

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Present Position of Church and Dissent.

The Inaugural Lecture of Session 1924-5, of Hackney, New, and Regent's Park Colleges.

THE issue between Church and Dissent is now of very old standing, and it is perhaps not unnatural that many of us should be inclined to regard the breach as perpetual, and to think sadly that it can scarcely be worth while to handle the question once more. But is this an attitude to which we ought to resign ourselves? We are professedly the followers of Him who came to bring peace and goodwill among men. It was His parting prayer for His disciples that they should all be one, as He and His Father are one, and in proportion as our love for Him is true, we must love heartily all those whom He loves. We may, indeed, hold that while men differ as they do in temperament, training, and circumstance, there will be different denominations of Christians, and hence regard the unity of the Churches as a far off, divine event—a something that cannot be realized until the consummation of this world-order in the new heavens and new earth. Yet even so, it is our duty, and should be our delight, to be “looking for and hasting unto” that ideal perfection of the Church of Christ.

But if, as Christians, we should strive for the union of Christ's members in general, then in particular, as Dissenters, we should watch for opportunities of rapprochement with the Church of England. This is the lesson of our history, rightly read. We are known as “Dissenters.” Dissent is necessarily relative to some body from which it dissents. It branches from a parent stock, yet it has still something of the character of that stock. It has, indeed, much of its essence in common therewith. It does not profess independently to supply a new Christianity. It differs merely on certain points. Of course, these differences, though partial, are to it vital—so much so, that it conceives it has no alternative but to separate from the parent body, so long as that body excludes them from its contents. But Dissent, at least in the best of its representatives, separated only from a sense of hard necessity, with reluctance and grief. And it remains true to its original temper only as it feels a constant sorrow over the separation, and shows a constant readiness to find ways of reconciliation.

The urgency of this standing obligation is greatly intensified at the moment by the political situation, both national and international. Wherever we look to-day, there is the menace of strife—at home between class and class, abroad between nation and nation—and of strife that threatens to run to ruinous extremes, unless it can be checked. We see also that the one thing needful to check it is *goodwill*. Without goodwill, bargains between masters and men, or between nation and nation, are worthless “scraps of paper.” And of effective goodwill among men—men of different classes and races—Christianity alone holds the secret. But a *divided* Church can never bring home to men’s consciences the lesson of mutual goodwill. In the view of a critical world, while the Churches preach love and fellowship in the name of a common Father in heaven, they do not practise it among themselves. And in this matter, as always, deeds speak louder than words. All our explanations, our justifications of division, our illustrations of its tonic effect, etc., are nothing to the world. The world looks at the broad fact—the practical issue. These Christians are endlessly divided among themselves. And herein the world happens to be substantially right. It is the Master’s own test. “By their fruits ye shall know them,” He declared. And more specifically for our present purpose, “By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one toward another.” The world is justified in neglecting our message while we cannot convince the world that we have among ourselves that hearty kindness which we recommend to it. Is it too much to say that the prospects of a successful aggression of the Church upon the world, at home and abroad, are the prospects of a real rapprochement between the various Churches?

Now what are these prospects? I venture to believe that in recent years there have been modifications of attitude whether on the side of Church or Dissent, which promise an effective contribution towards an eventual understanding between us. The object of this address is to register some of the more significant of these changes, and try to indicate the issues that are still outstanding—assured that the cause of Christian unity cannot be furthered by our waiving anything that appears to us vital truth, but endeavouring always to speak truth in love. We shall be concerned with questions of Church and ministry, worship and sacraments.

In such an enquiry, however, we could not proceed far without becoming conscious of a prior question—the question of authority. The Catholic Church recognized tradition as well as Scripture, and interpreted Scripture in its light, with the effect of making tradition the final authority. The Protestant State

Churches put the authority of Scripture in the place of that of the Catholic Church with its tradition. But they compromised in a greater or less degree, and eventually retained a good deal that was based on tradition rather than Scripture. Those who separated from them did so in the name of New Testament Christianity, rejecting everything for which express Scripture testimony could not be adduced. For them, the final authority was the Scripture, as read by the individual believer, with the aid of the Holy Spirit. To the genuine believer, the Scriptures were an open book. This view was naturally accompanied by a theory of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Their author was the Holy Spirit, His human instruments being negligible. They are a sufficient declaration of all that is necessary to man's salvation, and hence of the principles and practice of the true Church of Christ. It is all plain, at least to him that understandeth!

Now, it must be obvious to us all that the appeal to the authority of Scripture is materially affected by the acceptance of modern critical views of Scripture. To say the least, the appeal loses in simplicity and immediacy. These views are sometimes briefly characterised by saying that they recognise the human element in Scripture. But such a statement seems to imply that you can *distinguish* the divine and human elements—as though you could sublimate the purely divine essence from the human dross. That is not the case, and in the statement still lurks a leaven of the heresy of infallibility. A truer statement would be that the Scriptures are the literary transcript of their experience of the Lord Jesus Christ by Christian men—inspired, certainly by the Holy Spirit of God, but not thereby raised above the limitations of their individual humanity, and their age, and hence not above the possibility of insufficiency or error. We believe that our Lord alone, of all the sons of men, was raised above the liability to sin or to error in matters of religion. But only men, themselves raised above such liability, could fully comprehend and report perfect goodness and divine wisdom; for these are morally and spiritually discerned. Hence we cannot expect to find in the New Testament a perfect picture of Jesus, but only Jesus—His person, teaching, and behaviour—as apprehended by the men of the primitive Church. It follows that in the New Testament we have not immediate access to the "mind of Christ." What we have is the best possible help to finding the mind of Christ for ourselves—the reminiscences or experiences of those who knew Him in His earthly mission. There is, of course, a sense in which the mind of Christ is given to every believer—i.e. in germ or principle. But to learn the developed expression of this principle

—what it means in application to the various problems of individual and church life—is the task of Christian experience. And whether for individual or Church, this is a gradual and progressive task. The mind of Christ, then, is not a datum—a criterion of Christian teaching and practice supplied to us ready made, but in the first place a problem to be solved by the patient, devout, and united enquiry of Christian people. And there is no guarantee that the conclusion reached in a given case will be infallible. Actually we find that different enquirers often do not succeed in reaching the same conclusion. Clearly, then, the appeal to the authority of Scripture is embarrassed. But the difficulty thus created is not equally great for both parties. This point is seized by Archdeacon Greig in his book on *The Church and Nonconformity* (1913). He says: "Though the consequences of the changed ideas about the Bible are being felt among us very strongly, we have our shelter from the storm. There are, e.g. the Creeds, our Prayer Book, the Sacraments." And he goes on to claim that in times of unsettlement, episcopal organisation affords a great advantage over merely congregational—"You want the steadiness, and the slow, deliberate wisdom that belong to a large body—something that cannot be rushed, as a single congregation by the influence of one man," etc. In other words, the Church has its tradition of venerable antiquity, conserved and maintained by the authority of a bishopric of the whole church. We might be tempted to insinuate that even with its tradition the Church has its own difficulties; that in the Prayer Book there is such a thing as the Athanasian Creed, or that there are individual clergy or congregations which episcopal authority seems powerless to control. But let this pass. Relatively Dr. Greig's statement remains true. The difficulty is unquestionably greater for those who refer exclusively to the Scriptures. Suppose we challenge the decision of Scripture on a question of church organisation or worship. It may be that Scripture is wholly silent. In fact, the New Testament is anything but a comprehensive and systematic manual of instruction for incipient Church members. Its documents are all addressed to Christians, and take a good deal of familiarity with Christian teaching and practice for granted. For the most part, they deal with problems or difficulties of detail which had arisen in particular communities. Where other questions are touched, it is often only incidentally, and the information obtainable is neither full nor clear. (We have only to put almost any question about the status or duties of church officers in New Testament times to evince the truth of this statement.) Again, the precedent afforded may be (expressly or actually) only applicable to a merely temporary situation. Moreover, in this connection, we

Dissenters must admit that we ourselves have not at all points strictly adhered to primitive ideals or precedents. We cannot in this place forget (e.g.) that our trained and professional ministry is not primitive. This last admission, however, may appear a dangerous one. The Churchman may seize upon it, and say, It seems, then, that you Dissenters also recognize such a thing as legitimate growth of church institutions and ideas—that modifications of them may come, along with changing conditions of the Church's life, and that these may be sanctioned and passed on—in other words, you too have a tradition. Then the only difference between us is that you do partially and timidly what we do thoroughly and confidently. Why not frankly recognize and appeal to tradition as we do?

Because, we answer, tradition may include extravagant or unwholesome developments. We need a safeguard against these, a criterion of genuine and false development. In the history of the Church, this safeguard has been found once and again in a return to Scripture, interpreted by the devout lay mind as opposed to the ecclesiastical. But, it may be retorted, that has been on the naive assumption of the infallibility of the letter of Scripture. And you can no longer appeal to that letter as final. Even so, we answer, we have the advantage, in attaching fundamental importance to the primitive documents of the faith, apart from tradition. For, at the lowest estimate, these give us access to those disciples who themselves knew the Lord in the flesh, and their records must always be the starting-point of our endeavour to get back to His mind. But, it may be further objected, to do this requires the work of criticism. And for it the ordinary church member is not equipped. He must depend on the scholars, and scholars (notoriously) often and seriously disagree. But waiving this, there arises the further difficulty—that the Christian laity become dependent on the authority of a new hierarchy—a hierarchy no longer of ecclesiastics but of scholars. And I have known one of them affirm roundly that if he must have one or the other, he would much prefer the Papacy! But is there not a lack of discrimination here? We are not bound to accept the doctrine of scholars as a Catholic that of his priest. We are, indeed, dependent on them in questions respecting the text of documents, their origin and date, their original meaning, etc. But these are not directly religious matters. The religious interpretation of the documents, and its application to the church of to-day is another matter. And that is for the consideration of the Christian community, under the guidance of the Spirit.

This, then is our ultimate authority—the mind of the Spirit, as manifested from time to time in the body of Christian people.

We may regret the loss of an authority given once for all in an inspired book. It would doubtless be more congenial to our natural indolence! But such an authority neither is nor can be forthcoming. It is the task of each generation to discover the mind of Christ for itself. And advance in the comprehension of it depends upon advance not merely in scholarship, but above all in fulness and depth of Christian life. "If any man willetH to do His will, he shall know of the teaching." There is much we do not know. This fact should make us humble, largely charitable, and tolerant towards the views of others. We may be readier to acknowledge the consonance of elements in the Church's tradition with the Spirit of Christ. But in the last resort we must keep and exercise our freedom of judgment as Christian people. It is an inevitable part of the burden of faith.

We can now—with, let us hope, duly chastened spirits—proceed with our proposed enquiry. Perhaps, following time-honoured precedent, we should begin with doctrine—the Christian gospel as presented in the Scriptures. Over this head, however, I shall pass quickly, contenting myself with a general remark. Dr. Greig (*op. cit.*) observes that doctrinal understanding between his Church and Nonconformity has been considerably facilitated by the weakening of Calvinism among the Free Churches, and this remark is certainly true. The Church of England whole-heartedly detests Calvinistic theology (Recently I heard an earnest Church Missionary from South Africa stigmatise the Calvinism of the Dutch Reformed Church as the most devilish religion ever invented). But this type of theology even the more conservative of Free Churchmen have now largely abandoned. It would take too long to detail the points in which we have diverged from Calvin, and thereby come nearer to Catholic theology. I must speak very summarily, and risk the possibility of being taken for a Jesuit in disguise! We have to-day a theology less exclusively centred upon the doctrines of conversion and justification, and proportionately more open to give adequate recognition to the breadth and richness of a Scripture theology. In a like proportion we become more ready to acknowledge that the darkness of mediaeval Catholicism was not total. Dr. Greig marks with joy our increased readiness to find good things in the religion of the Middle Ages. Anglicans, on their part, show a disposition to meet us by making room within the four corners of their communion for a Protestantism thus modified. A more recent Anglican writer, Mr Rawlinson, in his *Authority and Freedom* (p. 166), says that if we believe in a Providential leading of the Church's development, we must legitimate Protestantism as well as Catholicism, and that the Church of England ought to make room within her pale for

Protestant as well as Catholic churchmen. With such conciliatory movements on either side, the prospect of eventual understanding should be brightened. We may forecast that the chief outstanding issue will relate to the significance of the Sacraments in the genesis and growth of the Christian. To this we must presently refer. But first let us say something concerning the Church which observes the Sacraments and the officers who administer them.

I need not remind you that one of the main questions on which our spiritual forefathers separated from the Established Church was that of the nature and proper constitution of the Church. They held that the Church consists of the truly converted or regenerate. As these are certainly known to God alone, the Church is strictly invisible. On earth the true church exists wherever a number of genuine believers voluntarily unite to form a community. They could not endure to remain in a state church which included all the population as matter of course, and in which there was no guarantee of the genuine godliness even of the ministering clergy.

