

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

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

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

International Relationships.

Delivered before the Annual Meetings of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland at Leeds, by Dr. Everett Gill, European Representative of the S.B.C.

THE question of "international relationships" is not one merely of diplomacy. It is many-sided. It involves financial, industrial, scientific, social and sociological, artistic, athletic, linguistic, religious and other relationships of the human family. For our purpose, I shall confine myself to the consideration of the last-mentioned—international relationships as regards religion.

Religion is regarded by many who are interested in international matters as a cumbrous and unimportant adjunct to human activities that might be well set aside as outgrown and useless. I think that we shall see that this is a quite superficial way of looking at the question.

EUROPE AND CHRISTIANITY.

Europe, until the settlement of America, was for more than a thousand years the second home of Christianity. Christ was born in Asia, but Asia rejected Him. I have never seen a satisfactory explanation of the fact that Christianity failed to establish itself in the East. Why was it that the religion of Christ that was of oriental origin and expressed in oriental terms did not meet a better reception in the orient? Why did Asia reject Him Who was one of them and could be so easily understood by them, while Europe accepted Him, though His moral conceptions and ethical standards were so opposed to the genius of occidentals. This historical and religious conundrum I leave to others to solve. I merely mention this strange and staggering fact.

The fact remains that the degenerate millions of the Roman Empire and the hordes of our heathen ancestry in the forests of northern Europe as well as in these Islands accepted Christ whom his fellow-Asians had rejected, and Europe became the second home of Christianity.

From the first, the Europeans, along with the rest, were tremendously concerned about dogmas and creeds, while the

Christianity that was developed was largely pagan. The Roman Catholic Church that had the destiny of Christianity and of Europe so largely and so long in its hands cannot evade the fact that its bishops and cardinals played diabolical politics, fostered wars and bloodshed, drowned freedom in blood and tears, and were guilty of wholesale crimes that can scarcely be charged to any of the great heathen religions.

Even the Reformation did not entirely change matters. Religious wars were fought with cruelty and bitterness, whole lands were devastated, millions were massacred or perished by famine or pestilence—and all in the name of Catholic or Protestant Christianity. I think that fair-minded men will admit that while immense improvement was made in life and morals by Christianity in Europe, its civilization has never been fully Christian.

But, what shall we say of America? Is America Christian? It would scarcely be appropriate for me to discuss that question. I can say, however, in general, that though there may have been some progress made in industrial relations and the war against alcoholism and the rights of the common man, no sane American would thank God for our moral superiority. There is a sting in the taunt of the Hindu Brahmin that Western nations dogmatize about Christianity but *do not live it!* The late and lamented President of the Baptist World Alliance, Dr. MacArthur, said to a small company of us a number of years ago after his world tour, that a Brahmin priest said to him that he could never believe in a religion that would permit the existence of a Tammany Hall. In our hearts we Americans feel the truth of these charges. For, we are only in part Christian.

The poignant fact is that Christianity is the religion of the white race, and we have only partially adopted it. Admitting that Christ has vitally changed the white man in relations with his neighbour, it has had but comparatively little influence upon his international and inter-racial relationships, *and this is the outstanding world-fact of the hour!*

THE WHITE MAN AND HIS FOUR BROTHERS.

The white man, with his Christian religion, comprises less than one third of the world's population, though he dominates for the present some three fourths of the earth's surface. He claims Asiatic Russia, the two Americas, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and as much of Africa as he can hold on to, and warns his yellow and brown brothers to keep off his grass.

As the result of his Opium Wars and other conquests following his world-trade, as well as his immigration laws and lynchings,

the white man has succeeded in arousing the bitterest and most far-reaching race antagonisms known to history. The tremendous upheavals and unrest in India, Egypt, Africa, China, Japan, and the Americas are not ephemeral phases of world-life, but are groundswells that will change the whole course of history.

What has caused this vast upheaval among the nations and races? The teachings of Christ is the cause. Missionaries and preachers in all lands have been proclaiming the brotherhood of man and the nations have taken these teachings at their face value, and they perceive that our missionaries, on the one hand, and our diplomats and business men, on the other, do not agree. That is, we preach one thing and practise another. The white-hot resentment of the white man's four brothers in yellow, brown, black and red against the wrongs and injustices done them and their fierce determination to have their fundamental rights in the affairs of the world and in their own lands, are the grimmest facts that the white man must face at the present hour.

There are approximately five hundred millions of white men in the world, over against one thousand two hundred million coloured people who are at present the white man's potential enemies.

Besides this overwhelming numerical majority of the non-white races the coloured races are far outstripping the white in birth increase. Wherever the white man goes among his coloured brothers in mandated or colonizing lands the white man destroys pestilences and famines that have hitherto kept down the rapid increase of the coloured races. An English gentleman told in London a little more than a year ago that since the English have "cleaned up" South Africa "the negroes have increased like rabbits." On the other hand, as every one knows, the white man is increasingly practising birth control. The result is that the white race is becoming relatively weaker numerically and the coloured races overwhelmingly stronger. Though the coloured races outnumber the whites now between two and three to one, the time may come when they will outnumber us twenty-five or fifty to one.

EUROPE AND WAR.

In the face of these grave facts what is the white man doing? He seems to be preparing for other wars as if nothing had happened. And, what has happened? As has been noted by current historians, the World War was a white man's war, and the most appalling disaster that ever befell the white race. More than ten millions of her best sons, potential fathers of a wondrous race were sacrificed in what has been aptly termed "a family quarrel," while the darker races looked on and wondered.

It was worse than suicide, it was a crime against our race, our civilization and our religion. Shall we repeat our folly?

TWO PLANS FOR WORLD SAFETY.

What can avert a world disaster of unexampled proportions? Some seem to think that there is no hope. Professor Ferrero, the distinguished Italian historian, who knows not only ancient history, but is, also, a keen observer of our own times, already foresees the militarized millions of China streaming over the western confines of that land and moving across the lands where the human race was born, to blot out European civilization and turn back civilization into another and worse "dark age."

One plan suggested by the chauvinistic writers of the day is to intensify race feeling and international hatred and increase armaments and unify the white race against the coloured races and defy them while we hold them down. Their plan is as foolish as it is unchristian and wicked. They would have us to sit on the seething cauldron of international and inter-racial hate to keep it from the inevitable explosion. But, surely the world must have learned that such problems are not solved by the sword or brute force.

The other plan is the only one that carries with it any hope. It is Christ's plan—that is, *to love your neighbour as yourself*. We must cease to think of these non-white races as peoples that we may use or exploit for our own gain. We must cease emphasizing our racial and national differences. We must cease talking of the "white man's burden" *and think of the white man's brother*.

Then, follows the inevitable corollary—that we must *Christianize the white man*. This is not humour, it is grim fact. No one desires nor is able to minimize the exceeding importance of missions to our coloured brethren in China, Japan, Africa, and the Americas. The sacrifices and labours of these saints of God have written their names deep on the pages of history. But, how sadly are their labours being nullified by the unchristian lives of their brothers in the homeland and many of the business representatives of our white lands in the homes of the coloured peoples.

THE WHITE MAN AND CHRISTIANITY.

As we noted at the beginning, by a strange providence of God the white man has become the custodian and propagator of the Christian religion. The coloured peoples are rejecting our Lord in many circles because they confuse Him with the aims of the business men of the West. If we would save ourselves for this world and that which is to come, we must become really

Christian. If we are to save our civilization, we must become more profoundly Christian. If we are to save our religion (I speak as a man), we must become more vitally Christian.

It would seem, then, that all efforts to evangelize England, America and Europe are of supreme importance. I count the pastors in our cities and villages who are giving themselves to Christianizing America and England and Europe are in the forefront of world missionaries. They occupy the strategic places in the Kingdom of God now. They are the only ones who, under God, can save the day.

THE CALL FOR EVANGELISM.

The greatest impulse that could be given to better international relationships would come from a sweeping and overwhelming revival of religion at home. Let us become so Christian that we shall never have strikes and lock-outs. Let us so follow the Lord in our daily and business lives that when we go abroad in business or to preach the gospel, other peoples will wish to be like us.

WORK IN EUROPE.

I cannot refrain from seizing this occasion to indicate the vast importance of helping those struggling groups of our brethren who live in Europe. They are, in many instances, better Christians than we are. They are, many of them, Apostolic Christians. Let us not despise them as they seek to extend the reign of Christ in a Europe that is only partially Christian. What more fundamental work for God could we do for bettering international and inter-racial relationships than by our helping to establish the pure gospel in Europe? I count this work of extending the gospel in Europe as of more final importance than the work of diplomats and business experts. Let us make of Europe and England and America a confraternity of peoples who love one another in the Lord, who will show to their less happy brethren the way to peace and prosperity in the great family of God. Let us pray for that day foretold by our own English-speaking Poet Laureate,

When the war drums throb no longer and the battle-flags are furled
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World.

Richard Baxter -- the Man.

RICHARD BAXTER was a man of unusual moral stature, a man of spiritual splendour and of surpassing mental gifts. He rises out of a welter of words, many of them his own, as a lighthouse rises out of the sea. Richard Baxter, the man, will always shine.

Notice his incorruptible soul. When he could not be beaten in argument, or persuaded to yield, might he be bought? A little flattery goes a long way with some who are great. The offer of some place of influence and power is commonly used to take away the lion's roar. But Baxter did not know that he was roaring, and was entirely untouched by the offer of a Bishopric to keep him quiet.

You cannot discover any place in Baxter's life when Baxter was thinking of Richard's career. He says :

"I was more and more pleased with a solitary life : though in the way of self-denial I could submit to a most public life for the service of God when He requireth it, and would not be unprofitable that I may be private ; yet I must confess that it is much more pleasing to myself to be retired from the world and to have very little to do with men ; to commune with God, and conscience, and good works."

Richard Baxter was always a gentleman ; faithful in speech and conduct, and always firmly respectful.

Baxter had so many difficult things to say—things which high-placed men do not want to hear—that it is greatly refreshing to hear him say them. The vulgar Judge Jeffreys said :

"Richard, Richard, dost thou think we'll hear thee poison the court? Richard, thou art an old fellow, an old knave; thou hast written books enough to load a cart, every one as full of sedition as an egg is full of meat . . . but, by the grace of Almighty God, I'll crush you all. Come, what do you say for yourself, you old knave? Come, speak up. What doth he say? I'm not afraid of you, for all the snivelling calves you have got about you."

Richard spoke up :

"Your lordship need not fear, for I'll not hurt you. But

these things will surely be understood one day; what fools one sort of Protestants are made to persecute the other. I am not concerned to answer such stuff, but I am ready to produce my writings for the confutation of all this, and my life and conversation are known to many in this nation."

Baxter's moral courage was always on the finest edge. He writes :

"When Cromwell's faction were making him Protector, they drew up a thing which they called 'The Government of England.'

"Therein they determined that all should have liberty or free exercise of their religion 'who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ.' Hereupon the Committee appointed to that business were required to nominate certain divines to draw up the fundamentals of religion, to be as a test in this toleration.

"I knew how ticklish a business the enumeration of fundamentals was, and of what ill consequence it would be if it were ill done, and how unsatisfactorily that question, 'What are your fundamentals?' is usually answered by the Papists. . . . When I saw that they would not change their methods, I saw also that there was nothing for me and others of my mind to do but to hinder them from doing harm."

Again he writes :

"At this time the Lord Broghill and the Earl of Warwick brought me to preach before Cromwell the Protector. I knew not which way to provoke him better to his duty than by preaching on 1 Cor. i. 10. . . . But the plainness and the nearness, I heard, was displeasing to him and his courtiers; but they put up with it."

I have taken the phrase "spiritual splendour" applied to Baxter, from Henry Clark's *History of Nonconformity*. Baxter has earned that fine word of praise.

Some of you will have read Laurence Housman's *Trimblerigg*, where the Reverend Jonathan Trimblerigg, entirely satisfied with himself, unconsciously grows a halo around his head. Mr. Housman's clever but biting satire implies the splendour and power of real goodness. This "splendour and power" Richard Baxter had in a marked degree. His disease-filled body was a temple of the Holy Ghost—men felt his power. It gave him ascendancy over friends and over opponents. It made him as guileless as a child at times when men were expecting him to be clever. This spiritual power was manifest all through his Kidderminster ministry. It was equally as marked in his wide range of fellowship

with his fellow ministers. It was this that made him tolerable when he was trying to argue rough soldiers, and shrewd politicians, and narrow ecclesiastics to his will.

