself, and it is more than all such descriptions. It is firmly rooted to facts about me, yet it goes beyond and eludes all reduction to mere description, while at the same time it is intelligible to me. Certain experiences of moral challenge may suggest "Duty" as an integrator on a larger scale which holds together general experiences. But "Absolute values" only cover ethical experiences, whereas disclosures of some "other" occur in Nature and so the word "God" is necessary and suitable to integrate "all those features of the world that a metaphysics confined to persons or values woul dhave to ignore." Thus, "God" can integrate talk about persons, values, science and perception; it is limited to none and covers all; it is, therefore, a truly metaphysical concept. We can start to talk about "God" in rather the same way as we use "I." But "God" is different from "I" just in those observable differences between the disclosures in the natural realm and those which lead to the intuition of ourselves or other people.

This is an essay which ought to be read, studied and mastered, especially by theological students puzzled by the purpose and achievement of the philosophy of religion. It will help to clarify the intention which lies behind Professor Ramsey's two books referred to above; books which are deceptively lucid. It is not too much to claim that this is the revolutionary thinking which is so necessary in the 20th century to give new drive and a fresh direction to the main stream of Christian thought. It is not just the patching up of old worn arguments; it is radically different insofirmly in empirically verifiable facts, and also using to the full the far as it fully accepts the challenge to keep one's language rooted concept of the "Self" or "I" which is characteristic of theism as we have seen. It is to be hoped that the book *Fact, Metaphysics and God* which Professor Ramsey promised in the preface to

Religious Language will soon be published. The volume here reviewed is important and valuable, but it needs to be followed by such an extended treatment of metaphysics as Professor Ramsey could give us. Such a work would demand wider and more considered respect from sceptical philosophers. Altogether it may be said that this is a timely and necessary book. It has many good critical sections, as well as constructive suggestions. Certainly we may say we are taking a sure and steady step forward on a pathway which has for too long been marked "Out of Bounds."

ROBERT BROWN

Reviews

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, completely revised and reset. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. 1,126 pp. 70s. Nelson.

Generations of ministers who have found *Peake* a constant guide and help, especially for those books of the Bible where the more detailed commentaries were less readily available, and many others who were suspicious of it because of the critical position which it adopted will now rejoice together in the publication of the new *Peake* where little of the old remains save the title and the general layout.

Over sixty contributors, all of them experts in their own field, have supplied the material, and the editors have worked with consummate skill and artistry in putting it together and in supplying an index which is surely a masterpiece, for not only are the more important references singled out from the rest by being printed in heavy type, but the whole runs to some sixty pages, three columns to a page. The assortment of the material too is more congenial, the articles being carefully separated from the commentaries in the list of Contents, and those on the Bible in general being separated from those on the Old and New Testaments.

What of the material? If any reader should be in doubt concerning the changes which have taken place in biblical studies since 1919 a careful reading of this volume will quickly bring him up to date. Additional articles, for instance, include on on "The Authority of the Bible," which stands at the beginning. There is another added on "The English Versions of the Bible," one on "The Theology of the Old Testament," and another on "The Theology of the New Testament," as against the old edition which only got to theology in "The Pauline Theology." The old article on "Organization, Church Meetings, Discipline, Social and Ethical Problems" has given place to two new articles, one on "The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament" and the other on "The Constitution of the Church in the New Testament." All these are indications of the general departure from the old detailed and critical approach to the more modern theological and comprehensive approach which has characterised biblical studies during the last thirty or forty years.

Similar changes and trends are reflected in the articles and commentaries. There is, for example, a careful survey of the changes which have taken place in Synoptic criticism since the 30's. The positive gains of Ras Shamra and the Dead Sea Scrolls are referred to and applied where they are relevant. No longer is a sharp distinction drawn between Judaism in Palestine and Judaism outside, whilst the ancient priest-prophet controversy is now seen in a new light and the work of men like Mowinckel and Johnson on the cultic prophets carefully recognized and assessed. So too is our Lord's attitude to sacrifice and the Temple, and the distinction between Paul and the Jerusalem apostolate in the early church, though one cannot help but feel that G. Johnston, in demolishing the approach of J.-L. Leuba to this issue, has done less than justice to the principle which Leuba was trying to enunciate (p. 725). All these moves represent very definite and positive gains on the old volume.