This theory has encountered more or less serious criticism. It is pointed out :

(1) That there is increasing agreement among the best scholars of all schools that the distinction of a visible and invisible church is not found in the New Testament writings, correctly interpreted.

(2) That the attempt to insist on a membership exclusively of the regenerate breaks down in practice. To begin with, there is no satisfactory criterion of a truly converted person. No examination by church officers (or deputies), however competent, can discover the state of a human soul in relation to God. But often the persons appointed have been pathetically incompetent. We repudiate the Church's use of creeds as tests, and the conception of faith as intellectual assent implied in it. Yet the questions asked of candidates in bygone days were largely leading questions as to the doctrinal beliefs they professed. More recently the justice of this criticism has been acknowledged, and young people attaining adolescence have often been almost automatically drafted into church fellowship. True, they may first have been put through a preparation class. In so far as we do this, we make an approach to the catechism and confirmation of the Church. On the other hand, we take pains to be assured that the seed sown has found receptive soul, and our ceremonies of admission to church fellowship have nothing of the sacramental character of Confirmation—the notion of a grace of the Spirit imparted through laying on of a bishop's hands. We have, then, in considerable measure, relinquished the attempt to decide the question of fitness. But at the same time (it is pointed out)

(3) We have lost the safeguard which is the necessary complement of our conception of the Church as a community of true believers. Originally, discipline was exercised on members whose behaviour proved them unfit—whether temporary suspension or final expulsion from the church's fellowship. We have not found it possible to maintain this discipline. Generally it has fallen into disuse, being only exercised in the case of one or two flagrant sins, while other glaring breaches of the law of Christ pass without personal rebuke to the offender.

(4) Another charge frequently levelled against us is the accusation of an excessive *individualism*. Our churches are said to have no proper corporate consciousness, as parts of the one body of Christ—of the Church Universal. Like-minded Christians of their own choice form themselves into a fellowship: it is a creation from below, not above; i.e. the initiation is human, not divine. Such a community is rather a religious club than a divinely constituted church, and accordingly it lacks any effective principle of cohesion. One congregation is not bound to another in a common unity. And within the individual community there is often grave dissension, issuing too frequently in permanent separation. In short, says the Churchman, we are infinitely "fissiparous!"

But not only the churchman. The same warning was given us, with unsurpassable cogency and earnestness, by our own Dr. Forsyth, and not the least part of our great debt to him is for the wise words with which he sought repeatedly, to make us feel, as heirs of a common salvation through Christ, an infinite obligation also to the Church in which Christ unites us. We can claim, then, that the confession of our defect has been heard within our own house. But more than that: so far as the lack of inter-organization of congregational churches is concerned, we have made a beginning towards modifying our hard-shell independency by the institution of area superintendents. Churchmen, on their side (e.g. Dr. Greig), have noted this development with satisfaction, and regard it as the germ of an episcopacy, without the name. The superintendent is as yet far short of a bishop. Among the Baptists, at least, his proper function is the "moderation" of changes of pastorate in churches aided by the Sustentation Fund. Perhaps the office is capable of further development, and in course of time it may undergo developments that would assimilate it much more to the episcopate. But there is one difference between the two which must always remain. We can never accept the sacramental ordination of the Anglican Church—with its underlying idea that impartation of the requisite grace for ministry is mediated by laying on of episcopal hands.

So we come to the question of the ministry. Our spiritual

ancestors insisted, with the New Testament, on the priesthood of all believers; and denied any specific distinction between clergy and laity. They maintained that in relation to the community, the minister was not sacerdotal, but representative. He was a man fitted for ministry by spiritual gifts and consecrated life; himself conscious of a divine call to minister, and giving proof of it by successful exercise of those gifts, and specially set apart by the community to render certain services in their behalf.

With this position some notable agreements can be recorded in recent utterances of churchmen. Bishop Gore recognizes in principle the priesthood of laymen when he says in his *Holy Spirit and the Church*, that "Both St. John and St. Paul appear to have a robust confidence that the good man—the spiritual man—will come to a right conclusion" (p. 171). Dr. Greig (*op. cit.*) is far more express: "What we do indeed more sorely need to-day throughout Christendom is . . . to insist on and realise the priestliness of the so-called (but never in Scripture) laity." As "principles of the Christian ministry," he recognises, besides "the conveyance through the "body" of "empowering grace," "the divine call of the individual, [and] its acceptance and ratification by the body." Better still, he asks whether there can be a serious doubt that a ministry so fruitful as that of many Nonconformist ministers is owned of God, or that the Sacraments administered by them fail to convey the appropriate grace to devout recipients. He complains, however, that while we attach importance to ordination for our ministers, we do not seem to realise its implication, i.e. a real distinction between clergy and lay. And he contends that the bishop is necessary, not merely as channel of the grace of ministry to the candidate, but also to do as the Church's representative, what she cannot do as a body—examine and approve candidates; and afterwards watch and control their activity as clergy.

We are grateful for the concessions the Doctor makes, and hope that they represent the thought of many of his clerical brethren. But we must continue to resist his conception of ordination. We cannot consent to make the necessary gifts for ministry conditional on the imposition of episcopal hands. The doctrine of apostolical succession remains for us a transparent fiction. We must insist that the qualification for ministry is spiritual in its source and nature. And we cannot consent to subject to the indignity of reordination by a bishop these honoured servants of God whose ministry Dr. Greig himself so generously appreciates.

Perhaps we ought not to pass from the subject of the Church without any reference to the relation of Church and State. Let us at least register one or two significant modifications of attitude on either side. There is no need to recapitulate to this

audience the evils which have resulted to the Church from alliance with the State. But it is worth while to notice an increasing recognition of them on the part of churchmen. One quotation will suffice. Bishop Gore affirms, "The real disaster happened when Christianity became the established religion. . . . It seems to me that no departure from the principles of Christianity has been so serious as that which allowed membership of the Church to become a matter of course" (p. 130-1). Another thing we cannot fail to mention is that to-day an increasing number of churchmen are willing to see their Church disestablished. It may be true that most of these are found among the High Church Party, who want greater freedom to introduce Catholic ceremonial. But this should not prevent us from welcoming a desire for more of the freedom which is the birth-right of Christ's followers. Among ourselves, perhaps, we may discern a growing consciousness that religion, as (to say no more) a supreme factor in human culture, ought to have due recognition in the life of the state? Many of us feel an imperative need that it should take its proper place in *education*, at school and university. Scholars in the critical adolescent stage, trained in institutions where religion finds no public recognition, grow up to think it negligible—a mere matter of individual taste. Others, again, in whose training Church religion is an integral part, feel its fascination, and leave us for the Church of England. On the Nonconformist side, it must be recalled that during the war we had our own chaplains, recognised and paid by the State. Perhaps some of us scarcely realise as yet that this was to recognise the principle of a connection between religion and the State. Surely these significant concessions on both sides might encourage us to think again that the solution of the liberation problem is practicable. It ought to be possible to devise some plan by which, without State preference of any Church, or interference with its autonomy, both the Episcopal and the Free Churches could have their catechists in State-aided schools, as well as their chaplains in the universities and the army.

Our last topic is that of *Worship and Sacraments*. Here we have to reckon with a fundamental difference in the conception of the nature and purpose of divine service. Anglicanism lays the chief stress on the worship of God by (or for) the Church, and finds the principal channel of grace to the worshipper in a sacrament—preaching being decidedly subordinate. The Protestant Free Churches tend to lay the chief stress on edification of the worshippers, and give the central place to the preaching of the Word. With such wide divergence in general idea, it is not surprising that the two parties should find much to criticise,

precisely in one another's mode of worship. Yet it is specially in the domain of worship that in recent times *we* have become conscious of defect, and shown readiness to learn from the Church. Let us briefly enumerate some of the criticisms that are levelled at our worship by our Church friends.

They accuse us of a false, or excessive *spirituality*. We are fearful of attaching importance to adequacy and beauty of outward form rather than to right disposition of the worshipper's heart. In recoil from such formalism we go to the opposite extreme. There is a noticeable bareness or even ugliness in our architecture and forms of worship: and our demeanour tends to be positively lacking in reverence—we sit to pray, and loll at sermon, to say nothing of allowing ourselves to converse in the house of God. Another reproach is that of an undue '*subjectivity*.' In various ways we put not God, but man first. In an eagerness to evangelize we go too far in the endeavour to make the service attractive to outsiders. We countenance instrumental music that is secular in suggestion and obtrusive in execution, and anthems more calculated to illustrate the choir than to glorify God. Our hymns are often unsuitable, expressive less of the praise of God than of individual religious sentiment. Specially vulnerable is our public prayer. It is utterance of the minister rather than of the people. It is apt to be *too long*. Unfamiliar beforehand to the congregation, it makes an undue demand on their sustained attention. It is apt to be *too individual*, reflecting the transient experience of him who prays rather than the standing needs of God's people in general—sometimes even his personal views and sympathies on public questions. Worst of all, it is frequently rhetorical, with an elaboration and balance of form, designed more for the ear of the congregation than the ear of God—sometimes almost a second sermon, giving the Almighty information He does not need, and doctrinal instruction which of course is aimed really at the audience. Lastly, as to our preaching, we are told that, from a laudable desire to testify only things which we have seen and known, we are in danger of being too narrowly experimental—to give a doctrine reflecting the limits of our individual experience. If we escape this defect, still we are prone to be bounded by the traditional theology of our school, as distinct from the full range of Bible truth. These faults beset us when we are in full earnest. When we are not, there is the ever-present temptation to the sensational and catchy, in both matter and manner. Our subjects are topical, sometimes to the verge of downright secularity, and often there is no serious attempt at imparting any systematic doctrinal and ethical teaching. (Similarly scrappy and unsystematic is our public reading of Scripture.) The manner of the preaching is marred and disgraced

by merely verbal points, extravagant overstatements, cheap diatribes and vulgar pleasantries. And all in vain; the world is not attracted, and God's children are starved and saddened.

I will cut short this melancholy catalogue, and hasten to say that in these criticisms we are prepared to recognize a good deal of truth, and are doing something to rob them of their point. There is perhaps a growing feeling among our younger ministers, that their primary business is to feed and build up God's people, and that to do this there must be a serious attempt to state systematically and validly the doctrines of the faith. As to place and forms of worship, we have begun to recognize that artistic beauty has a positive value in the expression of religious feeling. Further, forms of service are being drawn up and increasingly adopted, and along with their use there is (I am fain to believe) a growing feeling in favour of quiet and reverential behaviour in the house of God. And our Free Church liturgies are heavily indebted to the Book of Common Prayer—that is to say, ultimately to the great Catholic liturgies. Perhaps we hardly realize yet, that wherein we depart from it, it is lamentably for the worse. Naturally we are slow to make the discovery which Ruskin records in his *Praeterita*, that *all* the good prayers are Catholic! We cannot, on the other hand, adopt the Prayer Book as it stands. Setting aside for the moment those features which reflect the peculiar doctrine and organization of the Church, we want more freedom in prayer than it allows, and in particular, we want escape from some forms of prayer that are hopelessly antiquated, and do not answer to the aspirations of a Christian congregation of to-day. The Church of England herself (we all know) begins to find the yoke of the Prayer Book intolerably restrictive. It is true that the proposals for revision put forward by different sections of the Church differ enormously, and probably we should do well not to be sanguine as to the likelihood of any of them obtaining official sanction. But even if they should not, and the Prayer Book should remain substantially unchanged, there is no doubt that there must and will be much greater latitude in its actual use. That is to say, there will be more *freedom* in worship. In this connection it is interesting to note that Bishop Gore regrets the disuse of the primitive "spiritual gifts" in the church, and that Dr. Greig advocates the introduction by his church of some non-liturgical services. On the church side, we should be ungrateful not to note also an increased attention to preaching. Even among high churchmen there is a welcome movement towards making the sermon a means of conveying serious and regular instruction to their people. We must, however, still ask that this preaching should be truly Scriptural in content, instead of being devoted to laudation of Catholic ex-

crecences like invocation of saints, or a one-sided sacramentalism. I have heard of a clergyman whose sermon on a Sunday evening was a monition that it did his congregation no good to come to evensong, and that they had all they needed if only they were punctual in attendance at early celebration.

This brings us finally to the question of the Sacraments, and especially the Eucharist. (Of ordination we have spoken already.) On the subject of *baptism*, we of the Free Churches have our own differences, not negligible. But on the main issue can we not unite as against the Anglican conception, and refuse to subscribe to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration? We should not admit that the individual—infant or adult—is “made a child of God” by undergoing at the priest’s hands the ceremony of baptism. Neither can we agree that the grace necessary to maintain the believer’s spiritual life is mediated primarily and chiefly by the ceremonial of the altar. Our Anglican brethren hold this, and hence are quite consistent in urging frequent communion, whether hearing of the word be added or not. And naturally they object that we reduce the sacraments to a distinctly secondary place. Dr. Greig complains that to-day we are neglecting baptism, and Mr. Rawlinson says that the teaching and practice of Protestantism give the impression that the sacraments are secondary or even dispensable elements in it. To us it seems that the Anglican Church by its stress on the Eucharist tends to give a onesided prominence to our Lord’s Passion, which leads to a relative relegation of other important elements of the gospel—His teaching and general example. Also, that its doctrine of the Real Presence leads to superstitious or unwholesome consequences, such, e.g., as reserving the bread for the purpose of adoration (I note that Mr. Rawlinson speaks of this as a “simple and natural” observance).