The power of that shining spirit is the life of his two best known books. The *Reformed Pastor* is built upon one sentence in the book which rings true to Baxter's own practice:

"Be that first, yourselves, which you persuade your hearers to be; believe that, which you daily persuade them to believe; and heartily entertain that Christ and Spirit which you offer to them."

The *Saint's Everlasting Rest* burns with a tireless zeal for God:

"If thou wouldst have light and heat, why art thou no more in the sunshine? For want of this recourse to heaven, thy soul is as a lamp not lighted, and thy duty as a sacrifice without fire. Fetch one coal daily from this altar, and see if thy offering will not burn. Light thy lamp at this flame, and feed it daily with oil from hence, and see if it will not gloriously shine. Keep close to this reviving fire, and see if thy affections will not be warm. In thy want of love to God, lift up thy eye of faith to heaven, behold his beauty, contemplate his excellencies, and see whether his amiableness and perfect goodness will not ravish thy heart. As exercise gives appetite, strength, and vigour to the body, so these heavenly exercises will quickly cause the increase of grace and spiritual life. Besides, it is not false or strange fire which you fetch from heaven for your sacrifices. The zeal which is kindled by your meditations on heaven is most likely to be a heavenly zeal.

"Some men's fervency is drawn only from their books, some from the sharpness of affliction, some from the mouth of a moving minister, and some from the attention of an auditory; but he that knows this way to heaven, and derives it daily from the true fountain, shall have his soul revived with the water of life, and enjoy that quickening which is peculiar to the saints."

The mind of Richard Baxter was an extraordinarily ready mind. It had not the weight of the mind of Milton, nor the unearthly questioning of Sir Thomas Browne; nor had it any kinship whatever with the practical mind of Cromwell. Baxter's mind was ceaselessly furnishing itself with answers to his own questions, so that he was ready at all times to answer other men's questions. To ask Baxter for a reason for the faith that was in him was to invite an answer in three volumes. In the midst of a heated discussion with Cromwell, when evidently Cromwell had

lost his temper, Baxter quietly told Cromwell that he would "write down" what he had to say if Cromwell would read it. You will recall how imperturbably Baxter referred Judge Jeffreys to his books in defence of his teaching—"a cart-load" of them. At the Savoy Conference, when the Prayer Book was under discussion, Baxter was quite ready to present the Conference with a new Baptism, or a new Communion Service by the next morning; and if they gave him a little longer, he would do them a brand new Prayer Book.

Baxter was so full of reasons, that he could not help himself overflowing, often to the annoyance of his friends as well as to the confusion of his enemies. The intensity of Baxter hindered him from being impartial. Like all who think intensely and argue incessantly, Baxter could not understand how men could differ from him, and it was very difficult for him to widen the bounds of toleration where order and discipline were concerned. "My mind abhorreth confusion," says Baxter.

He went into the Army, though a Royalist, because he thought that he could put the Independents and the Baptists straight. A fine illustration of Baxter's mind at work is in the "Self-Analysis" chapter of *The Autobiography*:

"My certainty that I am a man is before my certainty that there is a God, for *Quod facit notum est magis notum*; my certainty that there is a God is greater than my certainty that he requireth love and holiness of his creature; my certainty of *this* is greater than my certainty of the life of reward and punishment hereafter; my certainty of that is greater than my certainty of the endless duration of it, and of the immortality of the individual souls; my certainty of the Deity is greater than my certainty of the Christian Faith; my certainty of the Christian Faith in its essentials is greater than my certainty of the perfection and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures; my certainty of that is greater than my certainty of the meaning of many particular texts, and so of the truth of many particular doctrines, or of the canonicalness of some certain books.

"So that you see by what gradations my understanding doth proceed, so also that my certainty differeth as the evidence differeth."

Mr. Ladell, in his book on *Richard Baxter*, makes a shrewd shot at the difference that always existed between Baxter and Cromwell, but I think that he misses the mark. Mr. Ladell thinks that it was due to Baxter's mind not being able to "grasp largely," that his world was made up of his immediate surroundings, and that "his ideas revolved with meticulous precision around the

problems and difficulties of the moment," while Cromwell's mind was just the reverse, being able to grasp largely with extraordinary understanding.

I rather see Richard Baxter with an accurate and an exacting mind, concerned with ideas, and with the understanding of truth — with a scholar's mind; and Cromwell, a man of deeds, possessing a workman's or a soldier's mind. Baxter took principles for light and order; Cromwell took them for use, as he might take a hammer or a sword. Baxter certainly was cumbered about with the near-at-hand problems, but he had a mind of range. He says :

"I cannot be affected so much with the calamities of my own relations or the land of my nativity as with the case of the heathen, Mohametan, and ignorant nations of the earth. No part of my prayers are so deeply serious as that for the conversion of the infidel and ungodly world, that God's name may be sanctified and his kingdom come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Nor was I ever before so sensible what a plague the division of languages was which hindereth our speaking to them in their own conversation; nor what a great sin tyranny is, which keepeth the Gospel from most of the nations of the world. Could we but go among Tartarians, Turks, and heathens and speak their language, I should be but little troubled for the silencing of 1,800 ministers at once in England, nor for all the rest that were cast out here, and in Scotland and Ireland; there being no employment in the world so desirable in my eyes as to labour for the winning of such miserable souls; which maketh me greatly to honour Mr. John Eliot, the apostle of the Indians in New England, and whoever else have laboured in such work."

Baxter's bodily weakness was with him throughout the whole of his seventy-six years. The buoyancy that usually flows from vigorous health was not his. He seems to have had all the ailments that one body could have, "acrimonious blood, excoriated finger nails, rheumatic head, flatulent stomach, extreme chilliness, bleedings of the nose, latent stones in the reins," and yet more; but he found incessant activity a capital doctor.

Death, the "inexorable leveller," stood always by, so that he must get on with his work in order to get it done; and in the doing of his work, the body was mastered by the spirit, and he did the work of ten men.

"The second book which I wrote was that called *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*. When I was weakened with great bleeding, and left solitary in my chamber at Sir John Cook's

in Derbyshire, without any acquaintance but my servant about me, and was sentenced to death by the physicians, I began to contemplate more seriously on the everlasting rest which I apprehended myself to be just on the borders of. And that my thoughts might not too much scatter in my meditation I began to write something on that subject."

Speaking upon his first Kidderminster ministry, Baxter wrote :

"All this forementioned time of my ministry was passed under my foredescribed weaknesses, which were so great as made me live and preach in some continual expectation of death, supposing still that I had not long to live. And this I found through all my life to be an invaluable mercy to me, for . . . 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 men to dying men."

Mr. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, in his fine "Introductory Essay" to *The Autobiography*, abridged by Mr. Thomas from the *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, speaks of Baxter's "unduring undatedness, the timeless element which will survive all our fleeting modernity"; and further says :

"In him we seem to have all the contradictions joined. He is a catholic Puritan as Savonarola was a puritan Catholic; a parliamentarian Royalist who took Cromwell for an ambitious usurper and thought that Hooker and other defenders of monarchy conceded too much to democracy; a nonconformist Episcopalian who would fain, had conscience permitted, have conformed; an intellectualist, but one who, as Calamy says, 'talked in the pulpit with great freedom about another world, like one that had been there and was come as a sort of express from thence to make a report concerning it.'"

I should like to close my estimate of "Baxter, the Man," who in old age, like Mark Rutherford, married in sexless love a young girl, and lived very beautifully with her, although he contradicted his almost life-long plea for a celibate ministry; I should like to close with words of Mr. Henry Clark. He is speaking of Baxter's attitude toward Presbyterians, and by way of parenthesis he says, "Even before the gracious tolerance of his old age came upon him to make his always beautiful character more tenderly beautiful still."

WILLIAM H. HADEN.

The Holy Spirit.

A STUDY OF EPHESIANS I. 11-14.

IT is almost impossible to separate these verses from each other. They hang together, not only because of a similarity of phrasing, but also because, taken in conjunction, they give to us the final product of Paul's thinking on the Christian religion. He begins this epistle, strangely enough, by a kind of parenthesis. The first fourteen verses have nothing vitally to do with the argument that he wishes to put before his readers. After his usual salutation, he breaks out into thanksgiving to God for His goodness. And then he forgets himself. Word after word of amazing power is used, and pictures as varied and brilliant as a man can make them pass before us. The whole world is swept into the influence of Christ. Man is shown as predestinated in the divine love from the very beginning of time to come to God through Jesus Christ. He is elected to righteousness and godliness before God. Christ is the Beloved, in whose blood we have redemption of sins. The divine mystery is revealed to us, God's eternal purpose to gather up all things in Christ. Men are called into an inheritance by the power of Him who worketh all things by the power of His will. Finally, those who believe in the Gospel are sealed with the Holy Spirit as an earnest of the inheritance they shall one day enjoy. It is only after telling us all that, that Paul remembers where he started, and gets back to his proper audience.

It is strange to have a parenthesis at the beginning of an epistle. It is stranger still to have one which is worth reading. But Paul often packs his best thoughts into his asides. And in these verses, which have been forced out of him without premeditation, we are given the very soul of his gospel. Even if the rest of this letter were lost, or even if all the remaining writings of Paul were lost, we should be able to judge from these fourteen verses the main things that Paul stood for. And in the last four verses, we see the final outcome of it all, the present life in the Spirit as the earnest of what we shall one day be.

But there are other ideas which Paul touches upon which it is necessary just to mention.

1. The whole work of the Christian Gospel, and particularly the whole purpose of the sealing of men by the Spirit is the effect of the express will of God "who worked all things according to the counsel of His will." This is redundant language, but the meaning of it is clear enough. At the back of all good work, there is God. Only where God works, is the work properly done. The purpose of God is first and last and all the way, in the work of Christ and the sanctification of the Spirit. Two further ideas are implied. One is that God does not act arbitrarily. From eternity it was decreed what should be done. The final success of God's plans are not dependent upon any contingencies whatever. The word of God has been spoken, and nothing can turn it back. God's purposes may be delayed, but they can never be defeated. To entertain such a thought for a single second would be the absolute negation of the Pauline Gospel. Neither does the will of God operate on man *ab extra* alone, as a terrific overmastering force which man is forced to obey. It acts in accordance with human experience, with an ethical object always in view, and is voluntarily and gladly enthroned in the heart of the Christian as the ruling factor of all that he does. The will of God operates all the more effectively in that it operates by means of the will of man. And secondly, Paul expresses the absolute self-determination of God. He rules over all things. He has no law to obey, no duty to perform. He is not forced into any kind of operation by anything outside of Himself.

2. We are given a glimpse of Paul's conception of Jew and Gentile alike as being brought into the fold of Christ on the same terms. "In Him, I say, in whom also we were made a heritage"—that applies to the body of Christian believers generally, irrespective of who or what they are; "to the end that we should be unto the praise of His glory, we who had before hoped in Christ"—that applies to the Jews—"in whom ye also, having heard the word of truth . . . ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise"—that applies to the Gentiles. Two thoughts are involved here. The first is that the Gentiles are admitted into the new Israel of faith. That is the thought which we meet in all Paul's letters. His whole grasp of Christian truth stands and falls with that. And second, by being members of the new Israel of faith, the Gentiles enter into the realm of the Spirit. To be in Christ is to be in the Spirit: to be out of Christ is to be out of the Spirit. But Paul allows us to see more than he realises. He is still a good Jew. He does not cease to be a patriot when he becomes a Christian. He, more than any other, is the Christian Jew. He does not forget that the Jews inherited the promises, whereas the Gentiles have to receive something they did not possess before. The Gospel is for the Jews and also for the

Greeks, but he is extraordinarily proud of the fact that it came to the Jews first, and only through the Jews came to the Gentiles. Even before the Advent, the Jews had hoped for Christ.