Inevitably, of course, the articles are of varied merit and at times one wants to put question marks in the margin. Weymouth, Moffatt and Goodspeed may *have been* the most widely used of the modern-speech versions, but it would surely be wrong even to hint that they still are (p. 27). In assessing the religious institutions of Israel the Sabbath scarcely seems to have its place (pp. 142ff.). In dealing with the history of Israel is it not too readily assumed that Nehemiah comes before Ezra? (p. 128). And Jaubert's approach to the problem of the Last Supper is hardly given the attention it deserves in dealing with the chronology of the New Testament (p. 729). It is a pity that the writer here too does not try to deal more satisfactorily with the problems of the timing of events in Holy Week.

At times too the old critical approach is still rather to the fore with a consequent lack of stress on the theology, the ideas and their significance. In view of the attention given to Israel's neighbours, to canon and text, to geography and archaeology, is it really a reflection of the present attitude to allocate only nine pages to the theology of the Old Testament? And in view of recent stress on the unity of the Bible ought there not also to be a general article on biblical theology in the first section?

Moreover, the one which deals with the theology of the Old Testament, though basically a good chapter, is not one of the most attractive in its layout. There is, for example, a marked deficiency of heavy type to enable the reader (often unfamiliar with this territory) to see the wood for the trees. And why is so much of the recommended literature foreign, especially when some of the works referred to are in English? G. W. Anderson's chapter, "The Religion of Israel," may be less important, but it is much more likely to be read and to make its impression.

The full value of the commentaries can only be appreciated by

steady use over a period, so that any comments at this stage may be adjudged premature. Nevertheless a careful look at the one on *Job* makes it apparent that present opinion and the gains of modern scholarship are there adequately recognized, though the writer does not recognize the significance of the epilogue belonging to the form of the book rather than to its message sufficiently to satisfy one reviewer. If only he had paid more attention to H. Wheeler Robinson's *The Cross of Job!* Those who have sat at the feet of T. W. Manson will soon recognize many bits from his lectures in his commentary on *Romans,* where at every turn meaning is much more important than critical questions, though one knows that these detailed critical questions have always received attention. This tendency is less apparent, for example, in the commentary on *Acts* 15 which is more critical than theological.

There are sixteen maps (as against eight in the old volume) and for quality there is no comparison. The new ones are in colour and are excellent, accompanied also by a separate index of place names.

Each article and commentary concludes with a short bibliography, though there is some inconsistency here. Some are quite long (e.g. pp. 69, 80) whereas others are quite short (e.g. pp. 57, 133, 141). Some stick to books whereas others include articles. Regularly the same work is referred to in different ways and even with different dates (cf. Oesterley & Robinson's *History of Israel* on pp. 125 and 133; or I. M. Price's *The Ancestry of Our English Bible,* pp. 28, 670 and 675). Sometimes the latest revised edition is noted and at other times it is not (cf. F. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* pp. 28 and 670). And H. H. Rowley's article on prophecy is much more easily accessible in *The Servant of the Lord* than in *H.T.R.* (p. 483).

There is a good list of abbreviations though *Sir.* has not been included and some that are (e.g. OTMS) are not always used. "Scripture" appears sometimes with a capital and sometimes without. Yet all these are but minor blemishes of presentation which one does not like to see in a work of such magnitude and quality but which one knows to be almost inevitable.

To some ministers and to many laymen it may appear to be an expensive luxury, and one who has the old volume may try to get by with it. Let him be assured that he cannot. There is all the difference in the world between the two volumes and there is certainly no cheaper way of having all this material on hand than by purchasing a copy. In this respect it is good value for money.