In view of such differences in idea and tendency, it might seem that the prospect of mutual understanding is not hopeful. But this may prove a hasty and superficial judgment. The writers I have been quoting so much this evening betray at least some consciousness of the dangers of their position. Mr. Rawlinson says “It is important (the word is certainly not too strong!) that the children of Christian parents should subsequently enter individually and consciously into the implications of Baptism and membership of Christ, upon a basis of personal faith.” (p. 76). Bishop Gore frankly acknowledges that the sacraments “very easily become charms” (p. 25). And Mr. Rawlinson is ready to let any form of Christianity stand or fall according as it makes its adherents more like Christ or not (p. 161).

It is again Mr. Rawlinson who points out that the Eucharist acquired for Christian faith a sacramental significance, in virtue

of the fact that it *did* (as it still does) serve to mediate communion with the risen Lord (p. 151). Is there not suggested here a possible common ground between his party and ourselves? I mean the ground of a common experience. All theories, Catholic or Protestant, are attempts to construe theoretically the experienced fact that believers devoutly observing the Lord's Supper as He observed it with His first disciples, do realize in a peculiar sense His living presence and grace. This experience, like all the great experiences of human life, finally eludes definition. We err when we insist on complete and clear definition of what can, after all, never be fully and clearly defined. Perhaps both are over-dogmatic, the Churchman positively, we negatively. The Churchman, by his doctrine of the Real Presence, dogmatically affirms more than he knows or can prove—that the presence of Christ is in the consecrated elements. And on our side, we perhaps tend to err in an opposite direction—dogmatic denial of what cannot be rationally proved, viz., that somehow, albeit in a quite ineffable way, the Lord Himself is present and does make a peculiar impartation of His grace to those who observe the Holy Supper in devout dependence on His word. Dissenters have often carried to a wrong extreme their recoil from the Romish mass and its attendant superstitions. We are not warranted in asserting that the Lord's Supper is *commemorative* merely—and nothing more. Transparently, that is to do less than justice to the solemn words "This is My Body, My Blood." If we entirely believed in the spiritual presence of Christ with His communicating disciples, we should celebrate the ordinance more reverently than has sometimes been the case with us: and we should supply in our worship something, of which the felt need tempts not a few of our members to the communion of the Church. But we can never cease to resist any doctrine or practice which submerges or obscures the facts (1) that our Lord's gift of Himself in the Supper is conditioned by the believer's intelligent grasp of His word, and humble reliance upon it: and (2) that Christ gives Himself also to the believer who seeks Him in prayerful study of Scripture, and that the peculiar realisation of the Lord's presence in the Supper is due to the fact that the elements set Him forth with peculiar vividness, and particularly in the supreme act of His self-giving for us.

A. J. D. FARRER.

The Christ of Jewish Expectation— and the Christ who came.

THE purpose in view in this article is to exhibit the conceptions of the Messiah which were held by Old Testament prophets and the authors of the apocryphal and apocalyptic books and to contrast the pictures which they painted with the reality. No account will be given here of Rabbinical ideas because the present writer has no first-hand knowledge of them.

I

The expectation of a glorious coming Sovereign born of David's house and sitting on David's throne runs through a considerable section of Old Testament prophecy. Micah speaks of a ruler who will come forth unto God, i.e. for His purposes, from Bethlehem, and it is probable that he was thinking not of a peasant prince, as G. A. Smith suggests, but of a Davidic monarch. The writer of the great prophecy in Isaiah xi. declares in plain words that the coming ruler will arise from the family of Jesse. Jeremiah announces in God's name that He is intending to raise up to David a righteous "shoot" who will reign as king. Ezekiel speaks of a coming prince who will bear the name of David. The same prince is referred to in the great evangelical chapter, Isaiah lv. Zechariah takes up Jeremiah's word "Shoot." In Psalms ii, lxii., and cx., the same hope of a great coming monarch is in evidence, and in the book of Daniel "the anointed one, the prince" appears.

In this statement the writer has been concerned to observe the sound canon laid down by V. H. Stanton in the *Hastings Dictionary* article, "In a historical survey we must be careful not to attribute greater distinctness or scope to the expectation than had at that time been attained." In accordance with this rule it must be added here that Micah expected the Messiah soon, if verse 5 is to be read, with the English versions, "This man be our peace when the Assyrian shall come into our land," and the same is true of Zechariah. Micah's meaning is, however, uncertain. Powis Smith says, "This refers to the following, not the preceding, context." Dr. Stanton in the article just referred to says that Jeremiah dwells upon "the renewed glory of the house of David and not one pre-eminent king of David's line." This is too decided. Jeremiah *does* speak of princes, but it certainly looks as though in xxiii. 5 he expresses his belief in one outstanding Sovereign, the hope of Israel. That expectation is not universal in the prophetic writings, but as our brief survey shows, it is

widespread. In view of that fact, the silence of many of the later writers is remarkable. In the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic books, about fifty distinct contributors are in evidence, and in not more than about one in four do we find any reference to the coming one. Westcott's view was that this silence may be accounted for by the nature of their themes. Ezra and Nehemiah, for example, do not mention Messiah. It must be admitted that this is true so far as some of these writers are concerned. They had no hope of any coming Kingdom of God on earth. But consider such a book as Tobit whose author, though not free from ridiculous ideas, was nevertheless a great catholic soul. "Many nations," he says, "shall come from far to the name of the Lord God with gifts in their hands." Or take Ben Sira, whose noble idea of God is expressed in the words, "The mercy of a man is upon his neighbour, but the mercy of the Lord is upon all flesh; reproving and chastening and teaching and bringing again as a shepherd doth his flock." He foretells in Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 30-32, and xxxvi. 17, the coming days when Wisdom will be the light of mankind and all they that are on the earth shall know that Israel's God is the Lord, the eternal God. Now in these and other books containing similar ideas, we might well expect to find Messiah a prominent figure, but instead He is conspicuous by His absence, and this is all the more remarkable in books like Tobit, in which God is represented as using angelic intermediaries. We are forced to conclude that by some of these writers the idea of a coming Messiah was not held. Of those among them who refer to Him, one has nothing to say of "God's Son, Christ" except that He "shall rejoice" men 400 years and then die with all creatures. Quite a number, however, have still less to say. They assign no function in the world to the Christ. To them He is a sort of lay figure. He only appears in their pages because the idea of Him is part of the traditional faith.

II

In the Old Testament Scriptures, Messiah is described as a purely human person. Even the great names in Isaiah ix. 6 do not really predicate Deity of Him, and although Jeremiah calls Him "The Lord our righteousness," it is necessary to observe that Jerusalem receives from him the same name. We who hold the Deity of Christ—we who can make our own the words of Phillips Brooks, uttered by him in a private prayer, "O Lord Jesus, Thou hast filled my life with joy and peace, and to look on Thy face is earth's most exquisite delight"—must be careful not to read into the words of prophets what is not really there. If the Messiah had been spoken of in either of these passages as God Incarnate the case would be without any clear parallel in

the Old Testament, for Psalm xlv. 6 is ambiguous. Moreover, the functions which the Messiah was to discharge were the normal ones of a sovereign, and for them He was to be equipped by the Spirit of God. When it is said that He will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and that He will slay the wicked with the breath of His life, one's first impression is that He is conceived of as one endowed with awful supernatural powers. But the passage is patient of a different interpretation. It is surely understood more correctly if it is regarded as vivid oriental poetry. It tells us that the King's condemning word when He sits in judgment will be authoritative for the punishment of ill-doers. In the later literature, the common view is much the same. One writer in the time when the Maccabees were reigning thought that the great hope would find its fulfilment in one of the sovereigns of that priestly line. He pictured Messiah as arising from the tribe of Levi. After the Pharisees had quarrelled with John Hyrcanus, this writer's work was revised and the older view of Messiah as coming from the tribe of Judah was again put forward. These men like most of their fellows did not dream of a Divine Christ. But in St. John vii. 37 we have evidence of quite a different conception, "We know whence this man is, but when the Christ cometh no man knows whence He is." More than once in the Apocrypha Messiah is spoken of in that way. He is not thought of as David's Son, born in Bethlehem, but as a mysterious person who is "to be revealed." He is "the Anointed One whom the Most High hath kept unto the end of the days." He is not a man though he has "as it were the likeness of a man." He rises out of the sea, flies with the clouds of heaven, and causes all things to tremble when He looks at them." In one Apocalyptic book—Eth. Enoch 37-70—he is represented as sitting on God's throne and as one "chosen and hidden before God before the creation of the world." In such books as the so-called *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and that Psalter of the Pharisees which bears the name *Psalms of Solomon*, the Messiah is great, yet he is only a man. But Dr. Edersheim's words as to the author of Enoch 37-70 are just. This man appears to have regarded the Christ as far above the ordinary, human, royal, prophetic, and even angelic type, to such an extent that the boundary line separating it from Divine Personality is of the narrowest." The later literature therefore gives us two diametrically opposite views as to the nature of the Messiah.

III

Sometimes, but by no means always, Messiah is thought of by the prophets as exercising a world-wide sway. There is no such thought in Jeremiah, and of Micah's Prince it is only said

that He will be famous to the ends of the earth. But Psalms ii. and lxxii. distinctly foreshadow a universal rule for Him, and in Isaiah xi, which the present writer understands not of animal regeneration but of a beneficial change in human kind set forth in the language of glowing poetry, the prophet seems clearly to anticipate that the coming Hebrew prince will create world-wide international harmony. Moreover, in verse 10 of that chapter, it is said that the nations will consult him. That is his purpose. He stands for a signal or banner of the peoples.

It is commonly a political deliverance, a national salvation, that is thought of when Messiah is spoken about. Our Lord served Himself heir to Jeremiah's wonderful prophecy of the new covenant, but no word of the prophet himself indicates that he so thought of the "Shoot." For him the reign of the coming one was to be a time of safety and justice in the land. For Ezekiel it was to be an era of national prosperity, abounding fruit and freedom from famine and from war. So in Micah the Messianic deliverance is political. Whitehouse held that the words rendered "mighty God" in Isaiah ix. 6 point to great military achievements, and it is possible that the same idea is in evidence in Micah v. 5, "This man shall be our peace when the Assyrian shall come into our land." In Ezekiel xxxvii. 23f, it is said that under his reign Israel will be a people obedient to God, but the Messianic sovereign is never described in express terms as the spiritual Saviour of His people. In the Ezekiel passage just referred to it is said that God Himself will cleanse them from their defilements.

In the later writings, the Messiah is sometimes regarded as the destroyer of the wicked. He is possessed of supernatural powers, and with these He slays ungodly nations. His coming means the overthrow of Israel's enemies. There are two writers whose idea of Him is that He will be the judge holding solemn assize to which all mankind will be summoned. But I find only one passage in Apocalyptic in which the idea of the Christ as a kind of Jewish Caesar mastering his foes by the sword, appears in express terms. This may have been the view of two others, but it is not clearly so.

They were all looking for a king,
To slay their foes and lift them high;
Thou cam'st, a little baby thing,
That made a woman cry.

It would not be correct to say that of all the later Jewish writers. Most of them do not indeed picture Him as the spiritual redeemer and hope of the world. For some He is the patron and champion of Israel only and the un pitying judge of nations outside

the pale. Where a more hopeful view is taken the Messiah is not presented to us as the agent of God for human regeneration. There are, however, three writers who are exceptions to the rule. One describes Messiah as the Saviour of mankind. He will turn disobedient hearts to the Lord. In his days sin will come to an end. The Gentiles will be enlightened. A second man speaks of Him as the stay of the righteous, the hope of the troubled, and the light of the Gentiles. A third prophesies widespread conversions under Messiah—"The Gentiles shall praise the Lord openly over all the earth."

IV

In one sacred and familiar series of passages in the Old Testament, we have the picture of a servant of the Lord who is very unlike the monarch of whom Isaiah, Jeremiah, Micah, Zechariah, and Ezekiel speak. It is clear that that servant of the Lord is sometimes Israel the nation. But in some passages the servant is distinct from the nation. In Isaiah lii. 13—liii., a great individual comes into view and to Christian thought he is none other than our Lord and Master. Certainly that word of prophecy finds its fulfilment only in Him. But that picture of the suffering servant had no influence on the ideas of the men who wrote apocalyptic books. In the *Encyclopædia Biblica* article on the subject, the writer says that the Rabbinical idea of a Messiah Ben-Joseph who dies for Israel and who is subordinate to the victorious son of David, is almost certainly the product of a polemic with Christianity. It is "to say the least unproved and highly improbable that Jews in our Lord's time believed in a suffering and atoning Messiah."