3. The third point to notice is that the work of God is ethical. He deals with us so that we may live to the glory of His grace. Holiness of life is the object of the divine will in its dealings with men. That we should live to the glory of God is Paul's ethical ideal. His ethical teaching has not been studied as carefully as it deserves. He is a moralist through and through. His emphasis is on character all the time. By nature and conviction he is a Jew stressing the reality of God and the need of righteousness and holiness of life as the only worthy way of serving Him. To do the will of God is the greatest thing on earth. It is only superficially that he is a Greek, talking of mysteries and sacraments. He is thoroughly in agreement with the prophets in emphasising holiness and the glorifying of the divine name as the ideal. His ethics have a decidedly religious basis, and his ideal has a decidedly religious content. God has the same ideal for Jew and Greek. The aim of God through all creation is that mankind in its entirety should live to the praise of His glory.

4. He defines the blessings of redemption through Christ as *an inheritance*. There is no need to track all the metaphors of Paul back to their origin and to build up elaborate systems of theology upon them. Paul must be allowed the same liberty as we claim for ourselves in the use of terms. Here he is simply adopting the Jewish conviction that they were the chosen people and applying it to the Christian Church. All the blessings of God belonged to the Jews because they were the chosen people of God. He was their Father, and Israel was His son. And through the centuries, generation after generation of Hebrews entered into the inheritance of Canaan and of the promises of the future Kingdom, because they were members of the race whom God had chosen out as His children. To Paul, the secret of the divine election was Christ. Israel was chosen in order that it might prepare the way for Christ and bring Him forth. When the conduct of Israel did not fall into line with the purposes of God, the promises were withdrawn from the Jews as Jews, and transferred to the Christian Church, the company of those of whatever nation who enter into fellowship with God by faith in Jesus Christ. The Church is the new Israel of faith. The members of it receive the inheritance and enter into the promises. But that is not all. Paul stresses very emphatically the absolute nature of the divine predestination and the reality of the human will. He does not enter into the question as to how the two are to be related, but both are for him imperative. God is all-operative and yet

man is free. In the last resort, when we are trying to interpret Paul, we have to be satisfied with unresolved contradictions. The promises are the free gift of God, and yet they have to be appropriated by man and be worked out through the entire personality. We are always brought up against the contrast of what is and what is to be. Salvation is the gift of God's grace, and yet every man has to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling.

Thus we are brought up to Paul's idea of the Spirit, "in whom"—that is, in Christ—"ye also, having heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, in whom, having also believed,, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of our inheritance, unto the redemption of the possession, to the praise of His glory."

σφραγίς is more than once used in the New Testament in a metaphorical sense to refer to the external attestation of an ethical and inward fact. Such is the case in 1 Cor. ix. 2, Rom. iv. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 19. The servants of God were conspicuously marked as belonging to God. They had the name of God written in their forehead. There can be little doubt that the figure comes from the mystery cults, and refers to those who had passed the preliminary tests of the initiated or were marked as belonging to the god. Here particularly there is a reference to the belief that the Spirit is imparted to the Christian believer at baptism. Baptism is the symbol by which the Christian expresses his faith that Jesus is the Lord, separates himself from his past evil life, and dedicates himself to the new life. The candidate is questioned, in all probability, concerning his faith, and when he declares his willingness to follow the Lord Jesus and expresses His conviction that Jesus is the Christ, the officiating minister receives him into the Christian community by baptism, sealing the whole act by calling upon the name of the Lord. Thus baptism leads to the sealing of the believer by the sacred name. But that is not all. Generally, baptism was the means of entering into the Christian community, and this was marked and further sealed by the imparting of the gift of the Spirit as an earnest (*ἀρραβών*) of what would be poured out upon the Christian in the new age. That, in brief, is what lies behind the figure of speech here. But there are several matters which deserve serious consideration.

What is the real origin of baptism in the Christian Church is a difficult matter to decide. It seems probable that our Lord Himself neither practised it nor commanded it. It was probably adopted by the earliest Christian disciples, partly as a continuation of the baptism of John, and partly as a literal means of following in the footsteps of the Master. John had said that his baptism was merely symbolic and preparatory. It declared that the baptised had repented of their past sins and had given themselves

over to the service of the Kingdom. But it was also a promise and a foretaste of the baptism of the Spirit that would be instituted by the Messiah.¹ There are evidences that the early Christians associated their rite of baptism with the gift promised by John. For one thing, Jesus was the Messiah, and therefore the new era of the Spirit promised by John had come. Then, also, on the day of Pentecost, it was shown plainly that the new era had come with the gift of the Spirit just as had been promised by Joel. It was only natural, therefore, that the disciples should declare that Christian baptism was the baptism of the Spirit

¹ It is not to be assumed that John meant by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit in the Christian sense of the term. In fact, that is impossible, seeing that the "Christian" Spirit is essentially related to Christ. Neither must it be assumed that John is thinking about Christian baptism, for there could be no such thing until after the death and resurrection of Jesus, and of such happenings John knew nothing. It must not even be assumed that he definitely predicted a baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire (*ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ*) as a contrast to his own baptism in water. The probabilities are that he predicted a baptism of judgment, of wind and fire (*ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ πυρὶ*). That would fit the symbolism of the fan and the threshing-floor, and the whole conception of the Messiah as one of Judgment. The tradition has been affected by the post-resurrection prediction of Jesus that the disciples would be baptised by the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (Acts i. 5). There is almost certainly connection between the two traditions. But John predicted the coming of the Messiah, and he undoubtedly followed the prophets in regarding the Messianic Age as one of great exhibitions of spiritual power. There would be warrant in his mind, therefore, for the fusing of the two traditions. But before long, it had become the generally accepted fact that John had predicted a baptism in the Spirit.

The supposition becomes even stronger when we turn to Acts xix. 1-4. This is undoubtedly an obscure passage, and the author is perhaps not extremely well acquainted with the facts. The whole of the early Christian Church believed in the reality of the Holy Spirit. That was the very bed-rock of their faith. For a body of men to confess that they did not know there was a Holy Spirit was equivalent to saying that they were not Christians. The probabilities are that they were followers of John the Baptist who had either left Palestine before the ministry of Jesus came to a head and therefore knew nothing of the claims made by or about Him, or who rejected Jesus and did not look upon Him as the Messiah whom John had predicted. We have other evidence that there was a "John the Baptist" sect in New Testament times. But if John had said that someone was coming after him who would baptise in Holy Spirit, it is extremely doubtful whether any of his followers would say with such emphasis that they knew nothing about the Holy Spirit. They would have framed their answer differently. This strengthens the theory that John made no such definite prediction.

Winstanley (*Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 46 and 125) arguing from Acts xix. 1-4, suggests that *Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ* should be omitted from Mt. iii. 11. This is impossible, because of the parallel passages in the other Synoptics. His hint in *Jesus and the Future*, p. 13, is much more to the point, "if indeed the Baptist spoke of 'holy spirit' at all except under the figure of wind for the winnowing."

promised by John. At first, baptism and the gift of the Spirit were not brought into indissoluble connection, but by the time of Paul, the idea was pretty well fixed. It was in the act of baptism that the Spirit was imparted.² Several causes led to this.

1. First of all, it must never be forgotten in our study of the New Testament, that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is an interpretation of a real experience. Conversion was real. It involved a radical change in character and outlook. By faith in Jesus Christ the early Christians were conscious of new powers which liberated them from the crippling influences of their old manner of life, and they were also conscious of new hope and new capabilities and gifts which came into them from the outside, and were so remarkable in their nature and in their effects that they must have come from the world of God. Moreover, the act of baptism was not a mere formality in the early Church, but rather corresponded to something very real in the inner life of the believer. For one thing, baptism meant a complete break from the past. All the early Christians had been brought up in either a Jewish or a pagan environment, and to express faith in Jesus Christ meant taking upon yourself new obligations and expressing new loyalties. Further, as the Church was then constituted, to be baptised in it was an act demanding no little courage. Further still, the Christian warfare was against sin and all the influences of this evil world, and the only power that the believer could rely upon was the power of the Messiah, whose name was invoked over him at baptism. Even further, baptism generally took place in public amid scenes of great enthusiasm and expectation. The believer had gone through a long training and discipline. He had been told times without number that there were certain rights and gifts that could belong to him only when he was definitely

² In Acts x. 44, the Spirit is imparted before baptism, while in viii. 15, and xix. 6, it is due to the laying on of hands. Here, the author has kept true to his sources. But in ii. 38, he expresses his own feelings and says, "Be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Needless to say, this cannot be taken as fully historical. It is a clear case of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. For the early church, the forgiveness of sins, the reception of the Spirit, and the entrance upon newness of life were realities. Moreover, according to the usual conception, they were connected with baptism. To join the church meant a complete break with the past and the break was symbolised in the act of baptism. When the convert openly declared his allegiance to the Lord, he opened the floodgates of his heart to the inrush of all the spiritual influences that were alive in the community. At first, the community feeling was not strong enough for that. But as soon as the idea was arrived at that the Spirit was bound up with the church, the conception was not far off that by joining the community, a man thereby came under the influences of the Spirit.

pledged as a baptised believer to the cause of the Messianic Kingdom. He had seen, from the wonderful gifts manifested by many Christians, that, by joining himself to the Christian Church, he was enrolling himself in a community in which marvellous gifts were operative. Those gifts he would covet. Further, he had to screw up his courage to take the decisive act at all. It is not to be wondered at, when we take all those facts into account, that the believer, who was already keyed up intellectually and emotionally, should be open peculiarly to psychological influences which would have lasting results, and should, when the definite pledges at baptism were taken, be conscious of the infusing into himself of new powers. It was but natural that these new powers should be taken as the gift of the Spirit who was promised in the new age and who was regarded as belonging conspicuously to the religious body the believer was joining.

2. Though the *religionsgeschichtliche* method of studying the New Testament and of finding in it deep influences of the pagan sacramental cults has gone too far, and has led scholars into many extreme statements, yet much of the Christian doctrine of baptism must be laid down to the influence of Hellenistic religion. Put briefly, Paul's doctrine is as follows. First and foremost, the believer enters by baptism into conscious communion with Christ and into the life of the Spirit, and so far as Paul is concerned, there is little difference between these two statements. Then, also, the baptised person passes through an experience of repentance for sin, forgiveness for and cleansing from it, and the imparting of newness of life. The reality of that experience is certain. It is too deeply ingrained in the New Testament to be denied. But so far as the believer could see, apart from his own preparedness and his open confession of faith, the only other two things that could call forth the power of the Spirit were the baptism of water and the invoking of the name of the Lord. All the Hellenistic religions had something very analogous to this. The whole meaning of the religion was symbolised in a secret rite, by passing through which the neophyte was made conscious of new powers and entered into mystic communion with the god. Though there may have been much of a magical and superstitious nature in connection with all this, yet the reality of the experience must again be acknowledged. When we take into account the mental and spiritual preparation of the neophyte, we need feel no surprise to find the awakening of new hope and power at the decisive moment when the ritual was celebrated. Now, as many of the early Christians had already been devotees of the cults, it was only natural that the sacraments should take on a magical significance, or that the act of baptism should be regarded as though it brought about the change in the life and was responsible

for bringing down the powers of the Spirit. In later times, baptism certainly was thought to act magically and to have an *ex opere operato* effect, but it is extremely doubtful whether that is the case in the New Testament. Paul would hardly have said that he came not to baptize but to preach the Gospel, if he looked upon baptism as in itself redemptive. But the tendency is setting in. Paul really believes with the Old Testament that the Christ is to baptise with the Spirit, and that the Messianic age is to be marked by great ethical and spiritual power. But through the influence of the cults, he has interpreted this in such a way as surely to prepare the ground for a sacramental interpretation of Christianity. When the act of baptism was fixed upon as the time of the imparting of the Spirit and the giving of new life, the time was not far distant when it would be regarded as the cause of the change.