F. G. Healey, *Rooted in Faith.* Three Centuries of Nonconformity, 1662-1962. 157 pp. 9s. 6d. Independent Press.

This is one of a number of books being published to commemorate the events of 1662. Written in the spirit of "thankfulness, humility and true charity" it presents Free Church history not for the sake of reviving bitter controversies, but for the sake of making clear the convictions which we share with our forefathers, and which today we seek to share more widely with the whole Body of Christ in the ecumenical movement.

With careful attention to detail Mr. Healey sets out the events which led to the great ejectment. Presbyterians and others rejoiced in the king's return, and worked for a comprehensive national Church, but the Puritans were outmanoeuvred by the Episcopalians at the Savoy Conference. Baptists, Quakers and many other Separatists had no wish to join the State Church, and a fifth of the clergy in Cromwell's State Church, most of whom believed in a National Church, chose to give up their livings, and make common cause with Christians whose ecclesiastical views they had despised. The author concentrates most of his attention on those who were ejected, but he quotes with approval Dr. E. A. Payne's claim that it is idle to speculate that if Presbyterians had not "swelled the ranks of Baptists and Quakers in 1662, radical nonconformity would have died out."

In the last chapter the history of each of the Free Churches, and of their relationship with each other, are surveyed, and eight pages are devoted to an account of the Free Church Council movement, and to discussions on Church relations in England. Baptists gladly note the comment that "Just as in the political sphere historians seem increasingly to recognize the importance of the continental Anabaptists, so in the sphere of Church relations the specific convictions of Baptists are more widely recognized as a crucial issue which can neither be avoided nor lightly brushed aside."

The *raison d'être* of the whole book is ably demonstrated as the author takes up four principles inspiring the men of 1662 and elucidates them in the light of our contemporary situation:

(*a*) *Church and State.* In matters of doctrine and the ordering of the Church, the Lordship of Jesus Christ must not be usurped by the State.

(*b*) *Scripture.* The authority of the Church must be subordinated to the authority of Scripture.

(*c*) *Episcopacy.* Mr. Healey faces this issue realistically. While there may be ways in which we can consider taking episcopacy into our system, we, no less than our forefathers, are unable to agree that "the bishop alone holds in its fulness and is empowered to hand on the Apostolic Commission."

(*d*) *Prayer Book.* The liturgical forms of worship set out in the

Book of Common Prayer have been, and still are, appreciated by many Free Churchmen. But it is still important to witness to the need for a measure of recognized liberty in the conduct of public worship, as against a statutory requirement.

It is good for the whole Church to " think on these things."

NORMAN S. MOON

H. H. Rowley, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Significance.* Newly revised edition. 28 pp. 2s. 6d. Independent Press.

First published in 1954, these two broadcast talks have now been re-issued in the same form, but with the addition of an Appendix of four pages briefly bringing information up to date. It is here stated that with few exceptions scholars are now agreed that the Qumran sect came into existence in the pre-Christian period; that with regard to the influence of the Scrolls in the Early Church many of the more extreme claims have now receded into the background and that their influence is now acknowledged to be less than was originally thought.

A. GILMORE

Bishop Stephen Neill (ed.), *Twentieth Century Christianity.* 448 pp. 30s. Collins.

Anyone who wants to get into the picture concerning the main trends in Christianity during the present century will do well if he finds a better book for the purpose than this symposium. It is a substantial one as it had to be for so considerable a task. One is surprised not that there are omissions (for that was inevitable in a single volume bearing this title) but rather at the amount of ground which has been covered so successfully. The demand for compression must have pressed heavily on the various contributors but they have pointed out the main landmarks with skill. The chapter by Dr. W. M. Horton on theological trends is an outstanding example of this and one might mention also those of the two Baptist contributors, Dr. E. A. Payne's on European Protestantism (he covers the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, the Church of Scotland and the Free Churches) and Dr. R. T. Handy's on the American scene.