V

A delightful passage concerning Christ appears in the Second Book of Esdras. "I, Esdras, saw upon the Mount Sion a great multitude, whom I could not number, and they all praised the Lord with songs. And in the midst of them there was a young man of high stature, taller than all the rest, and upon every one of their heads he set crowns and was more exalted; whereat I marvelled greatly. So I asked the angel and said, 'What are these, my Lord?' He answered and said unto me, 'These be they that have put off the mortal clothing and put on the immortal and have confessed the name of God; now are they crowned and receive palms.' Then said I unto the angel, 'What young man is he that setteth crowns upon them and giveth them palms in their hands?' So he answered and said unto me, 'It is the Son of God whom they have confessed in the world.' Then began I greatly to commend them that stood so stiffly for the name of the Lord."

This is a passage which must not be used in an attempt to ascertain the Messianic ideas of Jews. It is the work of a Christian.

VI

How completely our Lord revolutionized the Messianic conceptions of His predecessors! He adopted indeed the title "Son of Man" found in Enoch and in Daniel. But how strange are some of the predicates which He attaches to the title. "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many." The men who came before Christ did not dream of One who would serve humanity in such a humble fashion, and none save the author of Isaiah liii. conceived of a Messiah who would lay down His life as a sacrifice for sin. They did not think of a Christ so lowly. Nor did they ever imagine One so majestic as our Lord was. We have seen that one apocalypticist went very far in this direction, but so far as most of the writers are concerned nothing could be further from their minds than the idea of a Messiah who would be God manifest in the flesh. God always gives believing men better gifts than they ever anticipate. He is better to us than our deserts or our hopes. It was so when at last He gave Christ. The Reality was high above the thoughts of men as the heavens are high above the earth.

H. J. WICKS.

A Subjective Faith—Its Methods and Consequences.

ONE of the biggest words that has gained currency in religious circles is the word "Faith." It makes an equally strong appeal to all types of Christian men; to the man who is conservative in his religious thinking, and to the man whom we label "modern." But in each case its meaning, its application, the range of ideas which it includes may be widely different. For the theological superstructures which have been built upon this one foundation are legion. Faith itself, however, rests upon another foundation, and however diverse the forms of its interpretation may be, there is underneath them all a basic principle. Perhaps, after all, the basic principle is of more importance than

the superstructures. In spite of the emphasis which we place upon our cherished interpretations, it may be that the elemental thing which constitutes faith unites us all in one spiritual federation.

There are three interesting tendencies in the intellectual life of our times, to which Christian men can scarcely be indifferent. First of all, this is an age of apparent indifference to religion. Perhaps I ought to have said organized religion. But the use of the word apparent is my safeguard. I have used that phrase advisedly, for I am not altogether convinced that the present indifference to organized religion necessarily indicates indifference to Christ. At any rate I should like to believe that there are many people in the world to-day who, although repelled by some of the forms of organized churches, are nevertheless attracted by Christ. It is, however, quite safe to say that this is an age of apparent indifference to religion.

In the second place, this age has also witnessed the failure of materialism. Even if we make an exception of "the man in the street" it is well to remember, as has frequently been pointed out, that he is usually a generation behind in his philosophy. The nineteenth century may still have left its mark upon him, but the real thinkers are far from the position of their predecessors, and the ordinary man will yet follow. Materialism has never proved satisfactory as a workable theory of the universe, although the methods of its refutation have not always been satisfactory. Bishop Berkeley, for example, adopted the short way with the materialists, and attempted to reduce all matter to spirit or ideas existing in the mind. That refutation is scarcely successful. It leaves something to be desired. We feel cheated out of something. But to reduce all spirit to matter is to fail as well. The physical universe and the spiritual meaning written on it are both real.

Going to the other extreme from Berkeley, you find Harriet Martineau looking upon religion as a decaying mythology. She even rejoiced in the prospect of its coming collapse. History has proved how far out she was in her calculations. Not religion, but materialism, the creed to which she pinned her faith, has failed. The whole spirit of our age is a witness to that fact. Men have not found in the material the ultimate explanation of things. The eternal essence of spirit lies everywhere behind the material. All science has been tending in that direction.

In actual practice, this is also an age of the failure of agnosticism. The mind of man is so constructed that it cannot find rest in a place of suspense. Agnosticism never fully meets the demands of a man's mental life. In real life, what counts supremely is belief, not doubt. Men fail, in almost every sphere

of life, for lack of a living virile faith. Indeed, if there has ever been a time in the history of the world when faith was needed, the time is now. And the world's need ultimately becomes our commission.

The intellectual unrest and the questioning spirit of the twentieth century have not by any means robbed us of our gospel. We still have a gospel of faith; a gospel which does not need to be proclaimed in the precise language of dead centuries, but in the language that will make it a living message for our times. Men to-day won't sign creeds as they once did. You do not necessarily proclaim the gospel for your age when you draw up, with mathematical precision, the attributes and manifestations of faith, as evidenced in the first century. The principle remains, but the age demands the restatement of it in the intelligible language of the hour.

What then can be said about faith, that will not immediately focus our attention on those wonderful labels and categories we have manufactured? This much at least can be said; Faith is an activity of the mind which finds its chief source of inspiration in the intuitions. The Bible expresses that truth by saying that "with the heart man believes unto righteousness." Faith is not something which demands visible and sense impressions. It is the outgoing of a man's intuition to find some spiritual affinity in the universe around him.

Jesus always recognized that, and attached considerable importance to it. On many of the great pressing intellectual problems He was altogether silent. He made due allowance for the big part faith plays in a man's life. Man's intuition was an open door to Him, for what the intuition can grasp cannot always be demonstrated by the ordinary rules of reasoning. Is that not a feasible explanation of why Jesus omitted some things from His teaching? He never argued about God's existence. He never discussed the question, "Has man a soul?" He asserted Immortality, but never tried to prove it. He took the spiritual world for granted. In any case, while you may have a material expression of a spiritual fact, you cannot have a material proof of it.

This feature is not by any means the exclusive property of the Christian Religion. Some of the biggest facts of life, most dearly cherished by us, defy the powers of an ordinary mortal to explain them in terms that are purely rational. For example, what man could rationally explain why he loved a woman and made her his wife? He certainly never tried to offer such an explanation to the woman herself. She would have refused him if he had even made the attempt. You won't find a mother writing a treatise to explain the reasons why she sacrifices her own rights for the sake of her child. If she ever thought about it at all, she would

probably get no further than, "He's just mine." The workings of intuition are apparent on every hand and are an open book to the man who has eyes to read.

Even in those moments when we are convinced we are most rational, intuition finds its place. You can never wholly exclude it. In this connection, I must confess some of our well known writers have puzzled me. To take one typical and familiar instance, I have always found it difficult to reconcile George Eliot with herself. With the Christian doctrine of immortality she would have nothing whatever to do; she only believed in—

Joining the choir invisible,
Of those immortal deal who live again
In minds made better by their presence.

Did she not call herself an atheist? This is where my trouble begins. Why did she continue to read *The Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis? Why, with all the passion at her command, did she tell us about Dinah Morris preaching the gospel on a quiet village green? Was it not the product of intuition? And intuition is the chief dynamic of faith.

But faith is not simply the following of some uncharted course that intuition reveals. The intuition must lead to a positive belief, even if that belief should be subjective to begin with. What is the nature of that belief in its initial and elementary stage? Belief in what? I should be inclined to reply, belief in the spiritual nature of man and the universe. All that is necessary for the preservation of faith is the recognition of a spiritual order.

That phrase inevitably takes us back to the severe conflict that raged between science and religion in the nineteenth century. We all know how to some good people it seemed as if the new discoveries of science were destined to undermine the Christian faith. The spiritual life of man was thought to be in danger. Protoplasmic germs, geological aeons and evolutionary theories gave the saints a very miserable time. That was the situation confronting T. H. Green at Oxford when he set out to write his *Prolegomena to Ethics*. He began to plead for the preservation of the spiritual life, and declared that all that was essential for that, was the recognition of another order than the material. Which is exactly the point where faith begins.

The Christian faith is considerably strengthened by the consideration of some alternatives created by this definition. Is man to be considered a spiritual being? Or is he to be reduced to the dust of the material? Is the spirit or the mind that knows a thing to be put on the same level as the thing it knows? And according to the answers which men give to such questions, so the Christian Religion either lives or is killed.

Many writers and speakers are still telling us to-day that the Genesis story of the Fall is a myth; not merely the story but the conception which it embodies. The judge is called evolution, and according to his verdict man has risen, not fallen. The miracles of the Bible, such doctrines as those of the Virgin Birth and Heaven and Hell, are fiercely assailed. And when these have been successfully demolished, Christianity, they say, is buried. It is impossible to discuss these questions within the scope of this paper. But even if these claims were established to the satisfaction of everyone, they are scarcely fundamental to the preservation of faith. There are other questions still remaining. Is man spiritual? Is the universe spiritual? And so long as these can be answered in the affirmative, faith remains.

That, however, is but the beginning. The recognition of the spiritual has far-reaching consequences. When a man believes in himself as a spiritual being, he will want to make that belief virile, and therefore it will express itself in his conduct. His daily life will begin to reveal the spiritual. He can no longer treat himself as if he belonged only to the material. His spiritual needs will have to be provided for. New legislation will come into being, and the man will actually be saved.

He will be saved from too great an absorption in the passing temporal things of life. He will be saved from neglect of that spiritual kingdom of which he is a member. His very body will be saved from moral corruption. This faith will raise the standard of his ethics. Even death will be regarded by him as a liberation of the spirit, the going out of his spiritual nature into the spiritual universe that waits to receive us into its bosom.

Just here the objective element of faith is beginning to manifest itself. The man who has travelled thus far on the pilgrim pathway of the soul will find his faith rapidly extending. It is not within the scope of my present purpose to trace that further growth and development. But this much at least can be said. The man who treats himself as a spiritual being cannot avoid meeting Christ. And then the Kingdom of God will burst upon his vision; he will be impelled to follow Christ, for He is the symbol, the embodiment of all things spiritual. Divinity will be discovered in the dust and Christ at the centre and circumference of all life's common things.

R. GUY RAMSAY.

Former Secretaries of the Baptist Union.

I

FORMER SECRETARIES OF THE BAPTIST UNION.

- 1811—1819. *THOMAS, Rev. THOMAS, London. Died 1819.
1811—1821. *BUTTON, Rev. WILLIAM, London. Died August 2, 1821.
1811—1834. *IVIMEY, Rev. JOSEPH, London. Died February 8, 1834.
1832—1840. *BELCHER, Rev. JOSEPH, D.D., London. Removed to Halifax, Nova Scotia, December, 1843. Died 1859.
1834—1846. *MURCH, Rev. WILLIAM HARRIS, D.D., London. Died July 12, 1859.
1835—1882. *STEANE, Rev. EDWARD, D.D., London. Died May 8, 1882.
1841—1866. *HINTON, Rev. JOHN HOWARD, A.M., London. Died December 17, 1873.
1863—1877. *MILLARD, Rev. JAMES HENRY, B.A., Huntingdon. Died October 22, 1883.
1877—1879. BOOTH, Rev. SAMUEL HARRIS, London. Died April 7, 1902.
1880—1882. SAMPSON, Rev. WILLIAM, London. Died November 11, 1882.
1883—1898. BOOTH, Rev. SAMUEL HARRIS, D.D., London. Died April 7, 1902.

* Joint Secretaries.

THE *Baptist Hand Book* for the two years 1923 and 1924, in the table as given above, furnishes information as to the former Secretaries of the Baptist Union. Earlier issues, however, go no further back than 1832 and the secretariat of Dr. Belcher. Even Dr. Whitley, to whom we owe the inclusion of the three new names, dismisses the Union in "that day of small things" with the somewhat curt criticism, "It had no practical aim, no permanent officers, no inspiring leader. Not till 1831 did it attain any real importance . . . when it welcomed members from the New Connexion." (If the learned Doctor had belonged to the main stream rather than to the tributary, he might have expressed himself differently.) But as far back as 1863 John Howard Hinton, from the Chair of the Union, delivered as his swan song an address which might be briefly summarized by a not too friendly reviewer;—Among Baptists there was not any union, there never had been, and there never would be; and all the Union there was began in 1834, and had no relation to the annual social gathering of ministers dating from 1812.

