

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

Editorial.

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held on Thursday, 28th April, at 2-30 in the Baptist Church House. After reports and elections, Mr. Seymour J. Price will read a paper on The Contribution of the Baptist Building Fund to our Denominational Life. The Rev. S. J. Ford, of Bristol, will exhibit a picture designed by himself, showing in diagrammatic form the growth of Baptist Churches throughout the world. The meeting is open to members and their friends.

Nominations for officers and members of committee should be sent to the honorary secretary by 20th April. The list of officers is given on the cover: the other members of committee are Messrs. Blomfield (Sutton), Brooksbank (Leighton Buzzard), Chown (Wolverhampton), Dakin (Bristol), Farrer (London), Langley (Walsall), Laslett (Watford), Price (London), Thirtle (London), Townsend (Manchester), Underwood (Rawdon), and Warde (Surbiton).

GUINEA Subscribers for 1927 will receive in the autumn a study of Baptist Life in London from 1612 to the present day. It will include sketch-maps in 1741 and 1841 showing where churches existed then. Epitomised histories of more than seven hundred Baptist churches will be appended; also a topographical list, and an index to every place where worship has been conducted.

THE articles on the Baptist Building Fund, which have been contributed by Mr. Seymour J. Price for a year, will be gathered, augmented and illustrated, then published for the Fund Committee. The committee of the Historical Society propose to issue a copy to each Guinea Subscriber for 1926.

Sin and Grace.

A STUDY OF EPHESIANS ii. 1-10.

IN this section of his epistle, Paul contrasts in very vivid and pointed language the sin of the world and the grace of God. By ourselves, we are dead in sin and walk according to the dictates of the Prince of this world. By the grace of God in Christ, we are enabled to rise from the dead and sit down in heavenly places. It is only as we keep the contrast in mind all the time and impress it upon ourselves as a contrast that we shall realise the profundity of Paul's thought or the great sweep of his doctrine of grace.

I.

First of all, he tells the Ephesians what sort of men and women they had been before they met Christ. "And you, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins, wherein aforesime ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the Prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience, among whom we also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and the mind, and were by nature children of wrath even as the rest."

In the study of this section, there are several points of importance to be noticed.

(1) We have the comparison between Jew and Greek such as is constantly coming out in this Epistle. One of the fundamental conceptions of it is the unity of the universal church, the one-ness of all peoples in Christ. The days of religious exclusiveness are gone. Men have to be redeemed by the same gracious God, whatsoever be their tribe or colour, and until they are so redeemed, they are under the control of the same evil power. "You," i.e., the Greeks, were dead in trespasses, and "we," i.e., the Jews, also walked in the lusts of the flesh.

(2) The grammatical structure is peculiar. But it is to be doubted whether this is deliberate. Paul is a jerky writer, starting sentences he does not finish, and breaking off in the middle of a line in order to develop the thought suggested by some stray word. That is what has happened here. He began to develop the thought that the Gentiles, though they were dead in sin, were made to live in Christ, and then the idea struck him that the Jews were in exactly the same position. And so he finished his sentence, not

realising that the main verb had not yet appeared. He began a new sentence in verse 4. But, in spite of the grammatical difficulty, the meaning is perfectly clear.

(3) Two interesting figures of speech appear in this section. One is "according to the fashion of this world." This last word strictly means "age," "dispensation," and was used in later Gnostic thought to define the various emanations, linking up, in descending order of dignity, the Absolute with the world of finite things. Some scholars have said that there is a trace of this thought in the use of this particular phrase here. This is to be doubted. Gnosticism had indeed begun to appear as early as this, and was attacked by Paul. The proof for that is to be found in the Epistle to the Colossians, and traces are to be found in the Epistle to the Ephesians. But the doctrine of Aeons is a later growth, and apparently is not to be found in the New Testament. What Paul really means is that Gentiles who once lived in sin lived according to the rule and procedure of this world, using "world" in the predominant New Testament sense of the present universe as broken away from divine influences and given over to the control of sin.

"The Prince of the authority of the air" is another interesting figure of speech. According to Dr. Moffatt, it probably owes its origin to Zoroastrianism. The idea of the air as the abode of evil spirits is to be found in other places in the New Testament, as in Rev. xvi. 17, Eph. vi. 12. But this doctrine is not to be confined to Zoroastrianism. The idea of Beliar as prince of the power of the air entered into Judaism fairly early, and it is from there that Paul probably derived the conception. But in this figure of speech, there are serious things involved, both for the interpretation of the New Testament, and also for the understanding of its environment.

In the first place, account must be taken of Paul's dualism. There seems to be a sheer break between the material and spiritual worlds. The man of sin is under the power of the material world, and salvation consists in the miraculous transportation of him out of this world into the spiritual world which is ruled over by God. I say miraculous because man cannot effect the transition himself; it has to be done through the agency of God. Paul, of course, is not alone in this doctrine. He is followed, and followed far more consistently, by John. For this is only one side of Paul's thought. There is another side of him, when he is more under the influence of the prevailing Christian conceptions. The source of this dualism is ultimately Greek and Asiatic. First, there is the usual Greek contrast between the spiritual and material worlds. And then particularly, there is the Zoroastrian contrast between the good and evil spirits, Ahura Mazda and Ahriman. Dualism

is an adjunct to Christianity, and is not its prevailing attitude. It is foreign alike to Jesus and to the earliest thought.

The second factor in this figure of speech is the influence of magical conceptions. It is quite a mistake to study the religious literature of Judaism and the philosophical systems of Greece as though they alone provided the atmosphere of early Christianity. Superstition was there as well, and magic and astrology. Christianity was born into a world of magic, and willy-nilly had to use the language of magic to teach a message of beauty and life. And one of the great glories of the earliest believers was that they set themselves definitely and implacably against magical influences. The great pity is that their children have not been as true. The general opinion of the ancient world was that the soul was the breath, and that at the moment of death, the breath and therefore the soul was carried off into the atmosphere between the earth and the sky. Thus the air was filled by wandering spirits, *daemons*, with power to help or injure men, according as they were fed or neglected by those left on earth. All alike had capabilities of good and evil. This was the view in the earliest animistic stage. But under the influence of later conceptions, order began to be imported into the spiritual world, and a distinction drawn between the two armies of the good and the evil spirits, each under their own leaders. All this sort of thinking helped to create the atmosphere of early Christianity, and must be taken into account in the exegesis of the New Testament.

(4) Paul speaks of both the Greeks and the Jews as "dead through their trespasses." The construction implies that it was living in sin that had brought about death. But the most important thing is the meaning of "dead." There are, in the main, two interpretations. Meyer says that "dead" is proleptic: when you had through your sins drawn upon you death, had become liable to eternal death. Ellicott denies this, and says that Paul means spiritually "dead." Paul certainly does not mean that. When he speaks about death, he means death. He does not mean anything so weak and flabby as spiritual death, whatever that may mean, for those who use the expression always give the impression that they have interpreted something by giving it a fancy label. By death, Paul means nothing less than the exact opposite of everything he means by life. But Meyer also can hardly be right. The worst of Meyer is that he is so accurate, so accurate as often to be wrong. Paul did not use words as scientifically as the German scholar thinks. He is going on to speak of the way men are made alive in Christ, and he wants to point the contrast between what they are now and what they were once. And so he says, in his vivid way, that they had been dead. We can leave it there.

(5) A sentence that requires careful study is to be found in the words, "We were by nature children of wrath even as the rest." This has often been taken as evidence of the doctrine of original sin. There ought to be no need at this date to repel this doctrine, which, in the exaggerated form in which it has often been presented, has had pernicious effects, but it may be well to look at it insofar as it has tried to gain support in this particular passage. That Paul is not, at this point, at any rate, propagating the doctrine of original sin, can be accepted as certain, for two reasons.

(a) Such an interpretation puts far too much meaning into "by nature," which is by no means in an emphatic position, and means little more than "naturally." The word is quite neutral, and simply refers to the natural constitution of a thing, apart from any influences, good or bad, that may operate on it from the outside. There is a similar use of the word in Rom. ii. 14, Gal. ii. 15, iv., 8. Thus, on linguistic grounds alone, this interpretation falls to the ground. The text does not mean "we are, by an inborn tendency, children of wrath"; it means, "we are, as a sheer matter of fact, here and now, seeing that we happen to be what we are, subject to the wrath of God."

(b) The interpretation also does not harmonise with the context, which speaks of the actual sin of the Jews, and not of some inborn tendency which cannot be escaped. It is because the Jews had at one time indulged in sin that they became subject to the wrath of God. This, moreover, is the usual doctrine of Paul, and, for the matter of that, of the whole Bible.

But though this interpretation must be ruled out of court, there are two points that must be remembered.

(a) Paul regards sin seriously. Sinful men and women are really under the wrath of God. There is a sheer contrast between the holy nature of God and the impure life of men. God cannot do other than set Himself in opposition to sin, and His opposition, by the infallible working out of divine laws, is bound to come down severely upon those who choose a life of sin. This needs to be put strongly in days like these, when there is great emphasis upon the Fatherhood of God and little upon His Sovereignty. To Paul, as to his Master, the wrath of God and His love were inextricably bound up together. We may not be able to think through the two consistently, but they must certainly be held together.

(b) Paul regards man, unless he is under the influence of the Spirit, as being very much under the influence of the Devil. He has two different conceptions of salvation, springing from two different ways of looking at sin and human nature. One is ethical and the other is metaphysical and mystical. The first view was

Jewish, and Paul shared it, more or less, with Jesus and the whole of the early Church. The real evil of the world was sin: it was moral disobedience. There were other evils in the world, but they were all the consequences of sin. In the Messianic Age, men would be forgiven their sin and be delivered from it, and by this deliverance would be able to enter into the Messianic Kingdom. But Paul has another way of looking at the facts. Man has a radical fault of nature. He belongs to earth, and shares in the imperfections of earth, and from that he must be delivered and be transported into a higher realm of being, that of the Spirit. It would be hard to find Paul, at any point, consistently following either of these theories. They are rather to be found side by side with each other. And here the contradiction is apparent. Man has free choice. He has the power to choose whether he will follow the higher impulses of the Spirit or the lower impulses of the flesh. Adam chose to follow his fleshly impulses, and that choice was perpetuated right through the race, until, through the predomination of the lower desires, we became creatures of the flesh. That is, man has, by his own choice and gradually through history, come under the wrath of God. But Paul has other points of view which do not harmonise with this. One is that the whole human race was mystically present in Adam, and that it fell when he fell. But there is another conception in Paul's mind, and this more important, and we have justification for the discussion of it here in that he speaks of the lusts of the flesh and of man doing the will of the flesh.

One of the most debatable points in Pauline theology is the exact meaning attaching to "flesh," and to the contrast between body and soul. On the one hand, there is a large body of scholars who assert that Paul's psychology is Jewish to the core, and that it is only to the superficial student that he presents the Greek dualism. Paul does not look upon the body as the principle of sin, but only as that part of human nature which sin finds it the easiest to attack. On the other hand, there are scholars who think that Paul presents a dualistic philosophy, looking upon the flesh as being in direct antagonism to the spirit, as two opposite ethical principles. In my judgment, Paul, here as elsewhere, is inconsistent with himself, for, while in one mood, he is a genuine Jew, in another he is under the influence of Hellenistic thinking.

First of all, we cannot always be certain what he means by "flesh." Sometimes, he seems to regard it as synonymous with "body." But sometimes, it seems to stand for everything we mean by man, insofar as he lives without conscious obedience to the law of God. Thus, in this particular passage, the desires of the flesh are put on the same level as those of the understanding. Also, when he gives a list of the works of the flesh in Gal. v. 19,

the majority of the works he mentions are in no sense of the term physical.

Hebrew thought looks upon man as a being of body and soul, in which the elements of his nature are so closely bound up together that they can never be found apart. There can be no bodiless soul and no body without a soul. It was because of this that Hebrew thought about immortality inevitably moved along the line of the resurrection of the body. Sin is ethical; it belongs to a man's will, and it is by the renewal of the will that the power of sin is broken. The term "flesh" stands for man in his human, weak, creaturely, capacity. The desires of the flesh are ethically neutral. Whether they become sinful or not depends upon how and to what extent and under the dominance of what motives they are satisfied. The body is a necessary part of the complete human personality. There is no such thing as an ethical dualism between soul and body. The Hebrew never interprets salvation as the salvation of the soul from the crippling influences of the body. The outcome of Jewish thought was that, after the resurrection, man, complete in soul and body, would enter into the Messianic Kingdom.