3. But another fact must be taken into account. Few of the early Christians had any grasp whatever of a spiritual substance which did not have some material form or another. The distinction between the spiritual and the material was not nearly so finely drawn by the Hebrews as it is by us, nor indeed by any in the ancient world. That doubtless had much to do with the conception of the appearances of our Lord as being physical. In the New Testament we see the gradual materialising of the appearances, partly no doubt in order to safeguard the reality of the spiritual fact. Paul himself seems to have interpreted the appearances more spiritually than any one else, but even he held that there were material phenomena present. Also the Hebrew found it impossible to believe in the immortality of the soul. Soul without body was a figment of the imagination. Paul thought that, in the resurrection state, there was to be a spiritual body, which seems to be a contradiction in terms, although it is obvious that he is endeavouring to show that immortality belongs not to the bare and barren soul, but rather to the complete personality. Also Paul doubtless believed that there could be no influences from the spiritual world sufficiently strong to operate upon human nature unless there was the imparting of something tangible and real. The Spirit was not merely *spiritual*: it was, in some way, an extended, though very fine, substance, and it could be imparted only by some material ceremony. It was an influence which came flowing into the life from the outside, just as in the case of demons. The difference was that it was holy.

Paul speaks of the Spirit as "the earnest of our inheritance unto the redemption of God's own possession, unto the praise of His glory." Here he represents the Spirit as a sort of present deposit as a guarantee that in the Messianic Kingdom God will give immortal life to us. We are even now living in the Spirit.

We possess now the same kind of life that we shall possess in the perfected Kingdom. We are even now seated at the right hand of God. But though that may be so, the best is yet to be. The full redemption has not yet come. There are two or three points of importance involved here.

1. First, Paul shares with the early Christians the belief that the Golden Age lies in the future. Christianity is a religion of hope. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God and it doth not yet appear what we shall be." No matter how much the truth of God may be ours, and no matter how much we may possess of the powers of the Spirit, the full secret is laid up in God, only to be revealed after the day of judgment. Christianity is an eschatological religion. It always has its eyes fixed on the future. Earthly life is a preparation for eternity.

2. Paul also shares with the early Christians the conviction that the Gospel is at once a *Gabe* and an *Aufgabe*, a gift and an achievement. Redemption, justification, the gift of the Spirit—they are all the free gifts of God. In His goodness, God has put men into a relationship with Himself in which there is no condemnation for past sins, and in which they are endowed with the Spirit of God. That position cannot be obtained by our own labour or as a reward. It is of necessity the gift of God. But the spirit is given only on ethical conditions, i.e., only on the condition that we follow its leading. It is closely related to our faith. In fact, it is the supernatural response of God to our faith. This may involve him in contradictions, because the ideas of faith and of the Spirit as a supernatural gift from the outside belong to two different conceptions of religion. The one interprets religion ethically and the other mystically. But Paul holds the two ideas firmly together. The Spirit is received on ethical terms, and it is preserved only as we give to it an ethical response. It must be allowed to redeem us completely, and that cannot be done instantaneously: it is a long process. The one who truly possesses the power of the Spirit advances more day by day in the virtues of the Spirit. Paul would not be a reliable religious teacher were that not part of his message.

3. But it must be acknowledged that he involves himself in a little contradiction. Much of his teaching is an apologetic against Judaism, and, in the main, his argument takes on two forms. One is that Judaism is a religion of law. And as against that, he elaborates his great argument about the ineffectiveness of the law to redeem and the necessity of justification by the free grace of God. Also Judaism is a religion of promise only. All through, it makes promises that it can never fulfil. Its dreams are realised only in Christ. At first, Paul was satisfied with believing that Christianity was the logical outcome of Judaism,

but his thinking brought him to the point that the two religions were absolutely opposed to each other, with different views of God, salvation, and of human duty. One was a religion of law and the other a religion of grace. And there is no point of contact between the two. Judaism suffers from a radical fault of nature, which no pruning will ever get round. It is a new religion that is needed. Paul claims that Christianity gives us a present possession. Here and now, the Christian has peace with God. Here and now he dwells mystically with Jesus Christ. Here and now he shares in the life of the Spirit. Paul has not gone so far as the author of the fourth gospel in teaching that life eternal is the present possession of the believer, or with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who sets forth Christianity, not as one religion among others, but as religion itself, in its final, absolute form. But neither of these two men could have given their messages unless Paul had prepared the way for them. Through faith, we enter here and now into the fruits of the Spirit. Here and now the believer can say, "I live, yet not I, Christ liveth in me." But Paul does not carry through the thought consistently. He dwells with Christ now, but he longs to go away and be with Christ, which is far better. He has to live the life of the Spirit in the present order in the midst of many things which hinder the purity of his spiritual life. He longs to be delivered from the body, which is a drag upon the soul. There is something finer and more spiritual laid up for him, but from this he is at present debarred. And so he cannot carry through his conception to the end. Paul the Jew and Paul the Greek are in conflict. Though he lives the life of the Spirit, he is, to a certain extent, in bondage to sense. And though he lives in the era of grace and freedom, he has to struggle to make the freedom complete. To Paul, the contradiction is resolved by the thought of the sanctifying power of the Spirit. The full life of the Spirit is in the future, but it is only as the believer lives in the Spirit now and follows its leading that the full power of it will ever be his. There is a contradiction here, but it lies only in the interpretation. Paul's facts are right, true to his own experience and the universal experience of men. He has saved his religion and ethic, even though at the expense of his logic.

H. J. FLOWERS.

The Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund.

IV. THE LONDON BAPTIST BUILDING FUND.

THE national conditions prevailing at the birth of the new Society were strangely similar to those of the centenary year. In 1824, our forefathers were in the aftermath of a great war. The grim shadow of Napoleon had darkened the map of Europe for a generation. The campaigns which ended in his defeat taxed the resources of the country to the utmost. The resultant peace of 1815 had been greeted with cheers, for a period of almost boundless prosperity was expected to follow. Disillusion had come, however. Fluctuating prices, industrial depression and heavy taxation inevitably follow war's inflation and destruction. Thousands were forced upon the rates and the downward path was entered upon which, in a few years, reduced almost every labourer in England to the position of a pauper. After the lapse of a century, the description still holds. Such were the conditions facing the London leaders when they set out to organise a better response to the courageous chapel building policy of their country brethren. Similar conditions face the London leaders to-day as they seek to respond to the chapel building requirements of the ever-enlarging suburbs of the great city. Thus does history repeat itself!

London and the Country alike hailed the new Society with enthusiasm. It did not disappoint its founders. At the end of twelve months, in "a plain and unvarnished relation of their proceedings," the Committee was able to say: "all reasonable expectations have been realised, and the hopes of some greatly exceeded. The Society has cause for gratitude in having been the means, during the year, of preventing many painful and expensive journeys to poor Ministers, of relieving many distressed Churches, and rejoicing many sorrowful spirits."

The success of the Society is not surprising, for its leaders were men who inspired confidence. Almost without exception they were Deacons of their own Churches, and a majority served on the Committees of kindred Societies. Stern, unbending Dis-

senters, immovable in their conception of faith and order, they were typical Christian laymen of the period. The three Trustees were known beyond the bounds of London and Westminster. Benjamin Shaw was not only Treasurer of the Baptist Missionary Society during some of its most fateful years, and a Trustee of the Particular Baptist Fund, but was also one of the most active of the Dissenting Deputies and a member of the Stepney College Committee. William Brodie Gurney was perhaps the most widely known. He had founded the Sunday School Union in 1803, and was its leading spirit. He followed this with the Youth's Magazine in 1805. He further served on various Committees, including Stepney College, the Missionary Society, the Home Missionary Society, and the Particular Baptist Fund. Later, in 1835, he became Treasurer of the Missionary Society. The third Trustee, Samuel Salter, was prominent in connection with several Societies, particularly the Missionary Society and the Home Missionary Society. Of the latter, he was Treasurer. The close connection with the Missionary Society of these men, and also of those to whom reference was made in the last article, emphasises the influence of John Dyer in the choice of Trustees and Officers.

The members of the Committee are worthy of individual mention, for each contributed to the strength of the Society. Two must be accepted as representative of themselves and their brethren. John Penny was elected to the Committee at the inaugural meeting in 1824, and served for over twenty years. A Deacon at Eagle Street for many years, he was much in request as a lay preacher. His generous nature is evidenced by the numerous subscription lists in which his name appears. He was one of the representatives of Eagle Street on the Particular Baptist Fund, and also served on the Committees of Stepney College and the Home Missionary Society. The resemblances in the Christian service of this John Penny and that of Thomas Stubbs Penny, J.P., the honoured ex-President of the Baptist Union, who presided at the Centenary Meeting of the Fund, are so many, that one is tempted to suggest a family relationship which, in fact, does not exist. Gilbert Blight, the grandfather of Francis James Blight, the Treasurer of our Historical Society, was a member of Dr. Rippon's Church in Carter Lane, and for twenty-four years was one of its Deacons. Elected to the Building Fund Committee in 1827, he continued in office for ten years. He rendered devoted service on other Committees, including those of the Irish Society, the Continental Society, the Missionary Society, and the Particular Baptist Fund. Civic activities also claimed his attention; and the movement for the abolition of slavery found in him an ardent worker. Like his son, Gilbert Blight, who joined the Building Fund Committee in the fifties, and his grandson, Francis

James Blight, he was a Freeman of the City of London. The motto¹ of this loyal Baptist family is not ill chosen, if we may judge from this record of service. Such were the men, who, with their colleagues, gave themselves to the humdrum but all-important work of the Committee. It is a matter for thanksgiving that they have had so many worthy successors. Some day, perhaps, someone will be inspired to write the epic of the faithful Committee man.

Notable among the London Ministers who gave hearty support in those foundation years were Joseph Ivimey of Eagle Street, Joseph Hughes of Battersea, Thomas Griffin of Prescott Street, William Shenston of Little Alie Street, George Pritchard of Keppel Street, James Upton, sen., of Blackfriars, and William Newman of Stepney College.

In the main, as indicated by the rules, the procedure of the Committee was based on that of the Case Committee. The latter's regulations and enquiries were in no degree relaxed. The application form contained twenty-three searching interrogatories and, as many of them are found in the forms in use to-day, one continues to be impressed by the prevision of these men. Special attention was paid to Trust Deeds and applications for grants were not considered until the deeds had been produced to the Solicitor. There was urgent need for the care. Much laxity prevailed in legal matters, and frequently deeds were found to need rectification. In one case, the Solicitor's perusal revealed that, owing to a legal defect, the property was held at the mercy of the heir-at-law; in another, a formal re-purchase was necessary; in a third, the cost of putting the deeds right was Ninety-eight Pounds. References in the early Reports and other official communications indicate the nature of the usual defects, a typical reference being that in the Annual Report for 1826:—

“It should be distinctly understood that, in cases where the conveyance of land, or premises, is imperfect—where the deeds have not been enrolled in due time, according to Act of Parliament—where they give improper and undue powers to the trustees, with respect to the choice of the minister, the disposal of property, or, the appointment of their own successors in the Trust, or where property is settled upon the minister and not on the church—there is no alternative. The rules of the Society positively forbid such Cases to be received.”

Enactments of Parliament and the gradual substitution of Denominational Corporations and Property Boards for private trustees have necessitated periodical amendment of the rules; but

¹ “*Tenax propositi vinco*,” which may be freely translated: “I win by sticking to my purpose.”

the requirement that the deeds must be produced to and approved by the Honorary Solicitor before assistance is given has never been abrogated. The value of the service rendered to the denomination by the successive Honorary Solicitors of the Fund in examining the deeds and ascertaining that they effectively secure the property for Baptist purposes cannot be exaggerated. The gentlemen who have served in this office are :

Samuel Gale	-	-	-	-	1824-1826.
William Paxon	-	-	-	-	1827-1845.
William Henry Watson	-	-	-	-	1845-1868.
Samuel Watson	-	-	-	-	1868-1921.
Harold Collier Watson (Asst.)	-	-	-	-	1911-1921.
Harold Collier Watson	-	-	-	-	1921-

To return to 1825, the first question on the application form asked :—

“ Is your Church of the Particular, that is of the Calvinistic Baptist denomination; maintaining justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, together with the perpetual obligation of the moral law on all mankind? ”

An uncompromising question, almost as uncompromising as the first question of the Shorter Catechism. Only an unequivocal affirmative answer would satisfy the Committee, who nevertheless refused to gratify the theological purists by becoming embroiled in questions of *open* or *strict* communion, *high* or *low* or *hyper* Calvinism. Such issues were not allowed to influence the grant, on the ground that to exclude either “ open ” or “ strict,” or “ high ” or “ low ” or “ hyper ” would, as the Report for 1827 expressed it, “ be at variance with the principles of the gospel, with Christian liberty, and with all the best feelings of a Christian’s heart. . . . If it could be supposed that any persons can withhold their charities from needy churches, because they maintain either *strict* or *mixed* communion, they would be considered as leaving themselves no room or just ground to complain of the narrowness or bigotry of others.” In some things our forefathers were not so narrow as they are popularly represented. The instructions for completing the application form directed that :

“ Replies to the above Questions must be signed at a Church Meeting, by the Pastor and Deacons, and such members as may be present; and the recommendation of at least two ordained ministers, who are personally acquainted with the merits of the Case, must be subjoined in their own hand writing.”