In passing judgment, however, on the pioneers, their meagre design, and the early years of the Union's history, one needs to remember that we are dealing with a period when there were no motor cars, no railways, no telegraphs or telephones, when you

had to warn your correspondents that unless they prepaid their letters you could not afford to take them in, and that you yourself could not write unless you had matters of weight to communicate, and when the only possible means of communication between the scattered denominational leaders was the new *Baptist Magazine*, which in 1809 began to be published in Bristol. Further, Waterloo was three years ahead, and the aftermath of war! Happily there was an inspiring leader, and his name was Joseph Ivimey. He was the youngest of the three first Secretaries, being 38 years of age when an article from his pen appeared, in June 1811, in the *Baptist Magazine*, entitled, "Union Essential to Prosperity." He reminded his readers that a remarkable spirit of interdenominational union was abroad. In a few brief years, Bible, Tract, Missionary, Sunday School societies, had been founded,—largely by Baptist initiative,—and were supported by evangelical Christians generally. The intercourse furnished by their direction and control, and by their annual meetings, had fostered the spirit of union. And as for Baptists,—¹ "The Particular Baptist Missionary Society for propagating the Gospel among the heathen had passed like a magnet over our churches, and by powerfully attracting the particles of steel they contain has brought them to a point and united them into one object." The Baptist Assemblies of 1689 to 1693 had died out from want of the wider view, not seeking first the Kingdom. Now the unanimity which had been evoked by the missionary design was not merely a surprise but a heartening call to seek for some organization which should give this unanimity the means of expression, permanence and continual growth. ¹ "The Constitution of our Churches which prevents all external interference, preserving them independent of each other, requires some general bond of union, some mode of general association." The suggested plan was "That an Annual Association be held either in London, or at some of the larger and more central towns in the Country, composed of the ministers and messengers from the neighbouring Churches and of two deputies from every Association in the United Kingdom." The Missionary Society was to have its field day, with a report, and sermons and collections on its behalf; an account of itinerant labours in our own country was to be given by the Secretary of the Baptist Itinerant Society in London, and, amongst "many other things," funds were to be started for the support of our Seminaries, and for the relief of our aged and necessitous ministers. The following year the annual missionary sermons were, for the first time, preached on a week day, instead of a Sunday, making it possible for all the London ministers, as well as country visitors, to attend. The Dutch Church in Austin Friars was filled, Fuller and Ryland being the preachers, and £320 were collected for the Mission.

Fuller who had been doubtful, was overjoyed. The next morning, at 8 o'clock, a meeting was held in Dr. Rippon's Meeting House, Carter Lane, to take into consideration the proposed measure for an Annual General Assembly of the Particular Baptist Churches. Dr. Rippon was in the Chair, and the mere list of subjects he suggested for the consideration of future Assemblies almost takes one's breath away. The Union was formed. The first assembly was to be in London in 1813, on the last Wednesday and Thursday in June. London ministers were to act as a committee; Wm. Button and Joseph Ivimey were appointed Secretaries. The purpose of the Union thus formed was broadly and simply stated to be the promotion of the cause of Christ in general, the interest of the denomination in particular, and the encouragement and support of the Baptist Mission. The Baptist Union was like a stake, newly cut, driven into the hard soil of denominational life, and to which the Baptist Mission, the Itinerant (i.e., the Home) Mission, and the newly formed Irish Mission attached themselves more or less closely as their needs demanded. Like some stakes in my own garden, it was not always certain whether the stake held up the plants or the plants the stake, but as time went on it was discovered that the sap in the stake had induced it to send forth roots of its own, to bud and sprout, and to become at length a living and fruitful tree. Thomas Thomas so far has not been mentioned, and in the Union's story he is somewhat of a shadowy figure. A son of Timothy Thomas of Aberdare, he was born in 1759, and, giving evidence of early piety and usefulness, was baptized by his uncle Zechariah, and at the age of 18 entered Bristol Academy, for three years a fellow student of Robert Hall. His first pastorate was at Pershore, whence he came to London, to the church at Mill Yard, Goodman's Fields. In 1790 the Meeting House was burnt to the ground. During the rebuilding he and his people worshipped with Abraham Booth, and he remained as their pastor until the end of the century, when he removed to Peckham, and supplemented his income by starting a school in Mile End. In October, 1819, after a painful illness, he passed to his rest. He was the first Secretary of Stepney College, an office filled by him contemporaneously with that of the Union, and the College President, Dr. Newman, writes of him as his constant friend and companion, in public preaching excelling most of his brethren, lively but not light, serious and yet not sad, and possessing much more literary wealth than he showed to the world.

William Button was the oldest of the three pioneers; born at Peasemars, near Rye, Sussex, in 1754, his father being a farmer and a Presbyterian minister. When five years old he nearly died from small-pox, only recovering with the loss of the sight of his

right eye. At eight he was sent to John Ryland's school at Northampton, and at thirteen was baptized in the river, and the same day partook of the Lord's Supper, his religious life having been awakened by an Independent minister's sermon on "Suffer little children." Shortly afterwards the death of his mother, and the total destruction of his father's house and property, hastened his mental and religious maturity. He comes to London, joins Unicorn Yard, Southwark, begins to preach and, when he is only nineteen, is sent forth by the church to the public ministry, and preaches his first sermon in Unicorn Yard. An invitation to Tilehouse Street, Hitchin, after three months' probation, is declined in favour of the Separatists from Dr. Gill's Church who were taking up their abode in Dean Street. But during his stay in Hitchin he has been captured by, and captures, the late minister's daughter, who becomes the mother of their nine children. In a few years the growing family and his business capacity take him into the bookselling and publishing business in Paternoster Row, his name appearing as publishing the first volume of Ivimey's history, as well as on some of his own anonymous writings. His portrait shows a man of unusual refinement, with the grace and disposition of some distinguished court physician, but Ivimey, looking back on the good man's life, cannot refrain from saying that his absorption in business had been detrimental to his influence as a minister of the gospel, and probably it was the cause of the troubles which clouded the later years of his Dean Street pastorate and his retirement to Lewes in 1815. That year, when over sixty years of age, he had an operation for cataract which was so completely successful that he could read the smallest print without spectacles. Following upon his retirement, however, he met with serious financial losses, and his friends, rallying to his aid, collected a gift of £500, which brought to him the joy of friendship as well as material relief.

Of quite another make was Button's friend and comrade, Joseph Ivimey. Born in 1773 at Ringwood, Hants., he started in life with a meagre education, and a parental influence on the father's side which was definitely irreligious. Coming, however, under the direct influence of a godly aunt before he was eighteen, he was led to think earnestly and to good purpose on the verities of the gospel. Elisha Coles' *Practical Treatise on the Sovereignty of God* seems to have cleared his mind from the perplexities of hyper-Calvinism, and enabled him "to attain to that measure of purity of doctrine and steadfastness of belief, for which both in his private intercourse and as a Christian minister he was distinguished to the end of life." He was baptized and joined the church at Wimborne, nine miles from his home. In the following year he moved to Lyminster, where he worked at his trade as a

journeyman tailor, his open Bible at his side as he sat cross-legged on his board. He used his leisure to earn money beyond his usually meagre wage in order "to distribute to the necessities of the saints." He leads to vital godliness the man in whose house he is residing. His fervour in prayer, and the shrinking but clear expression of his mind on the meaning of some passage of Scripture, lead others to see him as one marked out for the office of the Christian ministry. A severe attack of smallpox, induced by inoculation, brought him to death's door. A visit of a few months to London made him resolve never to see the place again. Removing to Portsea in his twenty-third year, he married, and, starting a business of his own, for eight years he prospered and bore an unblemished reputation. His success gave him the leisure for an itinerant ministry, which culminated at the end of his thirtieth year in the church to whose communion he was united conferring upon him the public recognition of a Christian minister. His first staled charge was at Wallingford, where, after disposing of his business, he became the coadjutor of the Rev. Mr. Lovegrove. But he was not destined to hide his light in village work. Within a year he has removed with his family to London, and is preaching for two months at Eagle Street Chapel, London, as a probationer, and with a view to his being chosen pastor of the church. Thus began a ministry of quite unusual force and fruitfulness, which lasted until his death in 1834. In twenty-nine years he added to the membership of Eagle Street Church 800 members, and was instrumental in sending into the ministry 20 young men. From what we see of him in early life, fully consecrated as his powers were to his divine Lord, no less was to be expected. Of medium height, broadly built, athletic, with exhaustless energy, with a great voice, a clear, logical mind, a love of nature, a dash of poetry in his making, a compassion that overflowed conventional barriers,—he was just the man to stir the mind and heart of his hearers and to build out of the youth of old London a strong and active church. What is really surprising is the amount of literary and secretarial work which he was able to accomplish side by side with such faithful pastoral labours. The truth is that the time that many pastors spend running all over the country, preaching anniversary sermons, Ivimey spent among his books and at his desk. He was only thirty-three when the first volume of his *Baptist History* was in the press, the first of four quarto volumes bringing the story down to his own day, and occupying much of his leisure for twenty more years. He was a frequent contributor to the *Baptist Magazine*, and one of its editors for nearly twenty years. He crossed swords with Robert Hall and F. A. Cox, in letters and lectures, over the subject of open or close Communion at the

Lord's Table. He wrote an excellent life of John Milton. He edited and annotated Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, and later wrote a third part in continuation of the story, with Christiana's children as the heroes. And these are but a small part of his literary labours. In addition to the Secretariat of the National Assembly, he was Joint Secretary with Wm. Button of the ministers' weekly meeting for intercourse and conference, and he was founder and secretary for nearly twenty years of the Irish Baptist Mission. We have referred to his father. It was Ivimey's joy quite late in their life to witness the baptism of his father and his mother, who had long been a humble follower of Jesus. Eighteen months before Ivimey's death, Joseph Belcher had been appointed to act with him as Secretary; and two years later William Harris Murch, and the following year Edward Steane, were added to the staff. Mr. Belcher occupied the pastorate at Chelsea at the time of his appointment, and later at Greenwich. He was somewhat of an author, and published biographies of Carey and Whitfield. His later years were spent in America.

Murch was born at Honiton in 1784. He was "a boy preacher," and as such was admitted to the academy at Wymondley as a ministerial student. Fuller's *Life of Samuel Pearce* was the means of bringing him into the evangelical faith, and in 1802 Dr. Rippon baptized him at Carter Lane. Leaving college two years later, he declined various invitations to the ministry on account of his youth, but finally yielded to one from Frome, and became, first, John Foster's assistant and then his successor. After twenty years of labour in that quiet town, he was called to be the President and Theological Tutor of Stepney College, and Brown University, U.S.A., granted him the diploma of Doctor of Divinity. Failing health led to his resignation of the anxious and arduous duties of the college, and of the Baptist Board, and a little later of the Baptist Union. But he did seven years' further service in the pastorate at Rickmansworth, and a few years after his retirement in 1851 he proceeded to Bath, where he assisted in the formation of the church known as Kensington, of which Dr. O. Winslow was the pastor.

Edward Steane, born in Oxford in 1798, where his father was a Baptist deacon, was a student under Dr. Ryland for a couple of years, and then proceeded to Edinburgh for a similar period. There he soon made the acquaintance of Christopher Anderson who, when absent or unwell, relied on young Steane to take his pulpit. Many invitations to settle came his way, but he was finally drawn to what was a new sphere in Camberwell, where Joseph Gutteridge had bought a little meeting-house as the site of the prospective building. There, pastor to a church of twenty and preacher to a congregation of thirty, he began his life's work,

and at Midsummer, 1825, the fine new chapel was opened. ¹ "The full story of spiritual life and service begun that day is only written in heaven. The burning moments, the surprises, the keen pangs and pleasures of young and fervent ministerial life; what intensities of prayer and preaching have been felt in this place; how many hard hearts have been broken, and broken hearts have been healed; and how many have been the transactions here, causing joy in the presence of angels, are mysteries only known to the Master of Assemblies." Frequent illness and the death of Mrs. Steane in 1862 sent him to live at New Park House, between Watford and Chipperfield. His life was prolonged, thanks mainly to the tender care of the second Mrs. Steane, and his position as Secretary to the Union was nominally retained until his death in 1882. Four years after his first election as Secretary, the Bible Society reversed its earlier policy, and withdrew its support to the Bengali and other versions of the Scriptures produced by Baptist missionaries. The writing of the remonstrance was committed to Mr. Steane, and those who were best able to judge its worth, described it as courteous, scrupulously fair, scholarly, vigorous, convincing, unanswered, and unanswerable. The Baptist Translation Society was formed, and he became its first Secretary. In 1845 he took a major part in the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, and was for years its leading spirit, editing its organ and annual reports, framing its resolutions, and placing his administrative and diplomatic abilities at its service in its delicate negotiations with foreign governments.

* C. Stamford, colleague from 1858.

C. M. HARDY.

(To be continued.)

The Gospel Minister's Maintenance Vindicated.

AMONG the voluminous writings of that all too little known Baptist, Benjamin Keach (1640-1704), is a small book entitled *The Gospel Minister's Maintenance Vindicated* (1689), probably the only extant copy of which is to be found in the Angus Library at Regent's Park College. This little treatise, compact both in size and in subject matter, yields an excellent example of the value of antiquarian research. It deals with a perpetually recurring question with such sanity of judgment, breadth of outlook, and intelligent conviction, that one is inclined after perusal to concur in the practice of Gladstone, who is said, whenever a new book was published, to have re-read an old one. Here then is an old book handling one of our practical religious problems for us in an altogether admirable way, if we are prepared to make allowance for the old-fashioned style of presentation.