In many ways, Paul shows that he has accepted this conception. He seems often definitely to shut out the idea that the body is the seat of all evil. Thus, many of the sins which he ranks as fleshly are not physical: they are most essentially mental. He believes in the sinlessness of Jesus, whom he acknowledges as born of a woman, and who apparently, in other ways, lived a normal human life. Then, also, he looked upon the body as the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which he could not possibly do if he thought of it as inherently evil, and he urged the Romans to present their bodies as a living sacrifice to God, which he could not do if he looked upon them as full of sin. In all this, he is a true Jew. The body is a necessary element in the personality. It may certainly be the weakest element, but it is not inherently evil. It ought to be and can be redeemed.

But he often shows himself to be under the influence of an entirely different world-view. Man is corrupt, not only because of the piling-up of several instances of sin which have gradually built up a barrier between himself and his true home in God, but also because of a radical fault of nature. The flesh is corrupt and man is under the influence of the flesh. Salvation consists in the deliverance of man from the world of the flesh and his translation into the life of the Spirit. To destroy the power of the flesh is the same thing as to destroy the power of sin. It is in this mood that Paul can say that salvation consists in the mystical union of the believer with Christ.

Thus we have given to us one side of the contrast. We were

once children of wrath. We were dead in our sins. We walked according to the dictates of this world. We did the desires of the flesh. It may be that Paul has painted the picture with colours that are too black. The literature of the Jews shows us a people who were zealous according to their lights, obedient to what they conceived to be the will of God. They might be narrow and fanatical. They might give a gross national interpretation to ideas which the prophets intended to be taken in a spiritual and universal sense. But they were not lacking in culture and spiritual grasp. And the Gospels show us that many were hungering and thirsting after righteousness and longing for the coming of the Kingdom. And it cannot be said that the non-Jewish world was completely vicious. We have ample evidence of honesty and sincere pursuit of the truth, of the love of beauty and goodness, of the respect paid to the cultured gentleman, in Greece, and of the presence of peace, good government, quiet courage, and the domestic virtues, among the Romans. And Paul does not deny all this. Judging by the literature of the time, thought was mainly agnostic and pessimistic. Paul knew that the heathen had a law in their hearts and that they had been, to some extent, obedient to that law. But in view of the severe criticism he passes upon the life of the time, we need to bear several facts in mind.

(1) He is a preacher, who is trying to save people from sin, and the only way a preacher can do that is by showing them the sorryness of their own state. All the great preachers have interpreted the world by means of the great contrast of sin and grace. They have been blind to the positive good of men because of the bigness of their sin, and blind somewhat to the difficulties of the Christian life because of their emphasis upon the grace of God.

(2) Paul sees everything from the point of view of God, the destiny of the soul, and the conduct of man. He has no purely intellectual or aesthetic interests. The Greeks might make beautiful statues, but they made them to the honour of false Gods. The Jews might be zealous according to their light, but they were trying to build up life on impossible principles. Paul gets to the core of the whole business, and condemns Judaism and Hellenism alike for the inevitable tendency of the principles they accepted as true.

(3) He is not trying to give the exact judgment of the historical scholar. He is rather bringing the sin of the world into direct contact with the grace of God in Christ. We should have to take more facts into account than he did, and be more exact in our examination, and more circumspect in our judgment. We should not have to fix our attention all the time on the baser side

of ancient life, but be open to see the ideals of philosophers, the beauty of poets, and the leading of God everywhere. We ought to take into account all the facts, be honest in depicting virtue and equally honest in depicting vice. Such an endeavour would alone reveal a sound historical sense and a sound view of God.

II.

After showing the past evil state of the Jews and the Greeks, Paul goes on to describe the difference that has been made to their position by the gracious dealing of God. "But God, being rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, quickened us together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved), and raised us up with Him, and made us to sit with Him in the heavenlies, in Christ Jesus; that in the ages to come He might show the exceeding riches in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus: for by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared in order that we might walk in them."

Paul has many ways of interpreting the work of God for man. Here he explains it by saying that God has made us alive in Jesus Christ, so that we are capable of sitting by the side of Him in the heavenlies. Obviously, it would be a mistake to tie Paul down to the literal meaning of his words here. He is speaking as a poet and a seer. But some light may be thrown on the meaning and origin of his words.

He says that the redeemed will live with Christ in the "heavenlies." That he means by this something local can be seen by the fact that he claims that after His resurrection, Jesus went to dwell in them. But he also looks upon the heavenly sphere as being in some sense super-sensual, since Christ dwells there, whom he no longer wishes to know after the flesh but after the spirit. Further, the "heavenlies" are of an eternal order, free from the transiency of earth. Again, the conflict between good and evil goes on in the heavenlies. It seems that Paul has not clearly made up his mind on the matter. He is confused by the twofold way of looking at the after life, as both the resurrection of the body and as the immortality of the soul. But this much can be taken as certain. He believes that the Christian will share in Christ's future state of glory. The origin of this thought must be sought for in several different directions.

(1) There is the Jewish thought that the Messiah will dwell

with the redeemed and rule over them in the Messianic Kingdom. Messianism went off on an entirely new line in the Christian Church, owing to the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah, but the Jewish idea of the Messiah ruling over and dwelling with the saints in the new age was predominant in the Christian view of things.

(2) Paul has warrant for his view in the mind of Jesus. It is very uncertain how far he was acquainted with the actual teaching of Jesus, and also to what extent he consciously modelled his own message on it. It is also uncertain what exactly the eschatological teaching of Jesus was. But this much can be taken without much question. Jesus proclaimed Himself as Messiah, and as Messiah, He was soon to come to earth again and rule over the Kingdom of God. In that Kingdom, the saints would dwell, and some of them would be given positions of honour and authority. This thought filled the mind of the early Church. It is to be found even in the Fourth Gospel, much as primitive eschatology and Messianism are superseded there. There can be no doubt that Paul shared in the tradition.

(3) The Apostle was influenced by his belief in the resurrection of Christ and His living reality in the heavenly world. Jesus was alive. He had authority and power. He was clothed in glory. He could come into touch with men. All that was unquestionable. But Paul did not look upon all that as isolated fact. Jesus was the first-fruits of them that slept, the guarantee of the resurrection from the dead and of a blessed life of triumph to all those who put their trust in Him.

(4) A good deal must be laid down to the score of Paul's mystical view of things. Redemption meant mystical fellowship with Christ. All the outstanding experiences of Christ were to be repeated in the life of the Christian. The Christian was to be made to live in Christ, to rise together with Him, and to sit down with Him. It is not enough to say that the Christian was to do these things through the help of Christ. Paul's conception of the communion of the Christian with Christ was mystical rather than ethical. He was conscious of an indwelling power which replaced his ego and made him one, not only in ambition and will, but almost in substance, with Christ. This, of course, is an addition to the original Gospel message, due to Paul's Hellenistic training. Many of his converts had already heard of the death and rising again of the Gods, and of the mystical sharing of the devotee in the divine nature. They would understand Paul, therefore. But he was not making Christianity into a mystery religion. He had real facts to go upon. He did really have fellowship with Christ. Also, Jesus was historic and not mythical. Paul drew no elaborate distinction between the

Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, but by preserving the real manhood of Jesus, he saved Christianity from the curse of myth and idle dreaming. Then also, his Mysticism is Christ-mysticism and not God-mysticism. And last, he preserves his ethical sanity. The Christian has his life to live. He has duties laid upon him. He has a personality in fellowship with, but apart from, Christ.

Paul says that the salvation of the Christian is the work of the great love of God. In his usual way, he piles up word on word to show how great that love was. First, he lays it down as a definition of God's nature—"God, being," as He is, "rich in mercy," could not possibly do other than He has done in dealing graciously with us in Jesus Christ. Then he tells us the active love that God had for us, the outflowing of it in concrete acts—"through the great love wherewith He loved us." Then in order to show the great power wielded by the love of God, he emphasises particularly the depth of human misery—"even though we were dead through our trespasses, He made us to live with Christ." The "even" is not a mere connecting particle here; it emphasises and qualifies our condition, and suggests that, no matter how much we were living in a state of death, the love of God was strong enough to deal with us and save us. Then he says two or three times over that we are saved by grace. Finally, the whole purpose of God's gracious dealing with us is that through succeeding ages, His goodness might be known. Whatever else his readers miss, Paul does not intend them to miss this, that all they have and are and hope to be, they owe to the goodness of God. The grace of God stands for His free love, working with men, saving them, bringing them all the gifts of His heart, even though they reject God. It is bound up with the work of the historic Jesus. To know God in Christ is to know Him in grace. Grace works on ethical lines, for all the advance we make in character is due to the grace of God in Christ.

Paul further defines the gracious dealing of God with us by bringing it in line with His fore-ordaining. Our salvation is not of ourselves, but of God. It is a divine gift and due to no work of our own. "We are God's workmanship, created in Jesus Christ, for good works, which God prepared beforehand in order that we might walk in them." Here we are shown that the purpose of God does not deal merely with general laws: it enters into details, and regulates the lives of individual men and women. Also, the purpose of God is summed up in Christ. He is the goal of creation, the end and consummation of the work of God. Finally, God has an ethical purpose. He created us for good works. This doctrine is unique in the Christian religion. No other faith promises so certainly to make an ideal practical by the gracious activity of God in the heart of the believer.

But there have been criticisms brought against the doctrine.

(1) The first is that it undermines the free-will of man. The sovereignty of God seems to be taken so far that no freedom is left to man to choose his own life. If that were so, then the message of Paul would be robbed of ethical reality. But it is not so. On occasion, Paul writes as though he were an unqualified predestinarian. But it is only on certain occasions, when he is under the influence of the thought of the greatness of God, or is trying to drive home how much we depend on His grace. Further, he lays so many commands upon Christians, charges them so often to live worthily of their calling, and chastises them so often for not so living, that we can quite easily see that he does not deny the free will of man. Lastly, though he often presents salvation as a finished product, obtained immediately the sinner turns to Christ, he shows that he is speaking ideally, and that salvation is rather a growth, due to the co-operation of man with God. It was one of the paradoxes of Paul, as of his Master, that all is of works and yet that all is of grace.

(2) The second objection is that Paul's doctrine is narrow and arbitrary. It is unjust to confine the grace of God to His work in Christ. And if it be so confined, then God fails in His object, for Christians rarely manifest the works for which God made them. The spirit of this objection can be appreciated, but it is based upon a misunderstanding of Paul. First, Paul is the first to confess that Christians do not live as they ought, and that the results of God's work are still in the future. But he is certain of that future. He has no doubt whatever that the purpose of God will be realised. Then, also, he knows that no nation is without a witness of God. The heathen have a law written in their hearts. The order and beauty of the earth speaks to men of God. The race is one. God made us all of one blood. We are one in sin and one in grace. Paul draws no rigid line between what is true and what is false, otherwise he would not be so eager to interpret Christianity in terms of Greek thought and life. But last, Christ is the principle and goal of creation. God has always been dealing with men in Christ. Jesus was real man, but, to Paul, His earthly life was but a moment in a life which was eternal. The religion of Christ is the final product of the thought and striving of man only because Christ has always been at the back of the striving and has been the centre of the redemptive purpose of God. God has never been other than He is in Christ.

H. J. FLOWERS.

The Kingdom of Heaven in the New Testament.

WITH its synonym "the kingdom of God," the phrase "the kingdom of Heaven" meets us on the very threshold of the New Testament, where it is represented as being the burden of the message proclaimed both by John the Forerunner, and afterwards by Jesus Himself. It is thus given a prominence in the early preaching of our Lord which, according to the first three Gospels, it never fails to receive in all His subsequent ministry. It is, therefore, a valid conclusion from the Synoptic reports of the teaching of Jesus that the idea represented by this phrase is essential and fundamental to all that the Supreme Teacher taught concerning God and the soul. We can safely assume that it is the ruling conception of the Gospel He preached, the great theme of His ministry, vitally entering into the whole texture of the great revelation He has given to the world.