The country Churches of a century ago supported their appeals with ingenious arguments. One assured the Committee

"that in this irreligious city, the cause of God needs no other embarrassment than that which arises from the impiety of its inhabitants, fostered rather than subdued, by a servile and persecuting spirit." A second said, "I have this evening been called upon for the sum of £166, to be paid in one month's time. I have not got it to pay.—It appears to me that I am quite hemmed in: there is no path before me but ruin, except we receive some efficient aid from your Fund." One gentleman, in recommending a Case with which he was well acquainted, advanced the picturesque plea that "Unless the Denomination come forward to pay £140, which is now demanded, we shall have the Lord Chancellor across the roof of the building."

Realising the need for an adequate income, the leaders set a generous example. Their own annual subscriptions amounted to Three hundred and fifty Pounds, of which the Treasurer gave One hundred and fifty Pounds. The income of the first year was £1,511 5s. 6d., but owing to "embarrassments occasioned by the general depression among the commercial part of the community" it fell to £1,140 15s. 0d. in the second year. Two extracts illustrate the spirit in which the Committee faced its money-raising task. The first is from the lengthy statement and appeal sent to "a list of several hundreds of persons who had previously been in the habit of contributing to country cases":

"If a gracious Providence exempt us from that cruel oppression, which impoverished our ancestors by heavy fines for assembling in the name of Christ, are we not bound, by the strongest ties of gratitude, to devote a portion of our substance to this especial means of promoting and enlarging His Kingdom?"

The second appears in the first Annual Report, where it is quoted from the Wesleyan General Chapel Fund Report for 1820:—

"When houses are erected for divine worship, they become permanent blessings to the places where they are built; and he who places but one stone or one brick in the building, confers a lasting blessing on future generations."

Although two hundred and twenty-five became subscribers or donors in the first twelve months, many who had given when the earlier method was in operation did not subscribe. A few disapproved of the new Society. They preferred the former method and regretted that the personal touch between themselves and the Country Ministers and Churches had disappeared. True Baptists, loyal to the independent traditions of the denomination, they wished to do their own thinking and their own giving. But they were a small minority. Others—no doubt the "by-list"

men of the Case Committee period were among them—sheltered themselves under the wing of the new Society without contributing to its support. These non-subscribers gave much anxiety to the leaders, who became deeply concerned at their inability to increase the comparatively small number of subscribers, and at the inadequacy of many of the subscriptions. Country Churches repeatedly urged that it was unfair that they should be prohibited from making personal appeals, while so many Londoners escaped their obligations. "The relief from the operations of the former system is only intended for Members of the Society. Others should not be shielded behind one hundred and eighty subscribers." A few Churches, feeling the extreme urgency of their cases, sent their representatives to London. Strangely enough, some of the Ministers of the Baptist Board, by signing the appeals, unwittingly gave encouragement to this partial continuation of the old system. Personal collection under the new conditions was, however, found to be almost hopeless. "I have been trying to beg," wrote one Minister, "but, to my mortification, I have been to above a hundred places in London for 15/6. In consequence of the Building Fund, people appear to be all of one opinion not to give."² But the overlapping caused intense feeling and added to the difficulties of the Committee. Many subscribers discontinued their subscriptions or reduced the amounts on the ground that the Fund did not adequately protect them from the importunities of personal collectors.

At first the Committee published the names only of Subscribers, feeling that to publish the individual amounts of their benevolence would "wound the charity or delicacy of the givers." After repeated discussions, in the hope that publication of the amounts would cause a substantial increase in the total, modesty ceased to forbid, and the names and amounts appeared in the fourth Annual Report. Not only did the increased income not follow but by the end of ten years the number of subscribers had declined to under one hundred and fifty.

Twenty-seven applications were taken over from the Case Committee and, in the first year, thirty-six new applications were received. Of the sixty-three cases, grants were made to sixteen, seven were rejected, and forty postponed to the second year.

Cullompton, Devon, was the first Church to benefit, its grant being Eighty-five Pounds. The grants in the first year amounted to £1,400. Thirteen cases were assisted in the second year with £970. By the end of ten years, one hundred and seventy-nine Churches had received £10,835. The appeals made to the Committee and the responses given are well illustrated by the following details of cases assisted in January and February, 1828:—

² *Baptist Magazine*, April 1825.

Place.	Presented	Expended.	Collected.	Unpaid.	Granted.
		£	£	£	£
SWAY, Hants.	May, 1825.	280	68	212	60
SHEEPWASH, Devon.	Dec., 1826.	236	166	70	50
TWYN YR ODIN, Glamorgan	Jan., 1827.	160	90	70	40
SWANSEA, Glamorgan.	Jan., —	2,000	700	1,300	100
CRIGGLESTONE, York.	Feb., —	500	140	360	70
BORO' BRIDGE, York.	Feb., —	469	214	255	80
BRENCHLEY, Kent.	Mch., —	306	195	111	60
WORTWELL, Norfolk.	Mch., —	330	245	85	60
LEWES, Sussex.	Mch., —	200	100	100	60
EARLS BARTON, Northants.	Apl., —	498	139	359	75
GT. MISSENDEN, Bucks.	June, —	393	153	240	80

It is interesting to read that the attendance at the second Annual Meeting was "very respectable, though not numerous," and that it was "regretted that the ladies did not favour the meeting with their company." Ninety-eight years later, at the centenary Annual Meeting, two ladies and fourteen men were present—again "very respectable though not numerous." An interesting resolution of 1826 was: "That all Ministers of the Denomination in London and its Vicinity be invited to attend all the Meetings of this Society." Fortunately for the peace of the present Committee, this resolution has not survived.

In 1829, on his removal from Wild Street to Waltham Abbey, James Hargreaves relinquished the general secretaryship, although he rendered further service as joint secretary for two years. His appointment appears to have been an ideal one. Unremitting in his zeal for the fund and a skilful organiser, he possessed the power of kindling enthusiasm in others. As a result, it was his privilege to hand on to his successor an organisation established on deep and lasting foundations. The office has been held by a succession of men of fine devotion who have used their varying gifts for the advancement of the Fund.

Their names are:—

James Hargreaves	- -	1824-1829	*John Easty	- - -	1846-1854
James Hargreaves	}	- 1829-1831	Christopher Woollacott		1854-1861
Isaac Mann, M.A.			*James Benham	}	- 1861-1864
Isaac Mann, M.A.	- -	1831-1832	*Alfred T. Bowser		
Thomas Thomas	}	- 1833-1836	*Alfred T. Bowser	- - -	1864-1885
Charles Stovel			*John Howard	- - -	1885-1906
Thomas Thomas	- - -	1832	*William Wallace Parkin-		
Charles Stovel	- - -	1836-1837	son	- - - - -	1906-1908

Charles Stovel	}	- 1838-1841	*Henry Hewett Collier, F.S.I.	- - - - - 1908-
Stephen J. Davis				
Charles Stovel	- - -	- 1841-1845		
Charles Stovel	}	- 1845-1846		
John Aldis				

The asterisk indicates a layman.

The decease of the Treasurer, John Broadley Wilson, on the 16th February, 1835, was a grievous loss. This gifted Christian gentleman had filled the office from the commencement and throughout had laboured zealously for the success of the Fund. By his own munificence, he stimulated the liberality of others. Baptist Institutions were not the only ones to mourn his passing. The Religious Tract Society and other inter-denominational institutions lost in him an ardent worker and generous supporter. The Building Fund has had eight Treasurers only, in the course of the hundred years. It has been singularly blessed in the large hearted men who have served. They are :—

John Broadley Wilson	- 1824-1835	Alfred T. Bowser	- - 1885-1890
Joseph Fletcher	- - 1835-1853	Joseph Burgess Mead	- 1890-1897
Joseph Howse Allen	- 1853-1864	William Payne	- - - 1897-1908
James Benham	- - - 1864-1885	William Wallace Parkinson	1908-

Serious and prolonged ill-health caused the retirement of William Paxon, the Honorary Solicitor, at the Annual Meeting on the 12th August, 1845. He was a member of Wild Street and, amid increasing denominational claims and honours, his affection for his own Church never waned. He will "not forsake Wild Street, so long as the walls remain" was the testimony borne of him. He served it as a Deacon from 1817 to 1848. His service to the Building Fund was invaluable. Many Churches to-day are in the enjoyment of their buildings because he attended to the rectification of their Deeds long years ago. Nearly eighty years after his death, it is worth while to recall the words then spoken of him : "In his profession, he was an *honest lawyer*; in private life, a *sincere friend*; and in his connection with the Church, a *true Christian* and a *judicious and affectionate deacon*."³

V. CO-OPERATION WITH COUNTRY ASSOCIATIONS.

During the Secretaryship of Charles Stovel, the Committee had a vision of a wide extension of the usefulness of the Fund, culminating, if all went well, in the extinction of the whole of the debts on country Churches within the short space of seven years ! From the first, the fortunes of the Fund had been followed with

³ Woollacott : *Brief History of the Baptist Church in Little Wild Street.*

keen interest in the provinces. Its success aroused the spirit of emulation. The preliminary literature and subsequent Annual Reports of the Committee, were obtained, and in the course of a few years many similar Funds sprang into being. The London rules were adopted, but the administration was local. Bristol, Cambridge, Leicester, Liverpool and Oxford are early examples. The London leaders envisaged the whole country supplied with district Funds, worked in consultation with them. They set themselves to attain this ideal. At the Annual Meeting in 1834, it was unanimously decided to ask the Committee "to consider whether the operations of the Society cannot be extended by means of the various County and District Associations." So keen was Joseph Fletcher, the treasurer, for the thorough exploration of this possibility, that he gave a special donation of one hundred pounds to defray the expenses. "After considerable attention and discussion" the Committee acted. Conferences with the Ministers of the Baptist Board ensued at which it was recommended, as a preliminary measure, that "the denomination of this Society be altered by the omission of the word 'London,' so as to stand 'The Baptist Building Fund.'" It was further recommended that strenuous efforts be made to obtain greater support in London by means of Congregational Collections and an increase in the number of Subscribers. The recommendations were adopted at a General Meeting on 10th March, 1835. Thereafter correspondence took place with the country in an endeavour to ascertain "the real amount of debt for which the Baptist Denomination is responsible in reference to our places of worship in England and Wales." Answers were obtained from more than seven hundred churches, and on the 8th March, 1836, the Sub-Committee presented the following illuminating report :—

First. That the ascertained debts, in the country, amount to rather more than £73,297.⁴

Second. That the debts not returned, including those in London, will probably make this up to £100,000.⁵

Third. That the interest on this sum, amounting at least to £5,000 a year, is taken from the resources of the congregations, and operates heavily in reducing the maintenance of their ministers.

Fourth. That many of these debts have been contracted very imprudently, and that the continuance of the present system will annually increase the evil.

⁴ This figure was later increased to £78,000.

⁵ In a letter in the *Baptist Magazine* for April, 1845, J. Aldis thinks the debts "cannot amount to less than £180,000." Commenting on this in his *Observations on Chapel Debt Extinction* (1847), W. Bowser thinks "they might safely be taken at £150,000.

Fifth. That there are about thirty-three Associations; and that, agreeably to the above estimate, there would be an average debt of £3,030 on each.

Sixth. That if each Association could, on an average, raise £433 a year more than is required to meet its current necessities, the whole would be paid in seven years.