The book had its origin, according to Crosby (*Hist.* v. 4 p. 294ff.), in the selection of Keach in 1688 by a number of ministers to write upon the subject of Ministers' Maintenance.¹ He quotes also the letter of recommendation "to the Congregations of Baptized Believers in England and Wales," which follows the title page in the book itself. This letter, signed by Hanserd Knollys, William Kiffin, William Collins, John Harris, George Barret, Richard Adams, Benjamin Keach, Isaac Lamb, Edward Man, Leonard Harrison, and Hercules Collins, bears the inscription, "London, July 30, 1681," which would, on Crosby's evidence and on other grounds, seem to be an error of the printer for 1688. In the course of the letter the earnest desire is expressed "that our Brethren, both Ministers and Members, would be pleased to get this little book, and both read and well weigh what is said therein, without prejudice . . . that it may be blessed by JEHOVAH to the great and good ends it is designed." Crosby further records that in 1689 an assembly from above 100 churches "debated whether it is the duty of every church to maintain such ministers as are set apart by them;" decided in the affirmative; and "declared their approbation of a certain little book,

¹ "How most Baptist pastors supported themselves we are not informed, but we may safely say that they earned their own living, and were not supported by the churches, for no accounts that survive show more than small sums paid, enough in the country to pay horse-hire, or in town to pay rent." (Whitley, *Hist.*, p. 132 of previous period.)

lately recommended by divers Elders dwelling in and about the City of London." (This recommendation "by divers Elders" appears on the title page of the book itself.) They further directed its circulation through the churches, and sent also a general epistle recommending the duty of congregations in this respect. From all this it will appear that the question of a ministry adequately equipped and maintained was of no small importance for the days of opportunity which opened with the new era of religious liberty in 1688.

In addition to the title page and the letter of recommendation already referred to, the book contains, beside the main treatise, an incomplete list of errata, an excellent summary of the main arguments of the "Vindication," and an advertisement to the reader. This, referring to the 38th Article of Religion in the Church of England Prayer Book, repudiates strongly the allegation there laid against certain Anabaptists, that they believe in a community of riches and goods among Christians, and goes on to say, "We know none called Anabaptists in England nor anywhere else, who hold that absurd or rotten principle, but do testify our dislike and abhorrence of it."

The aim of the treatise itself is, as the title page informs us, first of all to assert "a regular ministry in the churches," and to answer "the objections against a Gospel maintenance for ministers"; next, to open "the dignity, necessity, difficulty, use and excellency of the ministry of Christ"; and, finally, clearly to evince "the nature and weightiness of that sacred work and office." That the aim is achieved the following brief survey will perhaps show. The warrant for a regular ministry is found in Christ's own solemn appointment of "Apostles and Disciples to bear that part of the work with Him, which He called them to and fitted them for" (Mark iii. 13, Matt. x. 2, Luke vi. 12-13). This ministry He instituted by the choice of the Twelve and the sending forth of the Seventy; confirmed after His resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 18-20); continued through the express command of the Apostles, who "ordained them elders in every church" (Acts xiv. 23, Tit., i. 5); and finally vested in the Church herself the power and authority "to provide ministers for her own edification, in obedience to His commands, and rules given in His Word." The Church must therefore see to it that she duly appoint ministers; that she appoint only men whose qualifications are such as those named in 1 Tim. iii. 1-9; and that "when the church has had trial of the meetness and abilities of any person or persons for this work and service, they are by election and choice solemnly to set him or them apart by prayer and laying on of hands; by which a new relation ariseth of an Elder and a Church, a Pastor and a Flock," the duties of each relation be-

coming mutually binding upon them according to the laws of Christ.

While the author is desirous that every Church should show a real anxiety to have officers according to Gospel rule, and that those whom they choose as ministers should be competently qualified for their high office, his main business is, he tells us, "not only to assert the ministers' maintenance to be an institution of Christ, but also to prove it so to be, and that to withhold it from them by a Church, who is able comfortably to provide for them, is a great and crying sin, and will be attended, we fear (unless prevented by an unfeigned repentance and reformation) with severe judgment from the Holy God, who will not always bear with the ignorant, much less the wilful, neglect of His own Holy Law, contained so expressly in His Sacred Word." This forceful utterance he supplements by thirteen arguments drawn from Scripture and so definite that he doubts "whether there is any duty lies more clear and evident in Holy Scripture than this doth." Briefly put, the arguments are as under:—

1. When Jesus sent forth His Apostles to preach he indicated His will that they should not spend nor waste their own substance (Matt. x. 9-10).

2. This maintenance is not of the Apostles', nor of the Church's, but of God's appointing. "Even so hath the Lord ordained that those that preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 14). God's will and ordinance under the New Testament is as binding as under the Old. Again, the same apostle elsewhere says, "Let him that is taught in the Word communicate to Him that teacheth, in all good things," and adds the solemn warning, "Be not deceived, God is not mocked," etc. (Gal. vi. 6-7), in order "to terrify those who find out vain and false excuses to save their purses."

3. The minister is commanded to attend wholly upon his work (2 Tim. ii. 4). All his time is little enough for that great task. "His mind must no more be diverted from it by the thorny cares of a necessitous condition, than by the thoughts that accompany worldly business, though tending to his profit.

4. He must indeed be protected from the scandal, which, though often unjustly, is daily ready to attend men who follow secular employments. The minister's being in debt, or exposed to the breach of his word in the way of trading, will lay him open to the charge, "Physician, heal thyself," and so will destroy the power of his ministry over the consciences of men.

5. Equity and justice demand that the Church should provide for its ministers, as Paul shows the Corinthians (1 Cor. ix. 7, etc.), in three common examples. "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charge?" "Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not

the fruit thereof?" "Who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" It is not charity that is now demanded, but common equity, which would readily be conceded in the ordinary walks of life.

6. Men are chosen for the ministry, not from the lowest of the people, but from those who possess ability for business, and "who could . . . get estates as well as you if they were not devoted to a better service." Furthermore, ministers, as much as other men, must provide for their families, and unless they be properly maintained they must either neglect their full duty to Christ and the Church, or else neglect their poor families by fulfilling their ministry.

7. Ministers under the old law were provided for by the Lord; so He has ordered that they should live comfortably now under the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 13-14). Indeed, their portion under the Law exceeded that of their brethren, but this is abrogated, and Gospel ministers have no divine right to the tenths of men's increase. Since present demands are so much less exacting than under the old Law, we should with cheerfulness discharge our duty.

8. A pastor must be hospitable, and so an example of charity and other good works. If he fail therein he loses some part of those excellent virtues in which he should shine. Churches should, therefore, make their ministers capable of giving proof of this grace.

9. The honourable discharge of this duty is one of those things which are "honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report." (Phil. iv. 8). Both virtue and praise attend it. Its due observance will give completeness to the obedience we render to Christ's ordinances; will deliver from the reproach of covetousness, and will raise the reputation of the ministry (1 Tim. v. 17-18); maintenance being undoubtedly part of the double honour due to such as labour in the Word and doctrine.

10. He argues for discharge of the duty of maintenance from the inconveniences which attend its neglect.

(a) There are some ministers who were brought up to learning, and are utterly unable to follow a secular calling. What will become of them?

(b) Such cases act as a positive deterrent to the young and gifted, who might otherwise seek to enter the ministry. Any such loss injures the Church of God.

11. Neglect of contribution to the public worship of God, and to ministers' maintenance is a robbing of God (Mal. iii. 8-10), and may bring a blast of judgment upon men's estates.

12. It is a shame to God's people to suffer the Heathens and Papists to do more to uphold idolatry, than they do to uphold the

true worship of the Living God. Divine grace should make us more bountiful than the hope of acquiring merit, which is said to be the reason for Papistical devotion.

13. The discharge of this duty will render your ministers inexcusable, if they do not faithfully discharge their duties in every respect to God and His people, and not only so, but will render you able with comfort to give up your accounts to Christ.

Further reinforcements of these arguments are to be found in the enumeration of four motives which urge the discharge of the duty of maintenance.

1. Ministers are the ambassadors of Christ. What is done to them is done to Him. Love for Him must show itself in worthy treatment of His ministers.

2. Seeing that ministers "watch for our souls as they that must give account" (Heb. xiii. 17), we ought to see that their bodily needs are well supplied, that they may be free from the blood of all men, and may give their account with joy.

3. Ministers are exposed to peculiar temptations and discouragements incidental to their work. They should therefore be strengthened and encouraged, not left to serve in wants and necessities.

4. Ministers are at liberty to forbear from working, if the Churches can provide for them and they faithfully discharge their duty.

Keach's next concern is to meet the objections and to answer the questions that arise from the consideration of his subject. In so doing he touches upon several problems which are of interest and importance to us to-day. Among them is the case of the Church which is unable adequately to support a minister. What is to be done? His answer is threefold:—

- (a) They may make known their condition to sister Churches, with a view to receiving assistance; but if none is forthcoming, and the Church is already doing its utmost for its minister, he must then be content to suffer with his people.
- (b) A plentifully blessed congregation is obliged to do more than relieve the bare necessities of its minister.
- (c) It should seriously be considered whether a people unable to provide for a ministry should constitute themselves into a Church at all.

We could wish that the dissenting bodies of those days had met in solemn conclave for discussion of, and action upon, this third point. To the failure clearly to realize the importance of the question which Keach here raises, we owe the existence of one of our most difficult practical problems to-day. Up and down our land there exist numberless little churches of this type, for whose

spiritual welfare provision has to be made. In many villages, and in some towns, there exist two, three, and sometimes more of these small causes, indifferently attended, poorly organized, spiritually defective, and incapable of making any real impression upon the life of the locality in which they are placed. To keep open these struggling churches the supply of preachers, workers and money has to be duplicated, and sometimes triplicated, without any adequate result. Four miles from the home of the present writer there is a village of just over a thousand inhabitants, which contains no less than five Nonconformist places of worship. All of them are eking out a precarious existence, and not one is able to support even a part time ministry. The deplorable result of this dissipation of forces is evident. The churches are poorly attended, and served only by local preachers of varying ability. Neither systematic Biblical and Free Church teaching, nor pastoral visitation, is possible. The Communion of the Lord's Supper is irregularly observed. Churchmembership is emasculated of its meaning. Sunday school work, because of the inevitable overlapping, is necessarily inefficient in scope and quality. By this quintriplication energy is wasted and expenditure incurred, which no business concern would tolerate for one moment. All this because the point which Keach here raises failed in the past to receive the attention it deserved. This is neither the time nor the place to suggest remedies for the present conditions; one must be content to offer the following proposition of Keach for the serious consideration of Baptist and Congregational Churches, Associations, and Moderators, with a view to some practical solution along the lines he indicates. "For a people to put themselves into a Church state is one of the most weightiest (sic) things in the world, and ought with as great care and consideration to be done; we concluding in some places where there are many churches near to each other, it would be far better for some of those small and insufficient societies to unite themselves to some other congregation; and by that means the whole of their indispensable duties and obligations that are incumbent on them would, with much more ease, be borne and answered, to the honour of Christ, reputation of the Gospel, and their own edification."

The question as to the obligation of churches to remunerate ministers who possess ample means of their own, seems to have been a burning one in Keach's day. He treats it in two different places in his book, and his answer is characteristic. "Certainly they (i.e. wealthy pastors), if of Paul's spirit, will refuse to receive anything, lest it should lessen their esteem in the ministry; 'tis left to their liberty; they may choose whether they will receive it or not. But though they may dispense with their right if they

please . . . yet cannot you dispense with your duty; you have no warrant so to do." Thus clearly does he vindicate the principle for which he has contended, even in the apparently vexed case of the wealthy pastor.

Another question, which Keach dismisses more briefly, is as to the remuneration of the occasional preacher. "May every one that preaches expect an allowance, though they preach but now and then?" Here is a problem which is receiving a certain amount of consideration to-day, especially with reference to the services of local preachers, and speakers at P.S.A.'s and Brotherhoods. The present writer has reason to believe that in some cases the practice of giving a fee to these speakers has been adopted with satisfactory results from the point of view of the churches concerned. A better standard has been achieved, and, under the remunerative system, can be demanded, than obtained under voluntary conditions. He is of opinion that much could be done along these lines, by a proper co-ordination of local preachers' associations, towards the better intellectual equipment of these brethren. If every duly recognized local preacher received even a small fee this could either be used independently, or be put into a "pool" for the purchase of books bearing directly upon his work as a preacher, which otherwise might be beyond his means to obtain. The wise oversight and advice of College Principals would ensure that only books of real and immediate value found their way into the hands of the men concerned. Keach's answer to the question is short and non-committal. "That must be left to the wisdom and consideration of the church; who ought to consider the person's circumstances, with the call he hath to preach, etc. But principally it belongs to those who are set apart to that work, whose strength and time is taken up about the great affairs of Christ and the Gospel."