That being so, this subject is, undoubtedly, worthy of the earnest consideration of all true followers of Christ, although for nearly eighteen centuries the conflicting theologies and confessions of Christendom—in so far as they can be said to have made any real attempt to teach people religion—sought to direct the minds of their respective adherents more to what was usually thought to be the Gospel of Christ than to this great phrase that was so often upon the lips of Jesus. To-day, however, there is an awakened interest in the idea of the Kingdom of God, which, in all probability, is mainly one of the fruits of the "Back to Christ" movement of the last half century, though the beginnings of the resuscitation of the idea are to be traced much further back than that—even, in fact, to the German Pietists of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, "who loved to speak of work for the Kingdom of God, instead of for the Church or for Christianity." But the first outstanding thinker to deal earnestly with the idea was Kant, who may be considered as "the morning star" of this theological renaissance, whilst other writers like Kant's later contemporary, Schleiermacher, helped somewhat to keep the revived interest alive. It was Ritschl, however, who did most to maintain consistently this idea of the Kingdom of Heaven, by making it one of the two poles of his theological system—the other pole being the idea of redemption or the love

of God. And so thoroughly and widely has Ritschlianism permeated current theological thought that the idea of the Kingdom of God has come to assume a new prominence in recent theology, in which more than one sustained attempt has been made "to find in it the supreme and controlling notion of Christian dogmatics, as well as of Christian ethics." (*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II., page 844.) Indeed, there are some rationalistic theologians in Germany who would go even further. They have a decided penchant for this phrase of Jesus, and hope that by giving all His utterances on this subject an eschatological interpretation they may be able to solve the very real problems created by His teaching and Personality. Accordingly, they hold that Jesus took over from contemporary Judaism not merely the phrase "the Kingdom of Heaven" itself, but also the crude ideas which most of the Jews generally associated with it. And thus Jesus is made the creature of His own age, confined within the most narrow limits of thought and outlook, and reduced to such a mean intellectual and spiritual level as to be unable either to originate a new idea, or to purify and give ethical content to an old one. He is merely a deluded visionary—for that is what their theory amounts to—whose thoughts have been "too well but not too wisely" steeped in the apocalyptic, and perhaps, too, pseudepigraphical, literature of His country and race; and so He dreams of a glorious coming Kingdom of Heaven which is to burst with dramatic and catastrophic suddenness upon "a wicked and adulterous generation"; of which Kingdom He Himself as "the Son of Man," is to be the sovereign Lord, whilst His faithful followers, who have left everything to become His disciples, are to share in His rulership and His triumph. In this belief of "a second coming" He died upon the Cross, but not without first having bequeathed the illusion to His friends and followers, all of whom expected Him to reappear within the life time of their own generation.

But, theologians, whether rationalistic or otherwise, are not the only people nowadays, to whom "the Kingdom of God" is of supreme and commanding importance. There are also social reformers and even political revolutionaries both in England and on the Continent, amongst whom this phrase of Jesus has received a popularity which has never been accorded to it in the Church itself—not even in the Church of the Apostles. Many of them are men who do not believe the deepest things concerning the Person and Work of our Lord as we find them stated in the New Testament, and yet with passionate eagerness they have adopted this phrase to express their highest social ideals; and whilst they utterly refuse to think of Christ as the Son of the Highest or the Saviour of the World, they, nevertheless, enthusiastically and

openly acclaim Him as the supreme social reformer and even as the greatest of political revolutionaries. And when it is remembered that these people believe in the democratization of religious as well as political, institutions and ideas—and when it is further remembered that this is an age of democracy in which “the captains and the kings depart”—it is certainly a remarkable fact that men have chosen such an intensely autocratic phrase to express their finest democratic ideals. Surely, it is an unconscious testimony to the influence of Jesus upon the life and thought of the world.

I.

That Jesus often spoke about “the Kingdom of Heaven” is, of course, unquestioned by any who accept the Gospels as trustworthy records of historic facts. Indeed, even so radical a critic as Schmiedel practically asserts that it was the main theme of the Master’s preaching, in admitting that the Synoptic tradition had its roots in history. True, in the nine passages “not open to question” which Schmiedel selects from our first three Gospels, and calls the “foundation-pillars of a really scientific life of Jesus,” the phrase “the Kingdom of Heaven” does not occur. Nevertheless, he goes on to say, after discussing his “foundation pillars,” “We must, therefore, work upon the principle that together with the ‘foundation-pillars,’ and as a result of them, everything in the first three Gospels deserves belief, which would tend to establish Jesus’ greatness, provided that it harmonises with the picture produced by the ‘foundation-pillars,’ and in other respects does not raise suspicion. And this gives us nothing less than pretty well the whole bulk of Jesus’ teaching, in so far as its object is to explain in a purely religious and ethical way what God requires of man, and wherein man receives comfort and consolation from God” (*Jesus in Modern Criticism*, page 27).

We may safely assume, therefore—the most advanced New Testament criticism being on our side—that the Master did speak about “the Kingdom of Heaven.” From the beginning to the end of His ministry—whether its duration be three years or only six months—Jesus constantly called men to repentance because of the imminence of that Kingdom and often likened it to common objects in the world of nature, or certain happenings in the realm of life. Indeed, many of our Lord’s most characteristic parables—such as those, for example, brought together in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew—contain some reference to the origin, the development or the coming of the Kingdom, whilst many of His more direct and less picturesque sayings make definite statements

concerning this great theme of His teaching. Hence the phrase must have been continually upon the lips of Jesus. According to the Gospels, as we now have them, He used it something like a hundred and ten times—though, obviously He must have spoken it much more frequently in the course of His ministry—and that number is greatly increased if we remember the number of times the phrase “eternal life” occurs in the fourth Gospel, a phrase which is undoubtedly the Johannine equivalent of the Synoptic “Kingdom of Heaven.” This latter fact is admitted even by Wendt, when he says; “Although in the discourses of the fourth Gospel, this title of the “Kingdom of God” occurs only in one place, yet in reality the whole contents of those discourses, their testimony to His Messiahship, and their exhortations to faith in Him, can be ranked under the general subject of the Kingdom of God and the two aspects under which He expounded it” (*The Teaching of Jesus*, Vol. I., page 174).

It is certain, therefore, as the foregoing facts amply prove—and has been pointed out, at the beginning,—that the idea of the Kingdom of Heaven is basic and essential to the whole scheme of Jesus’ teaching, the main theme in His proclamation of the “Good news.” And this position can be maintained in spite of the fact that Dr. Drummond, in his “Kerr Lectures,” following Dr. Kidd, denies that the “Kingdom of Heaven” is the master-thought of Jesus, and asserts that it can only be made to appear so by using the phrase “in a very lax way and by fitting into it numerous ideas that have no cognate affinity with the idea of king or kingdom” (*Apostolic Teaching and Christ’s Teaching*, page 183); for even this able lecturer practically admits, on a previous page (179) that the idea of the Kingdom was basic to the teaching of Jesus, in saying: “This phrase was constantly on the lips of Christ, particularly during the early section of His ministry, and in public utterance even to the end, though not in private colloquy with His disciples. It was used by Him as a summary for what He taught Himself, and what He commissioned His messengers to preach.” Still, the fact that we hold the “Kingdom of Heaven” to be fundamental to Christ’s presentation of His Gospel does not prevent us from agreeing with Harnack’s contention that the teaching of Jesus may be summed up under other categories besides the traditional one He adopted. Even a casual reading of the Gospel narratives reveals that it might be set forth equally as well under the heading of “God the Father and the Infinite value of the human soul,” or of “the higher righteousness and the command to love” (*What is Christianity?* page 51). Nevertheless, the point with which we are concerned is the one for which we have contended above—viz., that Jesus *did* adopt this traditional category “the Kingdom of Heaven” to

cover and express the content of the message He came to proclaim to the sons of men.

When, however, we turn from the Gospels to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles we are amazed to discover that the idea of the Kingdom falls into the background while that of the Church emerges. Except in the Apocalypse—which of all the books of the New Testament, gives the Kingdom of God most prominence—there are very few references to this master-thought of Jesus in Apostolic literature, apart from those in the Synoptic Gospels, and some of these few have a somewhat modified meaning. In the whole range of the Pauline Epistles the Kingdom is named less than a dozen times, whilst it is mentioned only once by James, once by Peter, once by the writer to the Hebrews, and not at all in the three Epistles of John. This paucity of reference would, therefore, seem to imply that to the Apostles, after that Ascension day when they made their last enquiry concerning the restoration of the Kingdom and received Christ's pertinent answer, the "Church" became practically everything and the "Kingdom" practically nothing. True, as we shall see later, this change may have largely been more one of phraseology than of essential truth; true also, the Apostles may have conceived the Church as a means to the establishment of the Kingdom; yet there are not wanting indications, in Paul at least, that the Church itself was construed in the terms of a determinative and final idea.

And this fact, on first blush, not only evokes surprise, but has sometimes led men to declare that Apostolic Christianity, either totally failed rightly to interpret its Master or unjustifiably neglected His teaching on this theme; that, in any case, however the fact be accounted for, the Primitive Church woefully missed the essential element in its Founder's presentation of the Gospel. Even so brilliant a writer and so earnest a Christian as "Ian Maclaren" has not escaped the temptation to say this, ("With all respect to the great Apostle one may be allowed to express his regret that St. Paul had not said less about the Church and more about the Kingdom." *The Mind of the Master*, page 321), although, to say the least, it is a very perilous procedure for any one to imply that those who knew Jesus best failed to interpret Him correctly. For if the Apostle scarcely be right where doth the modern critic appear? Far better and nearer the mark is Dr. Stalker's contention (*The Ethic of Jesus*, page 44) that the "Kingdom of Heaven" was never intended to have a permanent place in the Christian scheme of things, although he apparently makes the suggestion as much about the idea enshrined in the phrase, as about the phrase itself. (*The Christology of Jesus*, page 164). In the latter case the suggestion is no doubt correct, as the facts of Apostolic literature clearly indicate, but it is surely

going too far to maintain that the essential truths expressed by the phrase were predoomed by the chief exponent of them to be thrown aside on to the scrap-heap of worn-out theological dogmas. For certainly that great idea of Jesus, involving, as it does, His demand for repentance, faith in Himself as the King, a righteousness inward and absolute—surely that idea contains the essence of the Gospel, although, nowadays following the example of the Apostles, we speak more often of the Church of Christ, the grace of God, the forgiveness of sins, and the life everlasting. True, the phrase the "Kingdom of Heaven" contains no reference to the death of Jesus and its soteriological significance, but even that thought is not altogether excluded when we remember that the Kingdom was to be established by the King. And His death was essential to Jesus' method of bringing in His Kingdom, although in preaching the "Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven" very little could be done to teach even His own disciples the fact of His coming death and its vital connection with the spiritual needs and hopes of humanity—as the Gospel records amply prove. All that Jesus essentially meant to convey, therefore, by His use of "the Kingdom of Heaven," still finds a place in the theology of Christendom, although for many generations the phrase itself became well-nigh obsolete in the Christian Church.

(To be continued.)

JOHN PITTS.

DUNSTER, near the Bristol Channel, was evangelized about 1720 by James Sampson, of Tiverton, and a Baptist church was formed. It was ministered to by Spurrier, Bryant, Jackson, Jeffries. Then no further minister was forthcoming. The building was used also by a Presbyterian congregation, and the two bodies united, making a church of 80. Hall and Evans were not Baptist ministers. After the latter died in 1763, the cause ended.

MILBORNE PORT is in Somerset, four miles east of Sherborne in Dorset. The Presbyterian ejected in 1662 started a school and gathered a congregation, dying 1700. A subsequent minister was James Foster, from Hallet's academy at Exeter; he became Baptist, and was called to London, where he was famous. The new ministers were Samuel Fry and Thomas Boshier, both Baptists. The former was called to Horsleydown about 1738. The latter seems to have come from Beaminster, in Dorset, where a Seventh-day church is supposed to have been in 1710. He resigned Milborne Port in 1742, but was helping Loughwood as late as 1756, and was alive when Josiah Thompson made his notes. The church did not live much longer.

The Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund.

X. PROGRESS AND PROSPERITY (*continued.*)

THE Annual Reports reveal the fact that, throughout the hundred years, the Fund has attracted to its service many of the prominent men of the denomination. This was particularly the case in the later years of the Victorian era. Few names were then better known among Baptists than that of Edward Bean Underhill, LL.D., for thirty-five years a member and for twenty years a deacon of Heath Street, Hampstead. He was the founder of the Hanserd Knollys Society for publishing the works of early Baptist writers, and it was said of him "he knew Baptist history as most men know the alphabet." His connection with the Baptist Missionary Society, first as Joint (paid) Secretary and subsequently as Hon. Secretary, lasted for over fifty years. The Baptist Union called him to its Presidency in 1873, and the London Association in 1886. He succeeded Joseph Gurney as Treasurer of Regent's Park College in 1879, a position he held for twenty-two years "and even in extreme old age manifested the keenest interest in all that affected the welfare and development of the College." He joined the Building Fund Committee in 1864 and continued a member for thirty-seven years. Except when abroad visiting the Mission Fields, he was rarely absent from the Annual Meeting and he was ever ready to advocate the claims of the Fund and the churches it sought to help.