The report was sent to all the Country Associations, and each was "earnestly recommended to form a Building Fund for its own district, with a view to the liquidation of its present debts within a limited period, and for the purpose of supplying future necessities." Other suggestions were made, including a request that the local annual report be forwarded to London to be printed with the general report of the main Building Fund. The negotiations continued for a period, but the well-meant effort was destined to come to little, and after a few years the little that was done appears to have petered out. Two things militated strongly against it: first, the low spiritual condition of the times, and, secondly, financial stringency—the "hungry forties" were at hand. With very few exceptions, the London Churches neglected, or declined, to give collections, and the usual annual subscriptions were obtained with increasing difficulty. The responses from the Country Associations were equally discouraging. Suffolk, the Southern, and the West London and Berks. Associations resolved to form Building Funds and to co-operate with the London Fund, and the Yorkshire Association, which, in 1827, had provided a fund from which to make annual grants to needy pastors, determined on aggressive efforts to raise a chapel debts fund of £2,500. Most of the other Associations, for various reasons, found it impossible to take effective action.

VI. THE LAST OF THE GRANTS.

The grants which, in the first ten years, had averaged slightly over £1,000 per annum, declined in the next ten years to under £700. In the last year of that decade, the subscriptions amounted to no more than £585, and as a result £570 only was distributed. For several years, the waiting list had rarely comprised less than sixty cases, and usually from three to four years elapsed before a case reached its turn for a grant to be voted. The Committee was much exercised at the comparatively meagre response to its continued appeals. The generation which knew from personal experience "the monthly, weekly, and often the almost daily torment of personal applications" was rapidly passing. The Fund did not appeal with the same urgency to the new generation, and although the number of subscribers remained fairly constant, the

average of the subscriptions steadily diminished. The Committee was perplexed. Two questions faced it. What new steps could be taken to arouse the London Churches from their profound indifference? What new sources of revenue could be tapped? The Committee was still in its perplexity when the whole situation was transformed.

By his will, Dr. William Newman, the former Principal of Stepney College, left One Thousand Pounds to the Building Fund, payable on the decease of his widow. He passed away on the 12th December, 1835, but, owing to the survival of the widow, it was not until June, 1845, that the Treasurer received Nine hundred Pounds, representing the legacy less the Government duty of One hundred Pounds. One of the Committee, William Bowser, opposed the distribution of this sum in grants, and urged that it should be lent and re-lent to the Churches to be repaid by them in instalments. Given in grants, the legacy would aid possibly twenty Churches and then be exhausted; but if used for making loans which would be subject to annual repayments, it would be constant, sustain no diminution, and "be a round of benefit annually running its vivifying course." This bold proposal caused "much discussion and aroused many doubts and fears." The idea was new to most, and could neither be accepted lightly nor hurriedly. It was necessary to move with that extreme caution which is not unknown among Baptists even to-day. Fortunately, the proposer was a man of resource. He supported his proposal by pen and speech. His colleagues were won to his point of view. At the Annual Meeting on the 12th August, 1845, the Committee recommended the subscribers "to use the money as a *loan fund* for the purpose of assisting Churches that are oppressed by debt and interest, with a sum not exceeding One hundred Pounds to any one Church, to be held without interest, and to be repaid in ten years by equal annual instalments, those instalments, as they come in, to be annually invested in other loans, the whole forming a floating capital to be used for the extinguishing of the general debt." William Bowser moved the necessary resolution accepting the recommendation, and it was carried, the Meeting having first increased the maximum loan to any one Church to Two hundred Pounds. The Treasurer immediately gave a donation of One hundred Pounds to cover the legacy duty, so that the loan section of the fund commenced with a capital of One Thousand Pounds. That resolution ensured the life of the Building Fund: unwittingly it sounded the death-knell of the grant system. For twelve months the Fund consisted of two sections—grants and loans—but the loan system so rapidly and completely found favour that, at the Annual Meeting in 1846, it was decided to appropriate the whole of the future subscriptions

to the loan fund. At the same time, the Committee was given the option, in an extreme case, to make a donation as formerly. By the Annual Meeting in 1848, the grants voted prior to the resolution of 1846 had been paid. The Committee had then distributed nearly £19,000 in grants to over 350 churches.⁶ Besides exercising the option given to it, the Committee distributed more than £1,000 in small grants intermittently over a period of thirty years. The permissive rule was not finally abolished until 1905, but as an organised effort, the system ended in 1846.

We have no means of knowing what was done by London for Country Chapel Building prior to the activities of the Baptist Board, but it could have been only of small extent. From the annals of the Board, the Case Committee and the Building Fund, it has been possible to obtain some conception of London's organised contribution from the early years of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth. During this period, more than Fifty thousand Pounds was subscribed, an amount that carried enriching energy throughout the Kingdom. Henceforth, by the agency of the ever increasing loan fund, the help was given in another and a better way, as we shall see.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

⁶ The list of grants, for the purpose of permanent record, will be printed as an appendix to these articles. Only one copy of several of the early reports appears to be in existence.

MR. PRICE found more material than he anticipated when he promised the Editor to write an article, or possibly two articles, on the Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund. Reference has yet to be made to the defunct Baptist Metropolitan Chapel Building Society and to the amalgamation of the Fund and the Building Fund of the General Baptist Association of the New Connexion. Two more articles will therefore be needful, after which it is anticipated the series will be published in permanent form.

IN connection with the Baptist Laymen's Missionary Movement for supplying literature to Baptist ministers abroad and missionaries on the foreign field, a large number of applications have been received for THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY. Perhaps some subscribers to the Magazine would be prepared to pass their copy on, after reading it, or would subscribe for a copy to be sent to an applicant. If so, the Rev. C. T. Byford, 19 Banstead Road, Purley, Surrey, would be pleased to hear from such friends.

Baptist Beginnings in the West Riding.

THE local Church history of the West Riding of Yorkshire gives ample confirmation of the truth of the general statement that in seventeenth century England, Episcopacy was merely the formal state expression of religion, while Puritanism was its ruling force. Many of the clergy themselves refused to comply with the Book of Common Prayer. Robert Moore, Rector of Guiseley, near Rawdon, for over half a century, was notorious for his nonconformity, and is generally designated in the records as "Old Liberty Moore." Time after time he was summoned for disobedience before the High Commission at York, but although always condemned and threatened, he never was imprisoned or deposed, so high was his character and so strong his position in general regard. Although he publicly declared that the Archbishop of York "could not preach and was a doting fool" the Court dared not touch him. In 1601 he built the Rectory which is still in use, a beautiful specimen of Tudor architecture; and a Latin inscription over the doorway declares: "The House of a faithful Pastor, not a blind guide, and not a robber; Robert More was Rector of this Church and founder of this house. Woe unto the sacrilegious man. Woe unto the enemies of Levi. A.D. 1601."

Some fifteen years ago, when excavations were made in the Rectory grounds, there was unearthed a large stone trough, which the present incumbent, Canon Howson, frankly acknowledges must have been used as an open-air baptistery for adults—suggesting that our Baptist practices were not unknown even within the Episcopal fold. One of Moore's successors shrewdly "conformed" in 1662, but the puritan lord of the manor of Rawdon substantiated his claim to be the legal patron of the benefice of Rawdon, and secured its detachment from the parish of Guiseley, in which it had up till then been embraced.

The movement generally designated "Congregational," including Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists, was widespread and influential in Yorkshire from Cromwell's time. Among the ejected clergy in 1662, no fewer than twenty-one belonged to

the Leeds district, and sixteen in and around Bradford, a remarkable number when it is remembered that these towns at that time had populations of only about nine thousand and six thousand respectively. The Five Mile Act of 1666 drove them from their ministerial homes and hounded them from one locality to another. The parish Churches and subordinate Chapels were mostly deserted, and efficient preachers could not be found—even readers of printed homilies were scarce. One ejected clergyman, who had been a Rector in Nottingham, was a native of Rawdon, Samuel Cotes, and he came to reside with his father, Christopher Cotes, at "Crow Trees," a large house within sight of the famous "Buckstone Rock," refuge and sanctuary of harassed conventiclers. In 1672, he was registered as a licensed Presbyterian preacher, and held services in meeting houses throughout the district.

Independents, too, were numerous and active. Oliver Heywood, ejected from Coley in Lancashire, and whose "Life" was written by our Baptist Dr. Fawcett, was an ardent and eloquent evangelist over a wide area, and frequently preached in and around Rawdon. Several of his licensed meeting places were among the most important residences in the parish and are still extant: Rawdon Hall (home of the Lord of the Manor), Crow Trees, Ivy House (for which, in 1672, Josiah Collier, relative of the famous Jeremy Collier, obtained a license, and which later became a home for Quakers), and Rawdon Low Hall, whose owner, a substantial yeoman, John Hardaker, seems to have been the chief support and encourager of the brethren who, in 1712, built the first Dissenting Chapel in the Wood. For, when in 1672, the "Indulgence" was withdrawn, and services in these houses were no longer protected, it was in the large cave under Buckstone Rock, within John Hardaker's estate, which, sheltered by a "lean-to roof," he used as a cowshed, that the Conventicles were continued. Here large congregations met, and tradition says that watchers used to be posted on the heights above to give warning of the approach of constables armed with powers of arrest.

And now the circle must be more narrowly drawn, to describe the beginnings of the Baptist cause in the West Riding. There is some slight evidence that, as early as 1655, a Baptist church existed in Bradford, but it seems to have died out, and to have had no connection with the churches formed by William Mitchell a generation later. The first meeting place at Rawdon was built in 1712, but the church was not formally constituted till 1715, when a minister was ordained, and when written records began to be kept. This old Church Book has been well preserved, and indeed is still regularly used, not as

during the first 150 years for periodic entries describing the successive pastorates and the changing circumstances, but for the signatures of all who are baptised and added to the Church. The earliest entry in this Book traces the origin of the Church to the "ministry of several of Christ's ambassadors, who were providentially cast among us in these parts, especially William Mitchell. We stayed for some time, not being joined to any particular church, nor having submitted to the public ordinances of the Gospel, for which reason (we suppose) we would have been reproachfully called Antinomians—but far from deserving that character, the Lord further opened our eyes, and explained to us His mind and will revealed in His Word, particularly in the matter of positive worship—we cordially embraced and submitted to the same, being baptised upon profession of our faith and the manifest token of saving Conversion—and thereupon added to a people of the same principle and practise in Lancashire—there being no nearer that we then knew of, with whom we could conscientiously sit down. And we not being (as we then thought) a competent number to be set down of ourselves—but the Lord, having still more work to do in this country, had by His good Providence directed the above named W. Mitchell to make his abode among us in these parts, where he spent his ministerial labours till his last breath, till it pleased the Lord of the Harvest to order that faithful labourer from this Lower to His Upper House, which (though it was gain to him) was a smarting stroke to us, for in him we lost a minister, orthodox in his principles, pious in his life, indefatigable in his labours. And though that people in Lancashire (Rossendale) to whom we belonged was obliged by virtue of their relation to us, to take some care of us, which they did, so far as their circumstances would allow of, or we reasonably expect, considering their distance from us—and yet it came far short of what our necessity required—and after asking counsel and direction from the Lord, we thought it advisable that our Church relation with them should be removed, and we in Yorkshire orderly dismissed from them and set down as a particular congregated Church, so be we could find out a person competently qualified and cordially willing to take pastoral charge of us, after much enquiry, at last John Wilson came by way of trial for a considerable time. He was dismissed from a people in Furness, set down among us as a member and ordained on August 31st, 1715."

The most considerable personality, then, in the early days was this man of Apostolic zeal, William Mitchell. Converted in 1681, when nineteen, he only then began to learn to read while working at the loom, but three years later he was itinerating as a free lance evangelist, without license until the passing of the

Toleration Act in 1689. Haywood says he belonged to the Free Grace movement, and Crosley describes him as setting forth "the exceeding rich and free grace of the Gospel," while crowds from all parts flocked to hear him in the fields and woods—many out of curiosity and some to scoff,—but, powerful impressions were produced by his simple, sincere and fervent utterances, notwithstanding a certain "unpolished temper and harsh delivery." His religious experiences read like pages from Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*. He was long under deep conviction of sin, and for several years was seldom seen to laugh. Twice he was arrested, and once confined in York Castle, and only released a few days before the Liberty granted by King James was proclaimed. He and his cousin, David Crosley, seven years younger, a working stone mason, both belonging to Heptonstall, near Hebden Bridge, covered a preaching circuit of forty miles, with twenty meeting places and they lodged in about two hundred homes of their hearers. Bacup in Rossendale was an important centre of their labours, and there a Chapel was built for their special use. For some years they were simply evangelists, regardless of Church order or sacraments. Baptist principles and practice do not appear till 1692, when David Crosley, during a preaching tour in the Midlands, embraced the views of the Particular Baptists there, and on his return to the North won over his cousin, whereupon they both advocated the new discipline for the Rossendale Church and its branches. The change was accepted only gradually, but it is fairly certain that the Rawdon group was wholly Baptist before the erection of the first Chapel in 1712, and that they immersed their converts in the river Aire at Apperley Bridge.