As we should expect from a man who argues so ably for an adequate maintenance for the Gospel minister, Keach has an exalted ideal of the ministry. This is evident throughout the book, but seeing—as he himself says—"we have a little room, we shall add some brief hints further, to show the great charge and work of a true Gospel minister, and so conclude." The greatness of this work is shown in the facts that we are ambassadors for Christ; fellow workers with Christ, "sent to treat with poor sinners about eternal matters"; "a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish," being bound by necessity to give warning to men of their wickedness, lest their blood be required at our hands. We are stewards also, both of the mysteries of God, and of the churches and the doctrine of the Gospel, in which it is required that we be faithful. Our work is at once laborious and dignified. We are planters, builders, and

labourers; we are also called fathers, angels, ambassadors, stars, and rulers. It is so difficult that a man with all his acquired parts is not sufficient in himself for its demands. The difficulties of the work lie partly in our own imperfect nature, partly in the character of our work, which is mysterious: witness the mystery of Godliness, the mystery of the Incarnation, the mystery of faith, all of which we are required to study. This work calls also for care and exactness. (Everything must be done according to the holy pattern set by Christ in the Gospel.) It demands grace and wisdom; time and diligence. (A slothful or idle person is not fit to be a minister). Difficulties arise also from the oppositions and obstructions we meet with, from our own hearts, from sin, from Satan, from the world, from persecutors. "Is it not needful then, think you, that your poor ministers be thought upon, and encouraged by you as Christ hath appointed?"

The book concludes with an exhortation to "our Fellow Labourers," which we quote in full. "Brethren, let us strive to double our diligence, and show to all (that) the sense of the greatness of our work is upon our spirits; and though we have not that encouragement from the people, that God has ordained; yet, remember we serve a good Master: besides, a necessity is laid upon us, we must preach the Gospel; and let us be contented with that state and portion we meet with in the world; 'tis our great business to approve ourselves the ministers of Christ, 'in labours, in watchings, in fastings, by pureness, by knowledge, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of Truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand, and on the left; by honour and dishonour; by evil report and good report'" (2 Cor. vi. 5-8).

A. J. KLAIBER.

¹ Baxter as Preacher and Pastor.

DR. POWICKE, in his *Life of Richard Baxter*, seems to have achieved the very difficult task of appealing both to a popular and to an antiquarian audience. Members of both sections of the reading public will take up the book, some with a desire for further information on Baxter the man and the preacher, some to take full advantage of Dr. Powicke's researches in the valuable Baxter MSS. in the Dr. Williams' Library. In the present article we propose to limit our interest to what Dr. Powicke has to say about the famous pastor and preacher in his Kidderminster days, reserving for subsequent notice that which will be of special interest to Baptist readers, the controversy with John Tombes of Bewdley on Baptism.

In one sense it is an advantage that Dr. Powicke has practically limited his survey to Baxter's Kidderminster days, for he has been able to deal with the ministry of that period in a very full and entertaining manner. Preachers of the present time will read with great interest about the methods of Baxter both in the pulpit and out of it. "True Pastors and Bishops of the Church," wrote Baxter, "do thirst after the conversion and happiness of sinners and spend their lives in diligent labours to these ends, not thinking it too much to stoop to the poorest for their good, nor regarding worldly wealth and glory in comparison with the winning of one soul, nor counting their lives dear if they might finish their course and ministry with joy." Baxter always preached with vehement intensity: the sermon was never less than an hour long, and generally read from a closely written manuscript. It is interesting to notice that then, as now, there were those who objected to the reading of sermons—the Quakers alleging that to read a sermon was evidence of the lack of the Spirit. Baxter rejoined that not want of ability made a preacher read his sermons, but rather a regard to the work and the good of the hearers. He believed that the preacher's aim should be to convince the understanding and then to engage the heart—first light, then heat. It is refreshing to find that while his converts were of all ages he had considerable success among the young. He claims that the young formed the greater number of his converts and tells how frequently the children were able to induce their parents into a liking and love of Piety. Clearly the young people of those days, or at any rate the young people

¹ *A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter, 1615—1691.* F. J. Powicke. Jonathan Cape, 15s. net.

of Kidderminster, were a good deal more tolerable of long sermons than are their modern successors.

Baxter has given us an account of his own success, and what he considered to be the main reasons for it. When he went to Kidderminster, about one family per street worshipped God, he says, but when he left there were some streets where every household was of godly profession. His services were fully attended,—“On the Lord’s Day there was no disorder to be seen in the Streets, but you might hear a Hundred Families singing Psalms and repeating Sermons, as you passed through the Streets.” Among the causes of his success Baxter gives the following: the open field for work provided by the Cromwellian settlement: he came to a people not “Gospel-hardened,” a people who had not been used to good Gospel preaching: the influence of the numbers of the converted, together with their holy living: his own personal situation. He mentions “the acceptation of his Person,” though in no boasting way, and we can well understand his popularity when we note his whole-hearted interest in the practical expression of the Gospel he preached. A large part of his salary, together with what came to him through his literary work, he gave away. He maintained some of the needy children at the universities. “And I found that Three pence or a Groat to every poor body that askt me was no great matter in a year.” He considered his single state to be a blessing (he did not marry till 1662). “I could the easilier take the People for my children, and think all that I had too little for them, in that I had no children of my own to tempt me to another way of using it.” He refused, as he put it, “to meddle with Tythes or Worldly Business.” He found that “Nature itself, being conscious of the Baseness of its Earthly disposition, doth think basely of those whom it discerneth to be earthly, and is forced to reverence those whose converse is supposed to be most with God and Heaven.” We feel that here Baxter is putting his finger on a weakness of much pastoral life of to-day. It is the unfortunate case in many of our ministries that the pastor is compelled, by lack of suitable lay service, to spend too much of his time in the business management of the Church. This side of Baxter’s ministry may be commended to our laity to-day. One more point on this head—he thought it an advantage to him that he had a long pastorate, “for he that removeth oft from place to place may sow good seed in many places, but is not like to see much Fruit in any, unless some other skilful hand shall follow him to water it.”

The recounting of these points in his method will indicate how very “modern” Baxter was. There is nothing here of antiquated method: he is alive to the real needs of men and women, quick to discern the best point of approach, wise to apportion his time

to the best spiritual advantage. Like many another great man, his best work was often accomplished in spite of physical disability. Whatever advantage he enjoyed from his earlier single state, he seems to have suffered many distresses, and even when we read of them we cannot repress a smile, so quaint is his description of his malady and his search for ease. As a boy, he tells us, he ate Apples and Plums in great quantities, and this resulted in certain disorders. Doctors he tried—more than six and thirty in all, but they made matters worse. Permanent relief came to him through the use of simple remedies, and he gives us a delightful description of his successful recipe—Temperance as to quantity and quality of Food, exercise until he perspired freely, “for if I walk not hard, with almost all my strength, an hour before Dinner and an hour after supper, till I sweat well, I am not able to digest two meals.” “Beer as hot as my Throat will endure, drunk all at once, to make me Sweat.” This is a very humorous side to the picture of the great man, but underlying it all there is a very fine spirit. Baxter grew to regard pain as an “Unvaluable mercy.” It “greatly weakened Temptations; it kept me in a great contempt of the world; it taught me highly to esteem of Time; it made me study and preach things necessary and a little stirred up my sluggish heart, to speak to Sinners with some compassion, as a dying Man to dying Men.” There is a fine moral strength in all this which helps us to understand in some measure his great success in what we may call the personal ministry.

This personal ministry he considered to be of paramount importance. He was a great believer in following up the instruction from the Pulpit by pastoral care. He became enthusiastic for catechising. Week after week, together with his helpers, he assiduously visited the homes of his people. “Every soul in the Parish was approached with a view to its conversion, or edification. Copies of the Catechism were delivered to every family, rich and poor alike. They were delivered by one of the Ministers personally—this was the first step. Then it was understood that a month or six weeks later, the Minister would call again and begin the questioning.” Baxter knew what it was to have people in his congregation for years who “know not whether Christ be God or Man, and wonder when I tell them the story of His birth, life, and death, as if they had never heard it before.” When it is remembered that in addition to his preaching, his controversies (which he regarded as an aid to his work, helping to unify his people), his pastoral work, he found time to enrich our literature with so many books—he wrote over one hundred—it will be agreed that he spent his time wisely and well.

The picture which Dr. Powicke has drawn is well worth our study. We have designedly omitted references to Baxter’s con-

troversies, his apostleship of Church Unity in a very dangerous time, and have restricted ourselves to the picture of his work as preacher and pastor. A recent writer in the *Times* remarks, "So long as men respect conscientiousness, undaunted courage, sound learning, saintly character, and persistent endeavour to unite all but extremists, Baxter must be remembered." We notice that *The Reformed Pastor* is among the books which probationer Ministers of the Wesleyan Church are required to read. Ministers of any denomination might do far worse than turn over the pages of Baxter, for this commanding figure in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time speaks with a vigour and a truth which are needed just as much to-day. Dr. Powicke promises to return to the later period of Baxter's life in another volume, and we hope that it may not be long delayed.

List of Members.

- ADAMS, G. R., 13, Soudan Road, Battersea Park, S.W.
ANGUS LIBRARY, The, c/o Principal, Regent's Park College.
ADCOCK, J. H., 34, Sandringham Road, Dalston, E.8.
ACWORTH, J. H., 129, Scalby Road, Scarborough.
ALNWICK, ARTHUR B., 120, Manor House Road, Jesmond, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
BLOMFIELD, Rev. Prin., B.A., D.D., The College, Rawdon, nr. Leeds.
BOWSER, Rev. S., B.A., "Blencathara," 107, Ashby Road, Loughborough.
BAPTIST UNION LIBRARY, 4, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.
BAPTIST HISTORICAL COLLECTION, Colgate Univ., Hamilton, New York, U.S.A.
BROOKSBANK, Rev. J. H., "Rawdon," Grove Road, Leighton Buzzard.
BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC LIBRARIES, Reference Department.
BEST, WILLIAM, 29, Hayne Road, Beckenham, Kent.
BLIGHT, F. J., F.R.S.E., "Tregenna," Wembley, Middlesex.
BONSER, Rev. H., 61, St. Michael's Lane, Headingley, Leeds.
BATES, FRANK, 19, Holly Road, Northampton.
BRADLEY, WILLIAM, J.P., Taymouth House, Dover.
BRYAN, Rev. F. C., M.A., Dudley Villa, Victoria Park, Herne Bay.
CARLILE, Rev. J. C., C.B.E., D.D., 23, Connaught Road, Folkestone.
CHIVERS, J., J.P., Wychfield, Cambridge.
CALDWELL, Rev. S., 71, Windsor Road, Oldham.
CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY, 14, Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
CHOWN, Rev. J. LESLIE, "Longfield," Compton Road, Wolverhampton.
CLEAVER, A. R., 44, East Park Parade, Northampton.
COURTIER, C. L., 4, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.
CLAYTON, BRIDGE B., 111, Whalley Road, Accrington, Lancs.
CALDICOTT, F. C., 3, Warwick Avenue, Coventry.
COLES, A. R., 28, Albert Road, Worcester.
CRISPIN, Rev. Wm., "Brynaderyn," Battledown Approach, Cheltenham.
CRISPIN, Mrs., "Brynaderyn," Battledown Approach, Cheltenham.
CHARTER, Rev. H. J., B.A., B.D., B.M.S., Colombo.
COATS, Mrs. JOSEPH, 20, Queensborough Gardens, Glasgow.
CLOUTMAN, Mr. and Mrs. A. B., 19, South Grove, Highgate, London.
CARTER, F. C., 71, Middle Lane, Hornsey, N.8.
COATS, Rev. R. H., M.A., B.D., 32, Radnor Road, Handsworth, Birmingham.
CURTIS, J. A., J.P., 20, Barclay Road, Fulham, London, S.W.6.
CHILD, R. L., B.D., "Trafford," Gratton Road, Cheltenham.
COOMBES, Rev. A. H., B.A., "Tynings," Bratton, Wilts.
COLLIER, H. H., 42, Hereford Road, Acton, London, W.3.
DOUGLAS, Rev. T., Upwell, Wisbech, Cambs.