Equally well known was the name of William Richard Rickett, formerly a member at The Downs, Clapton, but later a member and deacon at Heath Street. "His sympathy and practical help went out to all institutions which had in view the glory of God and the welfare of men," but he was in a special degree a benefactor of his own denomination. His chief love was the Missionary Society of which he was Treasurer for seventeen years. In 1869 he was elected a member, and in 1890, a Trustee of the Building Fund. For thirty-eight years "by his constant attendance, his wise counsel and his liberal contributions" he rendered important service. On one occasion he gave a donation of one thousand pounds, and he left the Fund a legacy of the same amount. The Committee's memorial resolution recorded that "to the very last he manifested a deep interest in the

increasing usefulness of the Fund to the Churches." Another household name among Baptists of the period was that of Col. James Theodore Griffin. Born in the States, he took some part in the early stages of the Civil War. Coming to this country in 1862, he was soon in request for Christian service. Regent's Park Chapel found in him one of its most faithful members, and for twenty-seven years he was the Superintendent of its Sunday School. In 1889 he served as President of the London Association, and in 1891 as President of the Baptist Union. His membership of the Building Fund Committee commenced in 1871 and continued for over twenty years, during the whole of which time he "manifested an intense interest in the benefactions of the Fund."

The Hon. Solicitor to the Fund at this time was Samuel Watson, who, on the 8th December, 1868, was appointed in succession to his father. He was connected with the Walworth Road Church, and, following the example of his father, throughout his long life he gave "time, care and attention" to the work of the Sunday School Union. His service to the Building Fund extended for a period of nearly fifty-three years and, by "wise counsels and gratuitous professional labours," he placed the Fund and many Churches under considerable obligations. As he, in turn, was succeeded by his son, Harold Collier Watson, who still holds the position, a period of over eighty years of service as Hon. Legal Advisers has been covered by the father, son and grandson.

Other names arresting attention are those of Thomas Pillow, the Secretary of Shoreditch Tabernacle; Thomas H. Olney, the Treasurer of the Metropolitan Tabernacle; James Harvey, of Heath Street, fourteen years Treasurer of the London Association; Edward James Oliver, "a liberal subscriber during forty years, and an earnest and active member of the Committee during upwards of thirty years"; Joseph Wates of Brockley Road, six years Treasurer of the London Association; Jacob Perkins Bacon, "for many years a regular attendant at the Meetings of the Committee—wise in counsel, fervent in zeal—and for twelve years one of the Trustees"; and William Coulson Parkinson, formerly of Camden Road and later of Ferme Park, successively auditor, member of Committee and a Trustee. Loyally and constantly supported as it was by men of such calibre, it is no wonder that the Fund progressed.

Notwithstanding its own strength, the Committee found it needful to go outside its own ranks to secure a Secretary in succession to A. T. Bowser in 1885. So unique had been his secretarial qualities that men hesitated to succeed him. Finally, John Howard, a member of The Downs, Clapton, accepted the position. He was a man of different temperament. His annual

reports were short, businesslike statements, outlining only what had been done. They lacked the statesmanlike vision of his predecessor, but for over twenty years he recorded the minutes with a clearness that has made the reading of them a pleasure. It is interesting to note that he wrote the minutes at the meetings as the business proceeded. During his period of office, 819 loans for £235,816 were advanced, and, when in 1906 his health gave way, his colleagues recorded their appreciation of the conspicuous ability with which he had filled the office, and their intense regret at his retirement.

At the Annual Meeting in 1889, important amendments were made in the rules, the effect being to give the Committee power to grant loans for "buildings for Sunday Schools, Class and Lecture Rooms, and Home Mission Halls." This extension in the scope of the Fund arose out of an offer made in the preceding October by one who had been a member of the Committee less than twelve months. "In order to stimulate an effort for increasing the capital of the Fund," wrote Joseph Burgess Mead of Brockley, who at the time wished to remain anonymous, "I am willing . . . to contribute 25 per cent. on the net amount that may be raised from all sources within the next four years up to £20,000."

This very generous offer was typical of one of the largest hearted of the men who have served London. Already he was held in high esteem, for, in 1881, he induced the London Association to adopt a Chapel Debt Relief scheme, of which he was appointed Treasurer and Organiser. The feature of the scheme was that the fund would be distributed to Churches, in proportion to the amount raised by them in reduction of their building debts. Anonymously, in the course of seven years, £10,677 18s. 3d. was given to this fund, practically all coming from the Treasurer. It was disbursed in challenge gifts to sixty-nine Churches, and, thus stimulated, the Churches themselves raised £58,220 12s. 3d. The outcome was that the debts were reduced from the appalling total of £123,188 19s. 6d. to the more manageable one of £54,290 9s. 0d. This remarkable success undoubtedly influenced the offer to the Building Fund. The conditions attached by J. B. Mead to his offer were very simple, and, so thorough was he, his letter included an instruction to his Executors to consider as among his just and lawful debts any amount that might after his decease become due. The Committee accepted the offer with enthusiasm, and individual members subscribed generously. Much propaganda work was undertaken, but unfortunately the effort met with very modified success. At that time men's minds were occupied with the "Down Grade Movement," rather than with the work of the Kingdom. The result was that, at the end of 1892, when the offer terminated, £5,316 8s. 8d. had been added

to the Capital from subscriptions, donations, collections and legacies, and the donor, who still remained anonymous, "being one of those who 'do good by stealth and blush to find it fame,'" had the privilege of subscribing £1,329 2s. 2d. only of the £5,000 he had hoped to donate. In the meantime, in 1890, he had succeeded A. T. Bowser as Treasurer of the Building Fund.

XI. THE NEW CONNEXION BUILDING FUND.

1891 is a landmark in Baptist history, for in that year the fusion of the main bodies of "Generals" and "Particulars" was accomplished. During more than half a century the two sections of the denomination had been slowly drawing closer. The fellowship enjoyed in the Baptist Union not only fostered the desire for unity, but afforded convincing evidence that unity would bring increased strength and effectiveness. Ancient standards gradually lost their authority, and ministers passed from a Church of the one section to a Church of the other hardly conscious of, and certainly undisturbed by, the evanescent differences over which their forefathers had wrestled hard. The hopes of years were brought to fruition in 1891. The two Missionary Societies, the "Baptist" founded in 1792, and the "General Baptist" founded in 1816, then merged into one. "Generals" and "Particulars" coalesced in the various Associations and, coincidentally, the "General Baptist Association of the New Connexion Building Fund," founded in 1865, amalgamated with the "Baptist Building Fund."

In order to appreciate the importance and significance of this amalgamation, it is needful to turn to the General Baptist stream. Reference has been made to the support given by the General Baptist Assembly to building enterprises in the closing years of the seventeenth century and in the early years of the eighteenth. The middle years of the latter century witnessed grave declension in many of these pioneer churches. They lost their early evangelical fervour and devoted themselves to fighting one another "about the imposition of hands; about Arianism, and Socinianism, and Trinitarianism! And this they did with a will, and with the usual desolating effect."¹ Some of the Churches ceased to exist, while others drifted into unitarianism. It was, therefore, a somewhat meagre Assembly that met once a year, and this Assembly became more emasculated as, from time to time, the evangelical churches withdrew, usually to ally themselves with the more energetic and virile New Connexion. Nevertheless, at intervals, even after the formation of the New Connexion, the old Assembly

¹ Clifford: *The Origin and Growth of English Baptists, 1881.*

continued its practice of recommending building cases for collection. Two comparatively late examples may be given. The minutes of the 1787 Assembly at Worship Street record :

“The Church at Worplesdown, near Farnham, Surrey, having erected a new meeting house, request the assistance of the Churches in raising the sum of £200; and that the subscriptions be left at Mr. Dendy’s, Bridgefoot, Southwark, before the 1st of October next.”²

And the Minutes of the 1811 Assembly at the same place record :

“The Church at Northiam, being unavoidably involved in debt by the Building of their New Meeting House, the Assembly highly commending their zeal and Christian spirit recommend their case to the patronage of the Churches. Our brother Blundell means to go round to our Churches and we doubt not of their liberality.”³

For the purpose of this history, we are not again concerned with these old General Baptists. Their Annual Assembly became of little importance and its influence on chapel building was negligible.

“The New Connexion of General Baptists” was partly a reaction from “the defective theology, excessive disputatiousness and spiritual torpor of the age,” which had thoroughly penetrated the General Baptist Churches. It was formed at “an Assembly of Free-Grace General Baptists,” held at Church Lane, White-chapel, on the 6th June, 1770. Its design was “to revive Experimental Religion or Primitive Christianity in Faith and Practice”; three churches in Essex, three in Kent, five in Leicestershire, two in Lincolnshire, two in London and one in Yorkshire, ventured on this quest. From the first the movement was imbued with the spirit of evangelism. Fresh ground was broken, new churches were formed, and buildings became needful. Thus we read that the Melbourne Church carried the gospel to Cauldwell, where, in consequence of the success of the work, “a commodious meeting-house was erected, at an expense of one hundred and eighty pounds, which was opened in 1778.”⁴

The building policy of the New Connexion was largely based on that of the old General Baptists. Cases were recommended by the Annual Assembly, and the minister or other messenger of the church needing help went forth on a begging expedition. Many illustrations could be given. In the Minutes of the 1799 Assembly at Wimeswold we read :

² Minutes, Vol. II. p. 193.

³ Ibid., pp. 304-305.

⁴ Taylor, Vol. II., p.

"The brethren at Queenshead request the assistance of the Churches, under their pressing circumstances, to assist them in defraying the expences which have been necessarily incurred by erecting a gallery in the meeting-house.

Answer:—We advise our Queenshead brethren to state their cases to those Churches that have not relieved them."

"The brethren at Nottingham request the assistance of the sister Churches in defraying their expences in erecting their meeting-house.

Answer: We recommend it to our respective Churches to take the case of the Church at Nottingham into their consideration, and to assist them as early as they can make it convenient."

The Minutes of the 1811 Assembly at Melbourne record:

"The Church at Ashley, etc. having procured a piece of ground at Measham, agreeable to the advice of the Association, intend to erect a small Chapel upon it at the expense of £160, towards this they have raised about £50, and desire assistance with the rest.

The Church at Hinkley, having successfully introduced the gospel at Pailton and Monks-Kerby, have judged it advisable to erect a meeting-house at the latter place. The expense is estimated at nearly £400, towards this they have raised £150. They desire the approbation and assistance of the Association in this case.

Answer:—The Association recommend both these cases to the attention of the Churches, and hope they will assist in them when individually requested."

And a late illustration is that from the Minutes of the 1862 Assembly at Halifax:

"Lincoln Bicentenary Chapel. Resolved—That we cordially recommend the proposal of the friends at Lincoln to build a Bicentenary Chapel to the generous support of the Connexion."

As early as the 1808 Assembly at Bourne, "the great loss arising from the ministers travelling in collecting for meeting-houses" was discussed, but it was not until the ninety-fifth Annual Assembly at Boston in 1864, that definite steps were taken for the formation of the New Connexion Building Fund. At that Assembly it was resolved:

"(1) That it is desirable to establish a Chapel Building Fund in connection with this Association, the object of which shall be to assist by gift or loan without interest in the building, enlargement or repair, of places of worship belonging to the New Connexion of General Baptists.

(2) That the following brethren be appointed a pro-

The Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund 265

visional Committee to mature plans for the purpose, and report to the next Association: the Leicester Ministers, with Messrs. George Stevenson, J. F. Winks, and J. Roper."

This Committee was statesmanlike. It looked beyond its immediate present to the time when the two streams of Baptist life would be one mighty river. Could anything be done to anticipate that time? Here was an opportunity. One Building Fund for the whole denomination would be a striking gesture in the direction of unity. Not for the first time, however, the onward path was blocked by those whose vision extends no farther than "as it was in the beginning." Proposals to the "Particulars" that their Building Fund should be opened to the "Generals," or that the "Generals" should form an Auxiliary were a quarter of a century premature. Notwithstanding the advice of the Treasurer, some of the Building Fund Committee preferred to maintain the exclusiveness of their Fund, and at a Committee Meeting on the 10th January, 1865, a resolution "That it is desirable to extend the object of this Fund to the assistance of Baptist Churches, other than those of the Particular or Calvinistic Denomination" was "after considerable discussion . . . negatived by six votes against four." Nevertheless, determined to do nothing that would hinder united action, the Generals' Committee took a wise view of the situation.