David Crosley was a man of strong emotions, possessed of very considerable preaching gifts, but his character was erratic, and his behaviour frequently scandalous, leading to stern discipline and sometimes to excommunication. After his cousin's death, he published in 1707 a posthumous pamphlet by Mitchell—entitled "Jachin and Boaz," a compendium of doctrine, the rigid hypercalvinism of which is hard to reconcile with his fervid free grace evangelism. (It has been reprinted in the third volume of our *Transactions* by the kindness of Principal Blomfield.) The section on Free Will, incorporated from Charnock, subtly but unsuccessfully attempts to correlate that doctrine with Mitchell's high and dry Predestinarianism. The pamphlet enunciates a very strict conception of Church, Ministry and Sacraments—Order and Discipline being dealt with in no fewer than thirty-nine paragraphs. References to Teaching Elders suggest Presbyterian influences. "Where there are no teaching officers, none may administer the Sacraments, nor can the Church authorize any

transiently to do so." A modified Connexionalism is urged—Synods and Councils to deal with difficulties as to doctrine or Administration, but only for advice, not with power of jurisdiction over the several Churches.

Another Baptist pioneer of the West Riding deserves brief mention, John Moore, a convert of Mitchell's, who became to his leader what Timothy was to Paul, a colleague of most gracious disposition and abundant labours. In 1689, we find him acting as shepherd of Mitchell's flock in Rawdon, until in 1698 he removed to Bromsgrove, where Crosley had been baptized. Two years later he was ordained the first minister of a Church in Northampton, which subsequently became the important College Street Baptist Church. In 1711, Moore published a volume of sermons, *God's Matchless Love to a Sinful World*. These sermons are of very great length and show extraordinary power of analysis and allegorical interpretation—one having no fewer than ninety-five divisions and sub-divisions. They are admirable in spirit and sentiment.

By way of review the following points may be noted.

(1) There were baptized believers in the West Riding before the end of the seventeenth century, but apparently the distinctive rite was not made prominent in a sectarian way at the beginning. In the original Rawdon Trust Deed of date 1712, the term Baptist is not used, but "Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England, yet owning a Christian and sincere belief in the doctrinal part of the Thirty-nine Articles of the said Church, and usually known under the definition of the Congregational persuasion." Also, John Moore had no hesitation in taking the oversight of the Northampton Church, which was not strict but open on the question of membership.

(2) The Baptist cause here did not originate as a mere peasant or illiterate movement. Probably as in Corinth, there were "not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble," but there were *some*. Men of substance and public spirit, squires and landowners in the neighbourhood were at least sympathisers—and the Trustees in the earliest Deed were: two Yeomen (probably well-to-do farmers), one Batchelor (a subordinate degree of Knighthood), one Physician, and one Clothier (probably a weaver of cloth), and their well-formed signatures to the Deed suggest men of character and facility in penmanship. And the earliest records in the Old Church Book are admirably expressed in a beautifully artistic calligraphy. Some of the leaders of the Baptist cause were also pioneers in establishing the first public school in Rawdon.

(3) The terms Dissenter, Independent, Nonconformist are misleading if they are taken to convey a merely negative attitude,

as if the chief concern was to repudiate interference from without, and to refuse obedience to all authority. Behind the protest against certain forms of Order and Ritual there lay a positive testimony to the loftiest spiritual realities—an intense earnestness for scriptural and intelligent faith, and a passion for political liberty—not for anarchy and license, but for the building up of a better social order. And the spirit of toleration—of recognising the good in other Communion, was not lacking. In a local Church “Circular letter” of these early days there occurs the following: “Let not people indulge the narrowness of their minds, nor their rash and uncharitable censures of Christians of different denominations, perhaps wiser and better men than themselves.”

(4) Finally, there was a deep concern about the religious condition of the nation, and a conviction that the widespread degeneracy was largely attributable to the failure of Christian people to live up to their profession and privileges. Here is part of a letter issued from the Rawdon Church about 1720. “Nothing is more evident than that the vitals of Christianity in these our days are diminisht and grown small. Genuine religion is wearing out of the world, and many families whose fathers were pious, are grown prophane; and the rising generation are weary of Religion and a Church state. And even too many of the saints themselves make but an indifferent figure: some are ignorant, some negligent, some impudent, some contentious, some censorious, and even many that we hope well of, are in the main so degenerate and indifferent, and so like the men of this world, ’tis hard to distinguish ’em. God may have golden designs and gracious reserves tack’t onto the backside of these clouds. But it is clear that judgment must begin or end at the House of God. Storms make men prize their harbour, and they that neglect to mend their ship whilst in it, may see and lament their fault when too late any other way, than by becoming warnings to others who would take no warnings themselves. Build on the Rock. Learn to look with your own eyes. Get Faith. No reformation’s good but what reduces things to their first beginnings. Commend yourselves to God in well doing, as those that would have room in a royal breast, and a secret chamber till a stormy day be done!

DAVID GLASS.

Capel-y-ffin.

I HAVE recently had the privilege to examine a ragged small quarto, bound in vellum, and inscribed *A Register Book for the use of the Baptized Church of Christ meeting at Chapel y Ffin*. It is dated 1794, but it also contains "writings and agreements copyd out of the old decayd Register Book" from 1737. Capel-y-ffin (which takes its name, "the chapel at the boundary," not from the meeting-house hereafter referred to, but from an ancient chapel-of-ease of the parish-church of Llanigon) is a scattered hamlet in the south-eastern corner of Breconshire, where the counties of Brecon, Monmouth and Hereford meet, lying along the northern part of the next to the most easterly of the four valleys which run up into the Black Mountains, the vale of Ewyas. It is still a secluded place, where the road ceases to become really practicable for twentieth-century vehicles and the nearest convenient railway station is ten miles off, at Llanvihangel Crucorney where, in 1678, another "dissenter," the Ven. David Lewis (*alias* Charles Baker), a Jesuit, was brought before the magistrate. But in the years covered by the register-book the place was even more retired and suitable for the gatherings of a sect still hardly immune from persecution. Even in the earlier years of the nineteenth century the normal ways in and out of the valley were by the mountain bridle-paths to Hay at the north and to Longtown on the east; the southern end was not opened up as it is to-day, and Archdeacon Coxe in his *Tour Through Monmouthshire* (1801) gives a most alarming account of his adventures in a chaise when penetrating the vale of Ewyas from Abergavenny. In the register it is noted (15th Sept. 1805) that "Abergavenny is far from here and none from here goes there but seldom," and that letters should be directed "to the care of Mr. Swetman Shopkeeper Hay Breconshire."

The easternmost valley of the Black Mountains, adjoining Ewyas, is that of Olchon, and at its southern end, in more or less open country, is Oldcastle, the home of Sir John Oldcastle, sometimes called Lord Cobham, the leader of the Lollards during the reign of Henry V. After his escape from the Tower and the abortive rising of 1414 he fled to the west and was in hiding in the vale of Olchon for three years, from whence he organized the

disturbances which eventually lead up to his re-capture and hanging in 1417. The diocese of Hereford, to which Olchon and Oldcastle were adjacent, was one of the centres of Lollardy, and without doubt Sir John's enormous influence (he was a man of personality and ability as well as of position and wealth) extended the short distance over the mountain ridge to the then Welsh-speaking inhabitants of Ewyas. Indeed, in spite of the language objection, it is possible that *Bwlch Efengyl* (Gospel Pass) which opens the northern end of Ewyas, gets its name from Lollard preachers. Popular tradition associates it with the presence of St. Paul, while some writers have brought Archbishop Baldwin through here when on his crusading mission; the second conjecture is as certainly wrong as the first, for Giraldus, who was with the archbishop, definitely says that they went from "Landeu" to Abergavenny *via* Coed Grono i.e., Grwyne-fawr, the next valley west.

Joshua Thomas, that indefatigable collector of traditions, was told about 1750 that in 1633 there was formed in the vale of Olchon a Church of Particular Baptists under the pastorate of one Howell Vaughan. Though politically in Herefordshire, it was accounted the second nonconformist church to be founded in Wales and the first of that persuasion.¹

From very early days the Olchon Baptists had a "branch" at Capel-y-ffin, and the two places were closely associated. There was never a distinct meeting-house at Olchon, worship being

¹ There is no need to question the tradition that the influence of Sir John Oldcastle had persisted, and that dissent was rife in the vale. There is, however, abundant contemporary evidence that there was no dissenting church in Wales before 1639, when Wroth, Craddock and Jessey organized at Llanvaches. Had there existed any organized church in Olchon then, of any shade, silence about it would have been most unjust. The leaders of the Llanvaches church were in Bristol 1642/3, when local Baptists were influential enough to win John Tombes thoroughly to Baptist principles. Therefore it is quite possible that from 1643 onwards, Baptist views may have become known, both at Llanvaches and at Olchon. Yet repeated search for evidence has found nothing earlier than the entries in the church book of Swansea, now at Swansea, Massachusetts. They were summarised in 1795 by Joshua Thomas, and published fully in Welsh page 13 of the *Trafodion Cymdeithas Hanes Bedyddwyr Cymru*, 1910-1911. Mr. Thomas Richards concludes that early in February 1649/50 "a Baptist cause was started at the Hay in Breconshire as a convenient meeting-place for the converted Independents of Llanigon and the Baptists who had some years foregathered on the other side of the mountains at Olchon in Herefordshire"; and he notes that the researches of Baptist historians have hitherto failed to give a satisfactory account of the origin of this church. It should be observed that Myles and Proud went to London (not to Olchon) to learn more fully, and to be baptized. The letters of 1650 published by Ivimey would agree with the theory that the dissenters of Olchon were converted to Baptist principles and were organized into a church early in that year.—EDITOR.

conducted in private houses; and so when, in 1762, an acre of ground was given in Capel-y-ffin and a meeting-house built thereon, the Olchon "church" became merged in and lost its name to Capel-y-ffin.

It is thus seen that this tiny Welsh hamlet has a tradition of religious "dissent" going back to the days of Henry V. Whether that tradition is unbroken is not clear, but the Baptists of the neighbourhood are conscious and proud of the antiquity of their association, and always date it to the fifteenth century.² It is possible that there is here a tenuous link between pre-reformation dissenters and post-reformation Protestants—but no sufficient continuity to make Wiclif or Oldcastle, much less Langland or Fr. John Ball, "morning-stars of the Reformation."

The register-book of this ancient community was kept in no ways methodically or completely. It includes lists of members, baptisms (by immersion in the Afon Honddhu and other streams) amounts and details of collections, disciplinary records, and notices of pastors, who until recently merely added the duties of the ministry to their work as farmers. No marriages are recorded (this was the business of the parish-church) nor deaths, except incidentally. Throughout its pages, from 1737, the same family names continually appear, many of which, Watkins, Lewis and Price, for example, are with us still.

From the entry of a Church Meeting on June 2nd, 1784, it seems likely that the complete fusion of Olchon with Capel-y-ffin did not take place until that date. The agreement is a good example of the decency and simplicity which characterized their religion. It begins as follows:

We agree to make our covenant as a church with each other, in the name, and in the fear of the Lord and in His strength, that is to say as followeth. First if a Brother or Sister shall be found guilty of giving a private offence to a fellow-member, that such offended member is to behave to the offender according to the rule given in St. Matt. in Chap. xviii. 15, 16, 17. Secondly, not to forget or forsake the Assembling of ourselves together, on our publick, and more private prayer meetings, but in love, and after, instruct, sympathize, comfort, bear each other's burden, And pray with and for one another, Heb. 10. 25. *Et cetera, et cetera.*

Baptism being denied to infants, christening was replaced by a naming ceremony, e.g.—

William and Daniel and Mary and Sarah. The two sons and two daughters of Wm. Jones by Sarah his wife were

²They even claim that Sir John Oldcastle was "re-baptized" in Olchon brook, but there is no evidence beyond vague tradition.

named (as above) before many witnesses 6th of January 1812.