Bishop Neill, as well as editing the book, writes the introduction, in which he sets the scene as it was at the outset of the century, and two of the succeeding chapters, one entitled " Towards Unity " and the other on the Anglican communion. From the latter the non-Anglican will learn of problems peculiar to the Church of England and the extent to which solutions have been found. He will surely discover food for thought in the author's selection of ten Anglican characteristics which newcomers to that communion find

attractive, but he will also find frank references to features about which Anglicans themselves are disquieted. In this and other chapters devoted to different branches or areas of the Church the authority of first-hand information appears in candid and critical comments which accompany the sympathetic insights. It is probably with developments in the Roman and Orthodox Churches that Free Churchmen are most out of touch and in the chapters on the recent history of these bodies (by Professors R. Aubert and V. Istavridis respectively) they will find items on both sides of the balance sheet which will surprise them.

The book also contains an account of Christian expansion in the last sixty years, by the Rev. D. Morgan, a chapter on modern opposition to Christianity by Canon Max Warren, and one on the Ecumenical Movement by Dr. Hans H. Wolf, the Lutheran Director of the Ecumenical Institute. Finally, Dr. D. T. Niles of Ceylon attempts the difficult task of summing up the present situation and prospect. All but the last and the introductory chapter provide bibliographies. In his preface Bishop Neill expresses the belief that "even the expert student of Church history will find that he can learn a good deal from this book." It is certain that the far more numerous company of non-experts will be grateful for it. They will find it most informative and readable and unusual even in quality for a symposium. All will find it thought-provoking but none more so than those who come to it hostile to or chary about the ecumenical spirit.

G. W. RUSLING

E. H. Robertson, *Bible Weeks*, 80 pp., and *The Bible in the British Scene*, 70 pp., 4s. each. S.C.M.

These are the second and third books[1] to appear in the new series, "The Bible in our Time." The first describes in detail the way in which Bible Weeks have been conducted in various centres during the last two or three years. In order to avert the charge that "It wouldn't work where we are..." Mr. Robertson very carefully describes how it has worked in a wide variety of areas, from the country town to the very large city. The story is well told and some of the Bible stories are reproduced. It would be a good thing if Mr. Robertson could soon tell of a rural area where a Bible Week had been held and proved successful.

In the second of these two books Mr. Robertson sums up the background against which the Bible is to be read in this country, paying particular attention to what he has learned in his travels of the industrial scene. He then reports on the results of a questionnaire on the place of the Bible in the life of the church, and finally elaborates on four basic issues for the future. Some of his comments,

like those on the faithful nucleus and the harassed clergyman, are particularly apposite, and at least one reviewer hopes that churches will dig to find these remarks and then ponder them for a long time.

[1] The first was *The Recovery of Confidence*. See *Baptist Quarterly*, April, 1961.

Ruth Slade, *The Belgian Congo*, 2nd edition, with a supplementary chapter by Marjory Taylor. 82 pp., 6s. Oxford University Press.

Here is an account of the last few years of Belgian colonial rule in Africa and a careful assessment of the factors leading up to the granting of Independence on June 30th, 1960. To an outsider, the political changes in the country have been bewildering and Belgian policy in her erstwhile colony had been difficult for Britishers to understand. Dr. Slade's book can be recommended as a trustworthy guide to this subject, written by someone who has had long contact with Belgian colonial circles in the metropolis and who has also made visits to the area she writes about.

The title shows that the book produced by Dr. Slade concerned pre-independence Congo; it needs little training in "higher criticism" to see the end of her contribution at page 55, where the story has reached the period following the Léopoldville riots of January, 1959. Marjory Taylor provides further information to bring the account up to Independence Day. There is nothing here about the tragic events which swiftly followed the granting of independence to the Congolese peoples.

Two small points could perhaps be raised. Firstly, Dr. Slade's section on the education of Congolese women makes no mention of the fundamental service given by missionary wives long before the Government appointed salaried social workers in Congo. Secondly, the last chapter states: "Lumumba's followers toured the (Oriental) Province in lorries and terrorised the inhabitants all through the election period." I must object that in the Stanleyville area where our B.M.S. has several stations, these "followers" were received by the villagers with great acclamation. The talking-drums of the area spoke of Lumumba as a leader sent from heaven to liberate his people. Any policy which does not take into account the hold Lumumba has—even though he has been assassinated—on the peoples of the Oriental Province is doomed to failure.

J. F. CARRINGTON