"The Union Baptist Building Fund" was established at the ensuing Assembly in June, 1865, in the old Lombard Street Church, Birmingham. The rules followed those of the earlier Society, except that, on the advice of the Committee, the rule which was possibly the most material of all read "That it be exclusively a Loan Fund for Baptists without distinction." From the general funds of the Association, one hundred pounds was voted to the capital, which, however, grew very slowly. The Generals' Constituency was much smaller than that of the Particulars, and it contained few wealthy men. From the first, the raising of the Fund was the task of the rank and file, and, despite the picturesque plea of one who wrote "that the capital will last so long as the sun and the moon endure," at the end of five years it amounted to no more than £687. Successful efforts to obtain increased support were made at the centenary of the New Connexion, and later the responses to a challenge gift of one hundred pounds by William Bell Bembridge enabled the five thousand pounds mark to be reached by 1882. In 1876, the Assembly altered the title of the Fund from "The Union Baptist Building Fund" to that of "The General Baptist Association of the New Connexion Building Fund," more briefly and familiarly known as "The General Baptist Building Fund." At that date loans, modest in amount, had been made to thirty

churches for a total of £4,610. The churches to receive the first ten loans were :

Friar Lane, Leicester ...	£300	Dewsbury	£300
Long Eaton	£60	Coningsby	£100
Infirmary St., Bradford	£200	Ilkeston	£200
Belper	£40	Denholme	£100
Enon, Burnley	£100	Old Basford	£200

The largest loan granted in the course of the twenty-six years during which the Fund was in existence, was one of £500 to Westbourne Park in 1877. The Committee's report a year after opens a window on the quiet but growing success of the Fund : "In no department of Denominational work is there greater cause for congratulation than this. Some of the Churches have not yet contributed anything to the Fund, others are fulfilling their promises, and even in some instances, are in advance of them. Warm appreciation of the benefits of the Fund are expressed by Churches receiving loans; and the repayments are frequently made in much less than the specified time."

Unlike the Officers and Committee of the Baptist Building Fund, whose *appointment* rested solely with the Annual Meeting of Subscribers, the Officers and Committee of the General Baptist Building Fund were *recommended* by the Annual Meeting of Subscribers. The *election* took place at the Annual Assembly, after the submission of the Report and Accounts for the preceding year. Those who served as Treasurers and Secretaries were :—

TREASURERS.

Richard Pedley, Junr.	1865-1867.
William Bell Bembridge	1867-1877.
Charles Roberts, Jun.	1877-1887.
Henry Hill	1887-1891.

SECRETARIES.

Joseph Roper	1865-1866.
Rev. J. Thomas Gale	1866-1872.
Rev. Nathanael Herbert Shaw	1872-1879.
Rev. William Bishop	1879-1891.

W. B. Bembridge was the best known of the Officers. He was connected with the Church at Ripley and was one of the leaders of the denomination. He served on most Committees and in 1886 was Vice-Moderator of the Assembly. He relinquished the Treasurership of the Building Fund, on being called to a similar office in the General Baptist Missionary Society, a position he retained until 1891, but he remained on the Committee of the Building Fund. N. H. Shaw laboured

strenuously and the success of the Fund was largely due to his unflinching zeal. In the course of the seven years of his secretariat, the capital increased from £1,600 to over £4,000. In addition, when he resigned, many promises for comparatively substantial amounts were in process of redemption. On his leaving the country to take charge of the Baptist Mission in Rome, the Committee recorded "high appreciation of the way in which he has served the Fund, and especially of his indefatigable efforts to bring up the capital of the Fund to £5,000." The capital grew slowly but steadily, and at the amalgamation in 1891, it amounted to £6,469, which was on loan to fifty-nine Churches. It was estimated that this sum bore about the same ratio to the needs of the Churches of the New Connexion as the capital of the Baptist Building Fund bore to the needs of the Particular Baptist Churches. As the New Connexion's Fund was of much more recent establishment, this must be considered a fine achievement. The final Report contained the very satisfactory comment, "No loss has been sustained from failure of repayment, and no legal proceedings have been necessary to recover any portion of loans granted."

Charles Williams of Accrington, succeeded to the Chair of the Baptist Union on Monday, 10th May, 1886, and in the course of his Presidential Address made a strong plea for Union among Baptists. The plea was opportune. "The General and Particular Baptists, starting from different theological and geographical centres, fed and nourished on different theological diet,"⁵ had, as we have seen, formed themselves into separate camps. But, "slowly, shyly and surely" they had been coming together. The noble utterance of Charles Williams brought the subject from the shadows into the sunlight. On the 26th April, 1889, the Baptist Union Council passed the following resolutions, which were afterwards adopted by the Assembly:

(1) "That this Council consider it desirable that the General Baptists and Particular Baptists should become one denomination.

(11) That this Council deem it most desirable that the General and Particular Baptist Societies and Associations should be amalgamated, and recommend that the matters be respectfully referred to the Committees of those Societies and Associations, with the request that they take into consideration the practicability of such a course."

Within a few months, the Council of the Union was able to express the great satisfaction with which it had received favourable replies from nearly the whole of the thirty-four Associations.

⁵ John Clifford at Burnley, 1891.

With no impatient haste but, rather, with a degree of leisure, the Committees of the two Building Funds considered the request, with the result that two years later, on the 9th April, 1891, representatives conferred at the Mission House. Those present were :

Rev. S. H. Booth, D.D., in the Chair.

Joseph B. Mead.

Rev. W. Bishop.

James Mote.

Rev. J. Fletcher.

William R. Rickett.

W. B. Bembridge.

Samuel Watson,
representing the Baptist
Building Fund.

R. Foulkes Griffiths,
representing the General
Baptist Building Fund.

The report of the meeting stated :

“ A lengthened conversation, full and free, ensued—unreserved and satisfactory statements or explanations being given on either side on the various points raised—the Meeting throughout being pre-eminently cordial, and characterised by hearty unanimity.

The legal opinion was—that if the constituencies of both bodies joined with practical unanimity in the desire for amalgamation, the Courts would, on application, sanction such alteration in the Constitution of the Building Fund as would permit its benefits being enjoyed by all Evangelical Churches of the Baptist Denomination.

Resolved—“ That the [two] Sub-Committees report in favour of such steps being taken as may be needed to carry out the amalgamation.”

This report was cordially and unanimously accepted by the Committees of both Societies. Following further negotiations, during which it became clear that an application to the Courts was unnecessary, the proposed amalgamation of the two Funds received the approval of the General Baptist Assembly on June 25th, 1891, and of the Subscribers of the Baptist Building Fund on the 20th October, 1891. The subscribers were summoned by circulars sent to as many as possible, and, obviously with some relief, the record was made “ it was noteworthy that not a single protest nor objection was received in reply.” The amount transferred from the General Baptist Building Fund to the Baptist Building Fund was £6,469 5s. 6d., which, added to the existing capital of £43,401 5s. 1d., made the capital of the Baptist Building Fund £49,870 10s. 7d. Various agreed alterations were made in the rules, the principal one being the deletion of the reference to the “ Particular or Calvinistic Baptist Denomination,” and the insertion of the words “ Evangelical Churches of the Baptist Denomination throughout the United Kingdom.” On the nomina-

tion of the General Baptist Building Fund, William Bishop, Henry Hill and R. Foulkes Griffiths were added to the Committee of the Baptist Building Fund, and at the same time, William Bell Bembridge was appointed a Trustee.

Thus was completed a union that reflects credit on all who took part in its accomplishment. Thirty-six years have gone, and no discordant note has been heard. The nine who met at the Mission House have passed to God's greater service in the Beyond, but their wise action has permanently increased Baptist efficiency.

XII. EXPANSION.

The period at which we have arrived is modern. Its outstanding events are well known, and the three decades hardly call for extended reference. Expansion was the watchword. On the solid early foundations, broadened and strengthened as they had been by the recent amalgamation, was needed a worthy structure. At intervals, two new methods of raising money were introduced. The first was in 1903, when it was "suggested that each Church, on completing the repayment of its loan should be asked to contribute, as a thankoffering, the amount of one half-yearly instalment." It will be observed that at five per cent. per annum, this represents one year's interest on the amount of the loan. This suggestion has proved of immense value. By the centenary, four thousand pounds had thus been contributed by the Churches. The second new method of raising money was adopted in 1912. It was then decided to take up an agency of the Baptist Insurance Company, Ltd. in the hope that ultimately the commissions would cover the whole of the working expenses of the Fund. All Churches receiving loans were expected to effect their insurances through the agency of the Fund. This method also has been fruitful. Beginning with £3 7s. 8d. in 1913, the commissions rose year by year until, in the centenary year, they reached £133 12s. 10d. At that date, over £730 in insurance commissions had been earned for the Fund by the Secretary. Legacies have swollen the capital appreciably. Thirty-five were received in the thirty-five years amounting to £25,669 2s. 5d. Among the largest were £970 from Walter J. Benham in 1909, £5,000 from J. B. Mead in 1912, £1,000 from G. R. Searle in 1916, £8,765 from W. O. L. Winsford in 1920, £877 from Mrs. E. C. Eberlin in 1924 and £2,456 from W. Evans in 1924. On the other hand, subscriptions showed serious and continuous decline. In 1890, the number of subscribers approached five hundred and the amount of their subscriptions and donations

was £588 8s. 4d. In 1925, the subscribers numbered seventy-five and the subscriptions amounted to £56 14s. 6d.

The consistent progress of the Fund is illustrated by the following:—

Year.	Capital.	No. of New Loans.	Total of Loans.	Average Loans.
1895	£51,442	41	£10,915	£266
1900	52,911	40	12,730	318
1905	55,928	42	13,755	327
1910	59,737	38	13,760	362
1915	66,497	37	13,810	373
1920	71,395	48	22,020	458
1925	87,882	42	23,020	548

This table also reflects the steady increase in the cost of chapel building that was evident in pre-war days, and the rapid expansion that has characterised the post-war period. In the course of twenty years, from 1905 to 1925, the capital increased by nearly £32,000 but the number of new loans remained the same, namely forty-two. In this period the average amount of the new loans rose by sixty-seven per cent. from £327 to £548. As was stated in an earlier chapter, the first loan of £1,000 was granted in 1881. Two loans only of similar amount were granted in the following two decades, but at the Centenary, there were no less than twenty-seven loans of £1,000 or over. The largest was that of £2,000 made to Horfield, Bristol, in 1920. The centenary capital of £87,882 11s. 1d. was on loan to 295 churches, the average of the whole, therefore being £297. This capital included four special items:

1. Liverpool Auxiliary	£3,795	0	0
2. Devon and Cornwall Auxiliary	405	10	0
3. Aylesbury Trust Fund	50	0	8
4. Uxbridge Trust Fund	74	15	5

The Aylesbury fund originated in the early seventies in a project to erect a Baptist Church in Aylesbury. The proposal could not be carried through, and many of the subscriptions which had been obtained were handed back to the subscribers. The residue which could not be returned, amounting to £50 0s. 8d., was deposited in 1879 "to be used by the Baptist Building Fund Committee until there shall be in course of erection at Aylesbury a School Room or Chapel by a Church in connexion with the Baptist Union, in which case the said sum shall be returned without interest as a contribution towards that object."

The Uxbridge fund was deposited in 1906 and consists of "a sum of money collected in Uxbridge for the purpose of building a

Baptist Chapel in that town." The Baptist Church that had existed there for many years had lacked vision. It had been content to remain in obscurity, "walled around, chosen and made peculiar ground," with the natural result that it died out. It was agreed that the deposit "would not *carry any interest* but would be used for the general purposes of the Fund and would be returned only on the condition that a Baptist Church was built at some future time in Uxbridge."

A heavy loss was sustained by the decease on January 3rd, 1897 of the Treasurer, J. B. Mead. His service to the denomination in connection with the Psalms and Hymns Trust, the Missionary Committee, the London Association and the Building Fund was of the very highest order. The Committee recorded that he had filled the post of Treasurer "with conspicuous success, devoting all his business ability and energy to the conduct of the Fund, while his tact, warmheartedness and courtesy made him doubly beloved by his colleagues and by the Churches he served with such zeal." Once again, the Fund was privileged in having at hand a man in every respect worthy to follow in the office. William Payne, who was appointed in February, 1898, had been a member of the Committee since 1879. He was one of the founders of the Church at The Downs, Clapton, and was elected to its first diaconate in 1871. He is an illustration of the fine body of men in which the denomination has been singularly rich, namely, those who do not allow high Denominational claims and honours to interfere with the unstinted service they so loyally give to their own local Church. His minister wrote of him: "From the very beginning the interests of this Church were his supreme concern, its service his great delight, and its prosperity his one desire. Fitted by grace and nature to take a leading part in the heavy responsibilities of Church government and ministry, he was chosen Secretary in 1875, . . . and in that capacity he rendered splendid service to the cause of Christ. On the removal of W. R. Rickett to Hampstead, he became Treasurer, and held that office until his death. For twenty-two years the Church finance was his constant care, and to the administration of the funds he devoted his exceptional gifts with unsparing zeal. No Church was ever better served by its Treasurer, and no Treasurer ever made Church finance more of a sacred trust." The Baptist Union, the Missionary Society, the London Association and Regent's Park College found in him an untiring supporter. He was Treasurer of the Building Fund for ten years, and on more than one occasion his successor in office has paid public tribute to the high standard which characterised all his book-keeping and other work for the Fund.