John the son of John Nichols by Blanche Williams his intended wife was Named before witnesses. Feb. 19, 1813.

With reference to this last entry, it should be borne in mind that the country people of Great Britain have never regarded the parenthood of *betrothed* persons with excessive disfavour. So that when, in the thirteenth century, the clergy, as against the baronage, urged that English law should recognize the legitimation of children by the subsequent marriage of their parents, they voiced public opinion as well as canon law.

There are two moving obituary notices, expressed in familiar terms:—

Joan Ellis Died August 24th, 1843. . . . She had the high privilege of Living consistent with her profession. . . . She was a very eminent Christian, faithful and zealous with the cause, and in her last affliction she exemplified all Christian graces in great perfection—often she said . . . “pray for me that I may be kept from murmuring.”

Thomas Prosser of Cwmbwch died Febry. 2nd. 1848 He (under)went two great afflictions, he bore them with great patience, and resignation to the will of God.

A good proportion of the register is taken up with particulars of the exercise of the discipline of “exclusion,” i.e., excommunication, which in any given case was resolved on in private and executed in public meeting.

For what offences or crimes People ought to be excluded from communion (i.e., with the church).

1. Such who are disturbers of the Church's peace. 1 Cor. xi. 16, Gal. v. 12.

2. Such as do not keep their places in the Church. Jude vi., verse 19.

3. Such who walk disorderly and irregular in their lives. 2 Thess. iii. 6, xi. 14.

4. All such as commit atrocious crimes unrepented of and continued in with such we are bid not to eat at the Lord's Table. 1 Cor. v. 11.

5. All yt are erroneus who hold and propagate doctrine. Rom. xvi. 17 & John ix. 10, 11.

The end of excluding persons from a Church ought to be the glory of God in the 1st place.

2. To purge the church and preserve it from infection a little leaven leavens the whole lump. 1 Cor. v. 7, 13.

3. The good of persons excommunicated. Jude, verses 23, 2 Thess iii. 14, 2 Cor. ii 7.

Sound doctrine here! The following are examples of its application.

Chapel y ffin May 4th. 1793. Then agreed that James Williams to be excluded for drunkenness and other crimes laid to his Charge. Anne his wife to be suspended for false speaking with other things unbecoming the Gospel. And Mary Burton for injuring her fellow member and other crimes. To be done at the Lord's Table. Which was performed the Sabbath following. (Four signatures.)

23rd. May 1801. Then agreed for Wm. Edwards, Margaret Price, Jas. Lewis and his wife, and James Price to come to the prayer meeting (at our meeting house) at & upon the Day which the Ministers and Messengers at the next Annual Meeting shall appoint for prayer & C³ in the Churches and our Bro. Geo. Watkins to send a Letter to acquaint ye sd. Price of the necessity of his coming as he lives not near to be otherwise informed. And if they or any of them shall willingly neglect to comply to exclude such from communion upon the ordinance day next following for breaking the covenant with God and their brethren with other errors if they shall not be restored sooner.

James Lewis & his wife attended & gave satisfaction to the Brethren.

Witness our hands 27th. May 1801. (Five signatures.)

That faith was regarded as well as morals the following entry emphasizes :

Feb. 27. 1808. Then agreed to exclude James Price from communion with the Church for holding and propagating erroneous Doctrines, such as the winchesterian and C and profligate life to be done at our next ordinance day, which was performed after the Lord's Supper was administered at the Table on ye 27th. of March 1803. As witness our hands. John Griffiths. John Lewis. William Price. James Lewis.

"Winchesterian" doctrine was named after Elhanan Winchester, a Baptist minister from Philadelphia, who between 1787 and 1794 preached in London with great acceptance that all men would ultimately be saved. This doctrine had previously been called Rellyan, from James Relly of Pembroke, from whom it had passed to Winchester through James Murray. It is generally known to-day as Universalism. Its adherents in America had held a convention in 1803 at the town of Winchester in New Hampshire, and had published a Profession of Faith known as the Winchester Profession.

³ From elsewhere in the register I find that " & C " included fasting.

“Back-sliding” was duly noted. Thus :

Sarah Perrot was Baptized Decr. 5th. 1802. She was excluded March 25th. 1804 for illegal pregnancy after previous warning.

Evan Evans of the Cwm was baptized September the 1st. 1822. He was excluded he being guilty of fornication June the 20, 1824.

Under date August 17th, 1800, the names of fifty-two members are recorded, of whom four, three women and a man, were subsequently excluded. A note is added that,

There is seventeen of the above named . . . either too far off and can't attend, or neglygent and do not, all of them poor except Jane Gilbert who is prevented as she says by her husband.

The extracts which follow are from a letter dated September 15th, 1805, and superscribed.

The Church of Christ meeting at Olchon in Herefordshire and Chapel y ffin in Breconshire to the Church of Christ meeting at Broadmead Bristol sendeth salutation. Honored Brethren

Whereas our dear sister Ann Williams is (in providence) come of late to reside in Bristol and apply to Dr. Ryland for being received a member with and among you, and as the Revd. Dr. sent a letter to our Minister G. W. signifying his desire to be informed of her good character. . . . She in her youth submitted to the ordinance of Baptism & gave herself a member with us much against and contrary to ye consent & will of her parents with other relations according to the flesh. . . . (She) was as useful as could be wished according to her power, and beyond her power we judge that she was willing as she delighted to entertain strangers; which she continued to do for a number of years. Untill the wheel of providence turned unexpectedly against her and her late husband (we hope he arrived safe above) which obligd them both to quit the place and we as a church so low that we could not extricate them out of any part of their distresses. So she Naomi-like went from the poor neighbourhood . . . partly as we are given to think, by poverty, weakness, old age, & perhaps by stubbornness and abatement in her first love. But be that as it may we feel for her. . . . So our desire is that you would please to receive her in the Lord watching over her & performing all Christian duties towards her as becometh Christians to their fellow members so we commit you and her to the Lord and to the word of His grace which is able to build you & her and us, in the most holy faith. That

the God of peace may sanctify you and us wholly and that your and our spirits souls and bodies may be preserved blameless unto the coming of Lord Jesus Christ is & shall be the prayer of

Your unworthy poor brethren, & C.

The minister G.W. referred to is George Watkins, who speaks thus of himself.

And unworthy me was favoured to begin to engage in the pleasing tho' arduous work (of the ministry) in the year 1765. . . . And having obtained help of God I continue to this day. . . . I have no desire to live any longer than my Master would make me of some use to my fellow-men & fellow Xtians that Jesus X may be more and more glorified in the salvation of the objects of his eternal love. So be it. Geo. Watkins. June 6. 1806.

On the inside of the back cover is an anxious note on Lord Sidmouth's bill (1811) to restrain laymen ("Blacksmiths, Chimneysweepers, Pig-drovers, Pedlars, Coblers") from preaching. "The bill is thrown out."

Throughout the book the handwritings are notably literate, the spelling not often "eroneous," and the facts well expressed. There are no entries in Welsh, except the transcription of a hymn. Occasionally I came across examples of the more fervid style of evangelical diction, for example:

Our brethren enjoyed great liberty in speaking and the Doctrine was dropping like rain. (1838.)

When the net was drawn up, we found that some had been caught, and drawn (we hope) from their old element to breath in the air of Calvary. (1842.)

In reading these records of a despised sect of one hundred and two hundred years ago, there was brought vividly to my mind the early days of the Church. The simplicity, the faithfulness, the stern discipline, the unwordliness, the trust in God and His grace, whatever the world might do or say, are reflected clearly in the records of these folk whose salvation lay, not in adult baptism and in ordinances, but in their transparent good faith. And their descendants of to-day are not unworthy of them. Their religion is a reality; they hold it simply, firmly and almost without a thought of any other; and the newspaper has not yet supplanted the Sunday sermon, which is appraised and appreciated as an art-connoisseur his treasures. The comparison is deliberate, for preaching is here still a popular art of which all know the rules and the criteria.

DONALD ATTWATER.

Baptist Gleanings in Stafford

THE Rev. A. G. Matthews, M.A., has written an admirable account of the Congregational churches in Staffordshire, prefaced with some account of the Puritans, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers in the county during the seventeenth century. For the benefit of our readers and of future Baptist students who may undertake a similar volume for our own denomination, the chief Baptist facts are extracted.

In 1644 Captain John Garland and James Cokayne were examined by a minister, commissioned by a council of war at Stafford, for preaching at Ipstones (between Cheadle and Leek). First they claimed that the scriptures allowed every man to preach who had ability. Then they were accused of preaching that baptism without faith was of no force, that the baptising of infants was anti-christian, that soul and body both lie in the grave till the resurrection, that the calling of the clergy is anti-christian, that we may keep any day for the Sabbath, as well as the day we do keep. The result of the inquiry is unknown, and so are the future activities of these men.

In 1649 Colonel Henry Danvers was governor of Stafford, and member of a General Baptist Church there, whose Elder was Henry Hagger. These men were both active for five or six years in the neighbourhood. A group of churches in 1651 urged Cromwell to carry out a thorough reformation; another group in 1654 descended to details, and urged the regulation of alehouses.

The Quakers raided these General Baptist churches and won two prominent ministers, Thomas Hamersley and Humphrey Woolrich, who devoted themselves by public debate and otherwise to bring over all their friends; in this they had much success.

We should like to know the names of the County Tryers, both lay and minister.

In 1664 a pessimist magistrate kept reporting about plots by old soldiers, especially "they hotspurs, Anabaptists and Quakers"; next year he had arrested a company of conventiclers. One man did turn informer next year, and said that Major Gledman in London was ready to take command of four hundred men, for whom horses had been bought at Penkridge Fair. Meanwhile the constables were making presentations, and accused twenty-one people that year of being "Anabaptists"—

a good word to apply to anybody disliked—and twelve more of leaving their infants unbaptised.

The clergy reported to their bishop in 1669 that two conventicles were kept in Burton-on-Trent, both great; the place for the Baptist was either at the Shiltons, widow Honeworth, or Dixon Blount, or is not named. At Stafford John Wade sheltered three hundred or four hundred, including John Hudson, Samuel Harper, Thomas Dickinson. At Coulton (near Rugeley) thirty or forty Anabaptists met at the houses of George Wright and Richard Whiston. At Hanbury (near Tutbury) others met in the houses of Thomas Edwards, George Mallener, and Anne Cotton.

In 1672 the following licences were issued, avowedly for Baptists: On 25 July, for the parish of Audley (between Newcastle and Nantwich), Thomas Beech, for the house of John Cotrocke, and Thomas Sillito, for the house of Samuel Sillito. On 5 September, John Blundell, for the house of William Tomlinson, of Burton.

The church of Lichfield was still existing, and William Pardoe, even in prison, was able to help it. Dean Wood acknowledged in 1684 that, despite all his efforts, "three or four Anabaptists and one Quaker" declined to come to communion; and three years later he could only boast that he had stopped conventicles. In 1690 David Crosley found the Particular Baptists here, but preferring to meet outside the city. Lawrence Spooner was pastor about 1702, and was followed by Benjamin Hands, in whose day the centre was Little Saredon, on the way to Penkridge. Hands, however, was reported to Dr. John Evans in 1717 as at Darlaston, near Walsall and Wednesbury; his funeral sermon was preached in 1724 by Sing of Bridgnorth. For half a century there is no further sign of any Baptists in Staffordshire.

Baptist life began again in the county when members from Brierley Hill came to live at Coseley in 1776, whence arose the Darkhouse church. From this time Mr. Matthews devotes himself chiefly to the Congregational churches, but he gives a long and lively account of the proceedings of Benjamin Manders at Wolverhampton, involving the erection of a chapel at Temple Street in 1795.

One curious fact deserves to be followed up. Near Rushton, in a field overlooking the Dane Valley, are several gravestones, some dated from 1672, the oldest visible now is 1687. The farm was once owned by a Baptist, who bequeathed it with the condition that the house should always be available as a Baptist preaching station. This right was exercised in 1824, by the minister at Hanley. The last interment was about 1780.