- DAVIES, L. E., London City & Midland Bank, Bridgwater.
DAKIN, Rev. Dr., Baptist College, Bristol.
DAWSON, Rev. J. T., B.A., The Manse, 21, School Road, Moseley, B'Ham.
DIGHT, Rev. E. H., 222, Welford Road, Leicester.
DANIEL, Rev. E. H., B.A., 34, Russell Street, Reading.
DAVIES, ARTHUR, "The Woodlands," Warwick Avenue, Coventry.
DANIEL, Rev. J., 3, Balfour Road, Walmer, Kent.
EWING, Rev. J. W., M.A., D.D., 40, Grove Park, Denmark Hill, S.E.
EDMONDS, Rev. T., B.A., 36, Haughton Road, Handsworth, Birmingham.
EDWARDS, Rev. HARRI, Dean House, Raglan, Mon.
ELLIS, Rev. ERNEST E., The Old Rectory, Tilton, near Leicester.
FARRAR, Rev. Prof., B.A., 72, Grafton Road, Acton, London, W.3.
FARRER, Miss, M.A., 21, Rudall Crescent, Hampstead, N.W.
FRIENDS' REFERENCE LIBRARY, 136, Bishopsgate Street, E.C.
FOWLER, J., 34, Catherine Street, Salisbury.
FRY, CLARENCE, "Fern Leigh," Roby, Liverpool.
FRANCIS, H. W., "Cleveland," Gordon Road, Sundridge Park, S.E.4.
FOULDS, L. P., c/o Miss Robinson, Larchmont, Clayton, near Bradford.
GOULD, H. P., J.P., Saxlingham, near Norwich.
GLASS, Rev. Prof., M.A., Dial House, Rawdon, near Leeds.
GORDON, Rev. ALEX., M.A., 35, Rosemary Street, Belfast.
GLOUCESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY, Gloucester.
GREEN, C. T., J.P., 183, Willesden Lane, London, N.W.6.
GOULD LIBRARY, c/o Principal, Regent's Park College, London, N.W.
GOODWIN, W., 101, Toothill Road, Loughborough.
GLASGOW B.U. LIBRARY, per Miss V. Coats, 209, Bath Street, Glasgow.
GREENING, Rev. E. B., 68, Burlington Avenue, Kew Gardens, Surrey.
GODFREY, Rev. J. R., 91, Evington Road, Leicester.
GRAHAM, A., Station House, Bensham, Gateshead-on-Tyne.
GODFREY, Rev. E. W., The Parks, Minehead, Somerset.
HARRIS, E. H., "Southlynn," St. Mark's Road, Salisbury.
HASLAM, Prin. W. J., New College, Harrogate, Yorks.
HOOPER, T. R., A.R.I.B.A., Redhill, Surrey.
HASLAM, W. G., North Lees, Duffield Road, Derby.
HALEY, G. H., 10, Heathfield Place, Halifax.
HORLICK, Rev. B. E., M.A., Baptist Manse, Bradninch, near Cullompton.
HENSON, R. HOWARD, 164, Station Road, Redhill, Surrey.
HARDY, Rev. C. M., B.A., "St. Albans," Bridgefield Road, Sutton, Surrey.
HEMMENS, H. L., 28, Nithdale Road, Plumstead, S.E.18.
HEATH, Rev. F. R. W., The Baptist Manse, Southminster, Essex.
HATTEN, G. E., 64, Stourvale Road, W. Southbourne, Bournemouth.
HYDE, GEO., Cleveland House, 21, York Place, Harrogate.
HORNE, Counc. J., 21, Montgomerie Terrace, Ayr, Scotland.
HYDE, Rev. NORMAN M., M.A., B.Sc., 138, Whitehall Road, Norwich.
HENDERSON, D. F., 42, Maria Street, Kirkcaldy, N.B.

- HOUGH, Rev. W. E., 5, Oxford Road, West Bromwich, Staffs.
 HANCOCK, W. F., "Rotherwood," Elstree, Herts.
 IRELAND, W. L., 23, Abbotshall Road, Kirkcaldy.
 JOHNSON, AUSTIN H., The Squire Law Library, Cambridge.
 JONES, Rev. W. H., B.D., Rakehead House, Stacksteads, Bacup.
 JONES, Rev. T. H., B.D., 3, Laureston View, Douglas, I.O.M.
 JOHNSON, Rev. T. J., B.D., 861, Burnley Road, Lumb, Waterfoot, Lancs.
 KNOTT, HAROLD, M.A., 14, Rathen Road, Withington, near Manchester.
 KLAIBER, Rev. A. J., M.C., B.D., Markyate, Dunstable.
 KIRBY, F. J., "Winterlea," Brockenhurst Road, Ramsgate.
 LANGLEY, Rev. A. S., F.R.Hist.S., Coseley, Bilston, Staffs.
 LEEDS CENT. FREE LIBRARY, Leeds.
 LASLETT, Rev. G. H. R., "Beckworth," Park Avenue, Watford.
 LORD, Rev. F. T., B.A., B.D., 17, Stuart Road, Acton, W.3.
 LINZEY, A. ROBERT, Downhayes Cottage, Trowbridge.
 LAWS, Rev. GILBERT, 14, Blake Road, East Croydon.
 LORD, J., 15, Haywood Street, Accrington.
 LEWIS, Dr. W. O., 48, Rue de Lille, Paris, VII.
 LOVERIDGE, Rev. S. MOSS, 1, Southbroom Terrace, Devizes, Wilts.
 LAYCOCK, Mrs. H., Chellow Garth, Birkby Hall Road, Huddersfield.
 LEAR, Rev. J. P., M.A., The Manse, Love Lane, Pinner, Middlesex.
 LONGHURST, S. W., 9, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.
 LEWIS, Rev. F. G., The American Bap. Hist. Soc., Chester, Pa., U.S.A.
 MACBEATH, Rev. J., M.A., 55, Wallwood Road, London, E.11.
 MARNHAM, H., Frognal Rise, Hampstead Heath, N.W.3.
 MANCHESTER FREE LIBRARY, Manchester.
 MUMFORD, Dr. A. A., 44, Wilmslow Road, Withington, Manchester.
 MARSDEN, J. W., Lancrigg, Gorse Road, Blackburn.
 MCKAY, Rev. G. P., 22a, Church Street, Enfield.
 MORRIS, Miss Irene, Sheen Lodge, Friars Road, Coventry.
 MARTIN, Rev. H., M.A., 56, Temple Fortune Lane, Golders Green, N.W.11.
 MICHAEL, P. D., "Croyde," 10, Monmouth Road, Watford, Herts.
 McCAY, ALEX., Claremont Villa, Northland Road, Londonderry.
 MACFADYEN, Rev. A., Ivy House, 40a, Upper Kent Street, Leicester.
 MORGAN, GEO., 74, Grafton Road, Acton, W.3.
 MILLER, Rev. A. C., The Manse, Eythorne, near Dover, Kent.
 MORGAN, G. HAY, K.C., 15, Hamilton Terr., London, N.W.8.
 MURBELL, Rev. J., Monkswood House, St. Albans, Herts.
 MARSHALL, C. H., "Woodlea," Storey Road, Coventry.
 NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WALES, Aberystwyth.
 NEWMAN, Prof. A. H., D.D., Mercer Univ., Macon, Georgia, U.S.A.
 NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY, New York, U.S.A.
 NEWBERRY LIBRARY, Chicago, U.S.A.
 NEWTON, A., 21, Routh Road, Wandsworth Common, S.W.18.
 NORTH WALES BAPTIST COLLEGE, Bangor, North Wales.

- O'DELL, Miss D., 75, Ladysmith Avenue, Seven Kings, Essex.
- OWENS, EDWARD R., "Oak Lawn," Bromborough, Cheshire.
- PENNY, T. S., J.P., Knowls, Taunton.
- PRICE, SEYMOUR J., "Westbury," Creswick Road, Acton, London, W.3.
- PAYNE, Rev. G. E., The Manse, Neatishead, near Norwich.
- POLLARD, Rev. F. W., Cromwell House, The Broadway, Kettering.
- PHILLIPS, IDRIS W., c/o Hendry, 23, Havelock St., Dowanhill, Glasgow.
- POWELL, Rev. H. J., 12, Markfield Road, Bootle, Liverpool.
- POLLARD, Rev. T. G., 10, Grange Road, Ealing, W.5.
- ROBINSON, E., J.P., "The Towers," Sneyd Park, near Bristol.
- ROBINSON, Prin. H. WHEELER, M.A., The College, Regent's Park, N.W.
- JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Manchester.
- RICHARDSON, Rev. A. T., Lincluden, Kirkcaldy.
- ROBERTS, Sir JAMES, Bart., Strathallan Castle, Machany, Perthshire.
- ROOKE, CECIL B., LL.B., 45, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London W.C.2.
- ROBINSON, Rev. F. E., M.A., B.D., 12, Cotham Road, Bristol.
- RITCHIE, Rev. ALLAN M., M.A., 77, Knighton Drive, Leicester.
- ROBINSON, Rev. Prof. THEO. H., M.A., D.D., "Lynwood," Llanishen, Glam.
- RICHARDS, THOMAS, M.A., 16, Neath Road, Maesteg, Glam.
- RENDALL, Rev. J. C., M.A., Ellangowan, Rothesay, Bute.
- RUSHBROOKE, Rev. J. H., M.A., D.D., Baptist Church House, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.
- SPRUNT, Rev. J., F.R.S.L., "Lesness," Old Church Road, Clevedon, Som.
- SHAW, Dr. A., "Ardmore," St. Austell, Cornwall.
- LIBRARY, SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, 500, West Broadway, Louisville, Ky., U.S.A.
- STEPHENS, Rev. J. R. M., 16, Breakspears Road, Brockley, S.E.
- SNOW, J. H., "Berachah," Hollinghead Terrace, Brighton.
- SMITH, Rev. F. T. BLOICE, B.D., 36, Bassaley Road, Newport, Mon.
- STEWART, Rev. T., M.A., 16, Ailsa Drive, Langside, Glasgow.
- STEWART, Rev. T., M.A., Adelaide Place Bap. Ch., 209, Bath St., Glasgow.
- SKINNER, Dr. C. G., "Mossfield," Breckfield Road N., Liverpool.
- STOOKE, ARNOLD W., "Summerdown," 6, Park View Villas, Hove.
- SHORT, W. E., 30, Woodbridge Road, Knowle, Bristol.
- SHIPLEY, Rev. W. H., 40, Rowallan Gardens, Broomhill, Glasgow.
- SPURGEON, T. G., 31, Hertford Road, Freezywater, Waltham Cross.
- STEPHENSON, LEONARD, "Gazeley," Woodlands Road, Darlington.
- SPELLING, G. J., 107, Headcorn Road, Thornton Heath.
- SMITH, C. DUDLEY, 7, Arlow Road, Winchmore Hill, N.21.
- SWAISH, Sir JOHN, 29, Apsley Road, Clifton, Bristol.
- STOCK, PERCY, "Hayfield," Shadwell, near Leeds.
- SMITH, C. J. R., Holland House, Egmont Road, Sutton, Surrey.
- SMITH, Miss S. L., "Monkenhurst," Hadley Common, New Barnet.
- THIRTLE, J. W., LL.D., 23, Borthwick Road, Stratford, E.15.
- TUCKER, A., "The Brae," near Chilbolton, Stockbridge, Hants.

- THOMPSON, Capt. BUTT, Lederstock, Ventnor, I.W.
THOMAS, W. P., J.P., "Gorphwysfa," Treorchy, Glam.
TUCKER, T. F., 15, Princess Road, Regent's Park, London, N.W.
TOWNSEND, Dr. H., M.A., President, Manchester Baptist College, Rusholme, Manchester.
UNDERWOOD, Prof. M.A., D.D., Royd Edge, Green Lane, Yeadon, Leeds.
WALKER, E. M., J.P., Saxley, Wellington, Som.
WOOD, H. E., J.P., Hutton Manor, Brentwood, Essex.
WARDE, Rev. HORACE, M.A., 64, Ewell Road, Surbiton, Surrey.
WHITLEY, Rev. W. T., M.A., LL.D., 2, Ombersley Street, Droitwich.
DR. WILLIAMS LIBRARY, Gordon Square, London, W.C.
WATTS, Rev. H., M.A., "Verulam," Bertram Drive, Meols, Cheshire.
WOODFIELD, S., 22, Stanmore Road, London, N.15.
WATTS, W., 22, Dudley Road, Grantham.
WIBORG, FIT. MAG. SWEN, Lidingo, Villastad, Sweden.
WAUGH, P., 21, Cluny Gardens, Edinburgh.
WARBUTON, B. A., 90, Billinge Road, Spring Bank, Wigan.
WALLER, A. G., "Kingsleigh," 409, Westborough Road, Westcliff-on-Sea.
WEBB, P. C., "Woodstock," Crescent Road, Crouch End.
WELSH, R. E., 38, Pattison Road, Child's Hill, N.W.2.
WOOD, Rev. ARTHUR W., 64, West Bay Road, Bridport, Dorset.
WALKEY, Rev. F. J., O.B.E., M.C., Northampton.
WILLINGS, Rev. A. E., The Manse, Bluntisham, Hunts.
WESTWOOD, Rev. A., Haddington, Scotland.
YUILLE, Rev. G., "Craigholm," Scotstounhill, Glasgow.