At the Annual Meeting in 1908, the present honoured

Treasurer and Secretary were appointed. William Wallace Parkinson, son of William Coulson Parkinson, to whose service reference has been made, joined the Committee in 1901, and for two years, from 1906, he was Secretary, before succeeding William Payne as Treasurer. His unstinted service, particularly for the Missionary Society, of which he is a much valued Committee member, for his own Church at Walsworth Road, Hitchin, of which he is a deacon and Treasurer, and for country Churches generally bears a fragrance of its own. Henry Hewett Collier served on the Committee for seven years prior to his election as Secretary. He bears a name known in Baptist circles, not only in this country, but on the Mission fields in India and Ceylon. He was an Hon. Auditor of the Missionary Society for several years, he is a valued member of Regent's Park College Committee, and is highly esteemed in the Acton Church, of which he is a deacon and Treasurer. The Treasurer and Secretary deprecate personal references. They seek no praise from men in doing their Master's work. It may be said, notwithstanding, that they have served the Fund with a devotion that has maintained the highest traditions of previous officers. Their colleagues hold them in the warmest regard, and hope that they will be enabled to continue their united service for many years.

During the first seventy-two years of the Fund, the Officers were able to make the proud boast that not one penny of the capital had been lost owing to the default of a Church. With an integrity that was to be expected, every Church had faithfully fulfilled every obligation. This record was lost in 1897 when, for the first, and, as events have proved, the only, occasion in the hundred years, a Church made default. The Annual Report presented on the 22nd April, 1897, records: "The Committee regret to announce that, for the first time in the history of the Fund, it has been compelled to write off as irrecoverable a portion of a loan. In 1889 the Church at Ponder's End received a loan of £250. The Church having been dissolved, and the buildings sold, the proceeds, after satisfying the mortgage, were not sufficient to liquidate the claims of the Fund, and, after full enquiry had been made, it was found useless to proceed against the sureties, and other efforts having failed, £73 was written off as a bad debt." As loans have been granted for a total of over £699,000, this small default of £73, standing as it does in unsplendid isolation, serves but to emphasise that the financial honesty of Churches is beyond question. Reference having been made to this default, it should now be stated that at the Centenary Annual Meeting, not a Church was in arrear with even one instalment.

The waiting list of Churches desiring loans has been an acute problem for successive Committees. Except during the

war, when the erection of new buildings was generally stopped, the capital has not been adequate to the requirements. Twenty years ago, in March, 1906, for example, the Committee resolved: "That, in view of the present condition of the Fund, future applicants for loans receive a circular in reply to their applications to the effect that the Committee can for the present consider only new Chapel or extension cases." Not long after, it further resolved: "That no application form be sent out for at least twelve months." In the war years, the Committee was able to overtake the applications, but rapidly after the declaration of peace the position again became difficult. By the hundredth Annual Meeting, more than one hundred and fifty cases were on the waiting list. As is well known, a serious housing shortage has followed the war, and it has been almost impossible to rent a house. Churches, in increasing numbers, soon found it needful to purchase manses for their ministers. To meet this situation the rules were extended in 1920, so that, in exceptional circumstances, it has been possible to grant loans to assist such purchases.

The due celebration of the Centenary received early consideration from the Committee, but 1925 was an inopportune year. The London Association was then appealing for sixty thousand pounds in celebration of its Diamond Jubilee for the maintenance of existing work and for church extension; The Baptist Missionary Society was faced with a heavy deficit, and was striving to increase its annual income by fifty thousand pounds; The Baptist Union was maturing plans for its appeal for a Super-annuation Fund capital of three hundred thousand pounds. Faced with these appeals, the Building Fund Committee reluctantly decided that "it was inopportune to make a great appeal on behalf of this Fund." Thus the Centenary passed without special celebration, but for a moment our thoughts linger on two dates: the 10th November, 1824, when the Inaugural Meeting was held at the King's Head in the Poultry, and the 23rd April, 1925, when the Centenary Meeting was held at the Mission House in Furnival Street. One hundred years lie between. Those who, in 1824, walked to the Poultry from their homes in Paternoster Row and Fleet Street and the turnings off Holborn in the one direction and Leadenhall in the other, would not recognise the London of the Centenary year, with its tubes and buses and motors and inner and outer suburbs. But they would recognise a building which belongs to all Englishmen alike, whatever their religious denomination—St. Paul's, holding aloft its Cross over the City. And they would give thanks that inspired by love for Him who hung on a Cross outside a City's Walls, they were moved to start this Fund. They built far better than they knew, for their Society has made grants exceeding £19,600 and

advances amounting to £699,186; and further, on a modest computation, has saved the Churches over £145,000 in interest. That, however, is financial only. The Fund has achieved something far greater which we cannot easily estimate. The human character produced by the vitalising ministry of the Churches which have been supported by the benefactions of the Fund is something not to be tabulated in the coinage that bears Caesar's image and superscription.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

APPENDIX.

(a) Grants made to churches from the formation of the London Baptist Building Fund to the adoption of the Loan system. (See footnote, *Baptist Quarterly*, October, 1926, p. 177.)

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT, 24th JANUARY, 1826.

Collompton, Devon - - -	£85	Trowbridge, Wilts. - - -	£100
Rattlesden, Suffolk - - -	75	Oswestry, Salop - - -	70
Barnstaple, Devon - - -	90	Semley, Wilts. - - -	80
Clonmel, Ireland - - -	100	Nash, Monmouth - - -	90
Axbridge, Somerset - - -	80	Malton, York - - -	100
Ravensthorpe, Northampton	90	Swaffham, Norfolk - - -	90
Aldbrough, Suffolk - - -	100	Kingstanley, Gloucester	85
Gt. Brickhill, Bucks. - - -	80	Whitchurch, Salop - - -	85

TOTAL: £1,400.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT, 23rd JANUARY, 1827.

Andover, Hants. - - -	£80	Dover, Kent - - -	£100
Gainsborough, Lincoln - - -	80	Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk	30
Winchester, Hants. - - -	80	Brayford, Devon - - -	50
Stoney Stratford, Bucks. - - -	80	Little Stonham, Suffolk - - -	60
Appleby, Warwick - - -	75	Wattisham, Suffolk - - -	80
Gretton, Northampton - - -	75	Blisworth, Northampton - - -	80
Gloucester, Gloucestershire	100		

TOTAL: £970.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT, 23rd APRIL, 1828.

Hillsley, Gloucester - - -	£70	Crigglestone, York - - -	£70
Brecon, Brecon - - -	80	Boroughbridge, York - - -	80
Crewkerne, Somerset - - -	80	Swansea, Glamorgan - - -	100
Swanbourne, Bucks. - - -	25	Muckworthy & Sheepwash,	
Monks Kirby, Warwick - - -	40	Devon - - -	50
Heaton, York - - -	100	Twyn-yr-Odin, Glamorgan	40
Bardwell, Suffolk - - -	70	Brenchley, Kent - - -	60
Blaenavon, Monmouth - - -	60	Earls Barton, Northampton	75

The Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund 275

West Haddon, Northampton -	£70	Great Missenden, Bucks. -	£80
Newport, Isle of Wight -	70	Croyde, Devon -	50
Thrapston & Islip, Northampton	60	Lewes, Sussex -	60
Gamlingay, Cambridge -	70	Preston, York -	75
Sway, Hants. -	60	Paulton, Somerset -	80
Wortwell, Norfolk -	60		

TOTAL : £1,735.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT, 15th JUNE, 1829.

Reepham, Norfolk -	£50	Haverfordwest, Pembroke -	£90
St. Martins, Guernsey -	90	Builth, Brecon -	40
Arnold, Notts. -	80	St. Clement's, Oxford -	80
Wells, Somerset -	80	Kidderminster, Worcester -	80
Haworth, York -	100	Meltham, York -	50
Horham, Suffolk -	50	Milton, Northampton -	60
Braybrook, Northampton -	50	Llanelly, Carmarthen -	60
Foulsham, Norfolk -	70	Harbertonford, Devon -	45
Sheerness, Kent -	60	Grimsby, Lincoln -	70

TOTAL : £1,205.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT, 14th JUNE, 1830.

Abersychan, Monmouth -	£50	Knowlhill, Berks. -	£65
Aylsham, Norfolk -	65	Lantrissant, Glamorgan -	50
Box Moor, Herts. -	75	Lockerly, Hants. -	50
Coleford, Gloucester -	80	Ludham, Norfolk -	25
Crockerton, Wilts. -	70	Pontesbury, Salop -	50
West Drayton, Middlesex -	70	Swanwick, Derby -	70
Fenny Stratford, Bucks. -	50	Wellington, Salop -	70
Kislingbury, Northampton -	60	Yeovil, Somerset -	90

TOTAL : £990.

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT, 24th JUNE, 1831.

Croscombe, Somerset -	£50	Holt, Denbigh -	£50
Langley, Essex -	60	Gt. Torrington, Devon -	80
Varteg, Monmouth -	45	Stanningley, York -	80
Martham, Norfolk -	30	Milford Haven, Pembroke -	40
Stowmarket, Suffolk -	60	Isleham, Cambridge -	70
Corsham, Wilts. -	50	Bridgend, Glamorgan -	50
Berwick St. John, Wilts -	65	Hawkesbury, Upton, Gloucester	50
Perriton, Somerset -	50	Anmore, Hants. -	70
Woodstock, Oxford -	80		

TOTAL : £980.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 27th JUNE, 1832.

Sunning Hill, Berks. -	£60	Montacute, Somerset -	£50
Langorse, Brecon -	40	Ashford, Kent -	80
Scarborough, York -	90	Argoed, Monmouth -	30
Cowbridge, Glamorgan -	50	Lixum Green, Flint -	40
Apperton, Middlesex -	50	Salehouse, Norfolk -	40
Cuddington, Bucks. -	60	Twyngwyn, Monmouth -	40
Waintroeda, Glamorgan -	35	Bradford, York -	90
Carlton-le-Moorlands, Lincoln -	60	Yarcombe, Devon -	50
Welshpool, Montgomery -	60		

TOTAL : £925.

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT, 26th JUNE, 1833.

Glemsford, Suffolk	- - -	£60	Oakham, Rutland	- - -	£65
Bath (York St.) Somerset	- - -	70	Swansea (Welch Church)	- - -	
Mirfield, York	- - -	70	Glamorgan	- - -	60
Glyn-dwfr-dwy, Merioneth	- - -	40	Lowestoft, Suffolk	- - -	50
Newport, Monmouth	- - -	55	Epwell, Oxon.	- - -	20
Drayton Parslow, Bucks.	- - -	30	Mildenhall, Suffolk	- - -	35
Costessy, Norfolk	- - -	40	Creech St. Michaels, Somerset	- - -	70

TOTAL : £665.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT, 23rd JUNE, 1834.

Southsea, Hants.	- - -	£70	Sudbury, Suffolk	- - -	£60
Llanfyllin, Montgomery	- - -	40	Hadleigh, Suffolk	- - -	60
Kenilworth, Warwick	- - -	60	Long Crendon, Bucks.	- - -	50
Worboys, Hunts.	- - -	50	Ledbury, Hereford	- - -	70
Barton-in-the-Clay, Bedford	- - -	40	Brachwood Green, Herts.	- - -	50
Bishopswood, Hereford	- - -	40	Chideock, Dorset	- - -	60
Wraysbury, Bucks.	- - -	40	Wolsingham, Durham	- - -	60
Moelfre, Denbigh	- - -	30	Salisbury, Wilts.	- - -	75
Minchhead, Somerset	- - -	60	Nant-y-glo, Monmouth	- - -	40
Lantwit-Major, Glamorgan	- - -	40	Holyhead, Anglesea	- - -	40
Kidwelly, Carmarthen	- - -	25	Mill-end, Herts.	- - -	40
Bwlchsarnau, Radnor	- - -	35	Catshill, Worcester	- - -	60
Hadlow, Kent	- - -	40	Llanvihangel, Nantbrane, Brecon	- - -	30

TOTAL : £1,265.

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 22nd JUNE, 1835.

Aberystwith, Cardigan	- - -	£40	Filkins, Oxon.	- - -	£30
Loughton, Bucks.	- - -	30	Little Tew, Oxon.	- - -	30
Quiswell Quay, Pembroke	- - -	25	St. Melon's, Monmouth	- - -	40
Swansea, Glamorgan	- - -	50	Blackwood, Monmouth	- - -	40
Broughton, Gifford, Wilts.	- - -	30	Sainthill, Devon	- - -	50
Westbury, Wilts.	- - -	50	Bradninch, Devon	- - -	50
Dorchester, Dorset	- - -	65	Potter Street, Essex	- - -	40
Meopham, Kent	- - -	50	Lumb, Lancashire	- - -	40
Blackwater, Hants.	- - -	40			

TOTAL : £700.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 27th JUNE, 1836.

Bloxham, Oxon.	- - -	£40	Jezreel, Cardigan	- - -	£30
Newton St. Petrock, Devon	- - -	35	Tring, Herts.	- - -	50
Burnley, Lancashire	- - -	60	Borough Green, Kent	- - -	40
Soham, Cambridge	- - -	70	Braintree, Essex	- - -	60
Neath, Glamorgan	- - -	45	Walsall, Stafford	- - -	60
Ballina, Ireland	- - -	80	Bidestone, Wilts.	- - -	40
Eastfield-side, Notts.	- - -	50	Blunham, Beds.	- - -	50
Gt. Rollright, Oxon	- - -	35	Westoning, Beds.	- - -	50

TOTAL : £795.

TWELFTH ANNUAL REPORT, 11th JULY, 1837.

Llanidloes, Montgomery	- - -	£50	Steventon, Beds.	- - -	£25
Ipswich (Dairy Lane) Suffolk	- - -	60	Preston, Lancashire	- - -	50
Bexley Heath, Kent	- - -	40	Halstead, Essex	- - -	60
Dinas Colliery, Glamorgan	- - -	35	Phillips Norton, Somerset	- - -	25

The Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund 277

Market Street, Herts. - - - £55	Knutsford, Cheshire - - - £80
Wem, Salop - - - - - 60	Llansamlet, Glamorgan - - - 30
Brecon (Welsh Church), Brecon 40	Moreton Pinkney, Northampton 25
TOTAL : £635.	

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 12th JUNE, 1838.

Somersham, Suffolk - - - £40	Llanfair, Caerinion, Montgomery £30
Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk - - - 80	Ashdon, Essex - - - - - 30
Thorverton, Devon - - - - - 40	Newick, Sussex - - - - - 30
St. Austell, Cornwall - - - - - 50	Long Parish, Hants. - - - - - 30
Beverley, York - - - - - 60	Imber, Wilts. - - - - - 45
Wincanton, Somerset - - - - - 40	Penzance, Cornwall - - - - - 80
Llwyngwrl, Merioneth - - - - - 35	Lydney, Gloucester - - - - - 30
Ickford, Bucks. - - - - - 20	Heywood, Lancaster - - - - - 50
Sutton-in-Craven, York - - - - - 20	Cheddar, Somerset - - - - - 50
Halifax, York - - - - - 50	
TOTAL : £810.	

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 18th JUNE, 1839.

Appledore, Devon - - - - £45	Ramsgate, Kent - - - - - £60
Maes-y-berllan, Brecon - - - - 40	Wollaston, Northampton - - - 25
Bures, Essex - - - - - 50	Lyme Regis, Dorset - - - - - 25
Long Lane and Newtown, Berks. 25	Stratford-on-Avon, Warwick - - 50
Quainton, Bucks. - - - - - 45	Kingsthorpe, Northampton - - 50
Shrewton (1st Church), Wilts. 40	Thaxted, Essex - - - - - 45
Maryport, Cumberland - - - - - 45	Shrewsbury (Castle Foregate)
Ravenglass, Cumberland - - - 25	Salop - - - - - - - 70
Norton, Suffolk - - - - - 35	Long Preston, York - - - - - 50
TOTAL : £725.	

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 14th JULY, 1840.

Bacton, Norfolk - - - - - £30	Wootton, Bedford - - - - - £60
Merthyr Tydvil, Glamorgan - - 35	Liverpool (Soho Chapel),
Littleport, Cambridge - - - - 25	Lancaster - - - - - - - 80
Lynn, Norfolk - - - - - 80	Pen-y-garn, Pontypool, Mon-
Llanrhystyd, Cardigan - - - - 30	mouth - - - - - - - 50
Brimpton, Berks. - - - - - 45	Minchinhampton, Gloucester - 60
Yelling, Hunts. - - - - - 20	Charlton Otmoor, Oxford - - - 25
Redbourn, Herts. - - - - - 30	Blockley, Worcester. - - - - - 50
TOTAL : £620.	

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 30th JUNE, 1841.

NOTE.—No copies of the Annual Reports for this and the following three years appear to be in existence. The figures, therefore, have been compiled from other sources, and are believed to be accurate.

Burton-on-Trent, Stafford - - - £60	Whitchurch, Hants. - - - - £40
South Shields, Durham - - - - 50	Malling, Kent - - - - - 55
Tillingham, Essex - - - - - 40	Stowbridge, Worcester - - - - 50
Kilmington, Devon - - - - - 25	Cullingworth, York - - - - - 55
Laverton, Somerset - - - - - 25	Denbigh, Denbigh - - - - - 40
Rotherham, York - - - - - 70	St. Ives, Hunts. - - - - - 50
Blaenavon (Horeb) Mon. - - - - 40	Hatherleigh, Devon - - - - - 40
Guiting, Gloucester - - - - - 35	Shotley Field, Northumberland 20
TOTAL : £695.	

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 3rd AUGUST, 1842.

Bridgewater, Somerset	-	-	£60	Talgarth, Brecon	-	-	£40
Uley, Gloucester	-	-	40	Hunslet, Yorks.	-	-	60
Allbyrnyns Llanviangel, Monmouth	-	-	30	Gt. Missenden, Bucks.	-	-	50
Uffculm, Devon	-	-	35	Snailbeach, Salop	-	-	25
Buxton, Norfolk	-	-	40	Exeter, Devon	-	-	60
Hereford, Hereford	-	-	60	Grimseat, Northants.	-	-	15

TOTAL : £515.

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 23rd AUGUST, 1843.

Framsden, Suffolk	-	-	£40	Dolgelly, Merioneth	-	-	£40
Llanriangle, Croyddyn	-	-	20	Gt. Sherston, Wilts.	-	-	25
Crewkerne, Somerset	-	-	50	Tenterden (Zion Chapel) Kent	-	-	50
Halshom le Willows, Suffolk	-	-	30	Sheffield (2nd Church) York	-	-	80
New Romney, Kent	-	-	30	Milton, Oxon.	-	-	20
Northampton (Zion Chapel)	-	-	80	Great Samford, Essex	-	-	25

TOTAL : £490.

NINETEENTH ANNUAL REPORT, 10th SEPTEMBER, 1844.

Narberth, Pembroke	-	-	£50	Chadlington, Oxford	-	-	£35
Cloughfold, Lancaster	-	-	70	Usk, Monmouth	-	-	40
Leamington, Warwick	-	-	60	Romford, Essex	-	-	50
Gillingham, Dorset	-	-	35	Pen-y-fai, Glamorgan	-	-	30
Llanfyllen, Montgomery	-	-	30	Tunbridge Wells, Kent	-	-	50
Mount Bures, Essex	-	-	20	Cardiff, Glamorgan	-	-	50

TOTAL : £520.

TWENTIETH ANNUAL REPORT, 12th AUGUST, 1845.

Berkhampstead, Herts.	-	-	£25	Laverstock Green, Herts.	-	-	£25
Windsor, Berks.	-	-	75	Masham, Yorks.	-	-	35
Old Brentford, Middlesex	-	-	35	Chowbent, Lancs.	-	-	30
Gt. Grimsby, Lincolns.	-	-	50	Helston, Cornwall	-	-	70
W. Bromwich, Staffs.	-	-	35	Christow, Devon	-	-	40
Lynn, Norfolk	-	-	80	Torquay, Devon	-	-	40
Stotfold, Beds.	-	-	30				

TOTAL : £570.

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT, 14th JULY, 1846.

Guernsey	-	-	35	Bridport, Dorset	-	-	£50
Southwell, Notts.	-	-	60	Dunnington, Warwick	-	-	20
Pontestyll, Brecon	-	-	30	Finchampton, Berks.	-	-	30
Bideford, Devon	-	-	60	Addlestone, Surrey	-	-	40
Corntown, Glam.	-	-	30	Buckingham, Bucks.	-	-	50
Coleraine, Ireland	-	-	20	Netherton, Worcester	-	-	25
Cwmbran, Mon.	-	-	30				

TOTAL : £480.

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT, 10th AUGUST, 1847.

Stradbrook, Suffolk	-	-	£40	Merthyr Tydvil, Glam.	-	-	£75
Sulgrave, Northants.	-	-	40	Pailton, Warwick	-	-	20
Foot's Cray, Kent	-	-	35	Irvine, Ayrshire	-	-	50
Neath, Glam.	-	-	40	Stockport, Cheshire	-	-	60

The Centenary of the Baptist Building Fund 279

Maudlin St., Bristol - - -	£50	Machynlleth, Montgomery -	£20
Chard, Somerset - - -	50	Earl's Barton, Northants. -	35

TOTAL : £515.

TOTAL FOR THE PERIOD - - £18,205.

(b) Grants made in special circumstances after the adoption of the loan system.

1848	Culmstock - - -	£15	Llanvenangel Ystremllewein	£20
	Stanwick - - -	25	Machynlleth - - -	8
1849	Budleigh Salterton - - -	20		
1850	Morrison - - -	20	Presteign - - -	20
1851	Thurleigh - - -	20	Broadhaven, Haverfordwest	25
1852	Pailton - - -	20		
1853	Newton Longville - - -	20		
1854	Clayhidon - - -	15	Bradfield - - -	25
1855	Blakeney - - -	30	Landbeach - - -	30
	Shiffnall - - -	5		
1856	Aston Clinton - - -	20	Stow on the Wold - - -	10
	Torrington (for four village stations in Devon) - - -	20	Swavesey - - -	15
1857	South Lopham - - -	15	New Quay, Cardigan - - -	10
	Camberwell - - -	10		
1858	Dunstable - - -	10	Yarcombe - - -	5
1859	Farnham - - -	10	Sunnyside - - -	15
1860	Wigan - - -	30	Lifton - - -	15
1861	Gillingham - - -	30	Hadleigh - - -	10
1862	Ditton Marsh - - -	15		
1863	Brockley - - -	5	Leighton Buzzard - - -	10
	Woburn Green - - -	15	Southminster - - -	10
1864	Fifehead - - -	20		
1866	New Wisbech - - -	5	Swaffham, } Thetford, } East Dereham, } Yarmouth, }	83
	Garway - - -	20	Bampton - - -	10
1867	Clipstone - - -	10		
	Weston-super-mare - - -	10		
1868	Ryde - - -	25	Coggeshall - - -	11
	Staleybridge - - -	36		
1870	Aston Clinton - - -	10	Wickwar - - -	10
1872	South Wingfield - - -	5		
1874	Park End - - -	23	Walton - - -	5
1875	Harrow-on-the-Hill - - -	5		
1876	Brompton - - -	25	Earls Barton - - -	10
	Hartlepool - - -	6		
1878	Bruham - - -	3	Old Ford - - -	5
	Weston-super-mare - - -	100		
1880	An unnamed Church - - -	5		
1883	Ascupart Street, South-ampton - - -	10	Fivehead, Somerset - - -	10
1886	Ventnor - - -	350	(This grant was part of a donation of £1,000 given by Mrs. Hill of Reigate in memory of her husband. She attached the condition that £350 be voted to Ventnor.)	

TOTAL FOR THE PERIOD - - £1,410.

Some Notable Names in Midland Baptist History.

THE month of June will witness the gathering of the clans from 411 Baptist Churches in the East and West Midlands. They will come from eleven English counties, which contain at least another 127 Churches of our faith and order. Their association meetings may be as epoch-making as those of 1651, when representatives met and resolved to send forth to the world "the first General Baptist Confession to speak for more than one Church." It was called "the faith and practice of thirty congregations gathered according to the Primitive Pattern." It is, therefore, surely fitting to remind ourselves of some of the notable names that have contributed to our glorious heritage. It is not surprising that our history is so rich when you remember that we cover an area which from the days of the earliest British Christianity has been of special interest. It was at Aust, on the Severn, in Gloucestershire, that Augustine had his conference with the leaders of the Early British Churches in 603 A.D. Paulinus, about 626 A.D. baptized a large number of the citizens of Lincoln in the Trent. "The Morning Star of the Reformation"—John Wycliffe, the greatest Yorkshireman that ever lived—commenced and ended his ministry in these parts. The copies of his English version of the Scriptures, and the preaching of the Lollards prepared the way for our modern days. Hugh Latimer, a Leicestershire born man, was Bishop of Worcester. Anne Askew, the martyr, who was burnt at Smithfield in 1546, came from Stallingboro, near Grimsby, and many claim her as a Baptist.

The first pastor of the Pilgrim Church at Gainsborough, was John Smyth, the se-Baptist, who was born at Sturton-le-Steeple, Notts., and is the founder of the General Baptists. Another Baptist who accompanied him was John Murton, who became a furrier at Amsterdam. Roger Williams, the first Baptist in America, first met John Cotton in Lincolnshire. In the days of the Commonwealth, Lincolnshire and Worcestershire were the two chief Baptist centres of the country. Though King Charles I. unfurled his standard on the Castle Rock of Nottingham, yet Oliver Cromwell won his first victory at Horncastle, and his

“crowning mercy” at Worcester. His ablest lieutenant was Major-General Thomas Harrison, a native of Newcastle-under-Lyme, known as the “Head of the Anabaptists.” A Baptist, Colonel John Hutchinson, became Governor of Nottingham Castle; Henry D’anvers, the Governor of Stafford Castle, was a convert and wrote afterwards the first English “Treatise of Baptism.” Sir Henry Vane, the younger, who protested against Cromwell’s dissolution of the Rump Parliament, gathered and preached to his neighbours at Belleau, and thus was one of the founders of the South Marsh Church, which later centred in Boston, where Thomas Grantham was baptised in 1653, and ministered. Grantham became the General Baptist leader and messenger. In 1661 he was mainly responsible for presenting three petitions or addresses to King Charles II. He suffered “ten imprisonments for conscience sake.” Another who signed these addresses, was John Kelsey, of Kirton-in-Lindsey, who languished in Lincoln and Nottingham prisons for seventeen years.

As early as 1626 there were General Baptist churches at Lincoln and Coventry, in touch with the Mennonites. John Smyth and Thomas Helwys both were to be found in 1606 at an all night conference with Puritan leaders, at the house of Sir William Bowes, near Coventry. Benjamin Cox, M.A., helped found the Calvinistic Baptist Church at Coventry in 1644, and you find him attending the Midland Association at Moreton-in-the-Marsh in 1658. In 1660 Thomas Hobson, a Baptist, was Mayor of Coventry. Henry Denne’s visit to Spalding in 1646 led to the formation of a G.B. Church; the first baptism took place, near midnight, at a place called Little Croft; of the four who thus confessed Christ, one was Anne Stennett. For this service Denne was arrested and committed to Lincoln gaol.

At this time John Tombes, M.A., B.D., was Master of the Temple (London), driven out by Puritan hostility to Baptists; he returned in 1647, as lecturer to his native Bewdley, organised the Baptist Church there, 1649, and trained pupils; held public debate with R. Baxter and became one of the Tryers. Hanserd Knollys was born at Cawkwell, near Louth, in 1599; led to Christ by the testimony of a godly widow, at Gainsborough, he eventually embraced Baptist principles and became one of the greatest preachers of London. For over ninety years he witnessed scenes unparalleled in English history. Again and again you find him inspiring churches with his visits. Samuel Oates, a weaver from Rutland, you find disputing in 1649, at Barrow-on-Soar, with George Fox, about “Faith and Baptism.” He also disputed with William Sheffield, M.A., the rector of Ibstock, for three hours, in Leicester Castle. Oates was chaplain to Colonel Pride’s regiment and father of the notorious Titus Oates.

William Pardoe, born in 1630, at Tenbury, a G.B. messenger and clothworker, suffered imprisonment at Hereford, Worcester, and Leicester, finally settling at Lichfield.

In 1651, John Eckels settled at Bromsgrove, he was known as "the boy preacher," and trained by Tombes, on one occasion he was "taken whilst preaching and greatly abused, being confined in a dungeon of Worcester gaol," and only liberated on Mr. Swift, one of the Members of Parliament for the county, being bound for him in £1000. He baptised the Rev. Richard Claridge, A.M., rector of Peopleton, and David Crosley, the Northern Baptist Apostle. Bromsgrove sent into the ministry in 1793, John Palmer, who served the town of Shrewsbury as Baptist pastor and Doctor of Medicine thirty years; and in 1870 the Rev. George Hill, M.A., D.D., whose pastorates at Oxford, Leeds, Derby, and Nottingham were all memorable.

Charles II.'s Declaration of Indulgence, of 1672, was not accepted by all our people. Forty-three licences were issued for the Baptists of Lincolnshire; but the oldest church, meeting at Crowle, Epworth and Butterwith, made no application though it had more than a hundred members at the time. In Salop and Worcestershire not a single Baptist except John Langford, on the Herefordshire border, took any notice of the King's Declaration. The other counties were only lukewarm. The most notable Baptists in our area availing themselves of the same were Richard Farmer, Richard Adams and John Kitchen.

At Leominster, you find the work of Tombes being followed up by Vavasour Powell, the Apostle of Wales, who later is heard of near Oswestry. Joseph Stennett, Junior, was at Leominster, 1714-19. He became a D.D. of Edinburgh. He was the greatest of four generations of ministers which originated from Lincolnshire, and whose services stretched from 1687 to 1795. Here also in 1740, Joshua Thomas was baptised, becoming pastor in 1753, and continuing 44 years. He was five times Moderator of the Midland Association and wrote *The History of the Baptist Associations in Wales*.

The first half of the eighteenth century was one of apathy and decay, but now we note the names of families that continue for more than a century, and some still are with us, making the Churches their debtors. John Sing at Bridgnorth; John Collett Ryland, M.A., is preaching at Warwick, where his son, the famous Dr. Ryland was born; Isaac Poynting, for twenty-five years at Worcester; his son John succeeded him in 1740, and was pastor fifty-one years. The salary of the latter was so small that he had to keep a boarding-school, but, leading the life of a bachelor, he succeeded in leaving a fortune of £1,200, most of which passed to charitable institutions.

About the middle of the century there came from Goodshaw, in Rossendale, sons of a Baptist blacksmith, four brothers who were to be the greatest forces in the West Midlands. Their name was Butterworth. John settled at Cow Lane, Coventry in 1753, where he remained fifty years; one of his sons became M.P. for the city, another founded a firm of law stationers in London which still continues. James settled at Bromsgrove in 1775—his father's house had been the preaching place for David Crosley—and continued until 1798; Lawrence settled at Bengeworth (now Evesham) in 1768, and continued sixty years, being for forty years secretary of the Association; he received M.A. degree from Brown University; and the last, Henry, was for about forty years pastor at Bridgnorth. Their pastorates—all successful—totalled two centuries. Surely a record! John Butterworth at Coventry, was succeeded by Francis Franklin, who fulfilled a fifty-four years' pastorate, and his descendants still are in the fellowship, while one represents us in the Chinese mission field. We get a delightful sketch of this minister as Rufus Lyon in George Eliot's *Felix Holt*.

The Evangelical Revival has left its mark on all the Protestant Churches, and no section felt its influence more than that of the General Baptists. Dan Taylor, at Halifax, embraced Baptist sentiments, and since he was an Arminian, he set off to walk to Boston, to ask William Thompson to baptise him. To his surprise he found a company of General Baptists at Gamston, Notts.; and there he was baptised on February 16th, 1763, in the river, by the pastor Joseph Jeffery. Later he was ordained to the ministry by Gilbert Boyce, who was sixty-two years minister of Coningsby, in Lincolnshire, the friend of John Wesley, and the last messenger there of the old Connexion. At Barton-in-the-Beans a gracious movement began in 1741, which eventually became Baptist and has always been the centre of a group of Churches. Its most noted family was that of Samuel Deacon, who himself was one of the pastors for fifty-two years; his son Samuel was pastor there thirty-seven years, while John revived the cause in Friar Lane, Leicester, which he served for nearly forty years. Dan Taylor and these Barton preachers were mainly responsible for the formation of the New Connexion of General Baptists in 1770.

John Ash, LL.D., was pastor at Pershore 1751-79. Along with Dr. Caleb Evans he compiled a hymn-book in 1769, while six years later he issued *A New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*. Benjamin Beddome, M.A., who for fifty years was at Bourton-on-the-Water, was born in 1718 at Henley-in-Arden, where his father, John, was pastor as well as at Alcester. Bernard Foskett helped at Alcester before going to

Broadmead, in 1720, to act not only as pastor but as tutor in the Academy at Bristol.

In 1753, Robert Hall came from Cumberland to Arnesby, where he was thirty-eight years; there his famous son, Robert, was born in 1764. The latter became the greatest preacher of his day and was a M.A. and D.D. of Aberdeen. His ministries at Bristol, Cambridge and Leicester still bear fruit.

It was at Park Street Chapel, Nottingham, in May, 1792, that William Carey preached his famous sermon, that roused the churches to the need of the regions beyond the seas. His clarion call was that they should

Expect great things from God,
And attempt great things for God.

This resulted in the formation of the first modern foreign missionary society, at Kettering, October 2nd, 1792, and of the thirteen pioneers present, at least six belong to us, viz:—John Ryland, Abraham Greenwood, Joshua Burton, Samuel Pearce, William Staughton and William Carey. Carey and John Thomas were the first to go out; the latter was born at Fairford, in Gloucestershire. William Ward, of Serampore, was a native of Derby, and edited a newspaper at Stafford. George Grenfell, the pioneer of the Congo Mission, belonged to Birmingham, where also was born W. K. Landels, who for fifty years laboured in Italy.

The General Baptist Foreign Missionary Society had for its birthplace, Boston, in 1816. Amongst its earliest and most distinguished missionaries we claim William Bampton, James Peggs, Dr. Amos Sutton, Isaac Stubbins, and Dr. John Buckley, the last named being President of Orissa College and chief reviser of the Oriya Bible. The founder of this Society was J. G. Pike, who settled at Derby in 1810; he was also founder of a family which has an unbroken succession of ministers and missionaries ever since J. C. Pike succeeded his father, in 1855, as secretary of the Foreign Missionary Society.

The enthusiasm for education must not be judged by the precarious existence of the Midland College. Morgan Edwards, who was pastor at Boston, in 1750-57, emigrated to America, in 1761 and was the chief promoter of Rhode Island College, now Brown University, the oldest Baptist College in the New World. Dr. William Steadman—the first principal of the Northern Education Society was born near Leominster in 1764. Dr. William Staughton, of Coventry, was President of at least three American colleges. The Principals of all our English colleges to-day, as well as Dr. Blomfield, were born or served as pastors within our bounds. McMaster and Acadia Universities have received our sons as Professors on their staffs. The latter one of its principals

in Dr. Thos. Trotter. D. J. East left Leamington for Calabar College. The Midland College has had honoured Principals and tutors like Joseph Wallis, the Stevensons, Dr. Underwood, Thomas Goadby and Dr. Witton Davies. Though her number of students was never large she produced the very best, and rightly gloried in the fact that Dr. John Clifford, a native of Sawley, was among her *alumni*. He not only won more degrees at London University than any minister of religion had ever done, but became the greatest citizen of the greatest city of the world. No wonder he followed the Prince of Preachers—Dr. Alex. McLaren—in the chair of the Baptist World Alliance. Another of the Midland men was Dr. Newton Marshall, one of many of Dr. Clifford's "boys."

The Goadby family from Market Bosworth, forms a most important chapter in Baptist history; for a century it produced "Not Saints but Men." Joseph, who settled at Packington in 1799, was the first minister.

The Hyper-Calvinistic Baptists have had great leaders in our midst. William Gadsby was born at Attleborough in 1773. He settled at Hinckley in 1800, where he remained until 1805, when he moved to Manchester where he spent thirty-nine years. John Stevens, M.A., was at Boston, 1806-11, and while there issued his *Selection of Hymns*. J. C. Philpot, M.A., resigned his Fellowship of Worcester College, Oxford in 1835, and settled at Stamford, where he fulfilled a thirty years' ministry, as well as editing *The Gospel Standard*. Near by, at Deeping St. James, there also seceded from the Church of England the incumbent of the parish—the Rev. F. Tryon, B.A.—a relative of Admiral Tryon, and with the bricks he had bought to build his Rectory he built a Baptist Chapel, where he ministered for about sixty years.

Among historians we claim J. H. Wood, William Stokes, and Dr. B. Evans, the last being the historian of the Early English Baptists.

We have had an innumerable company of loyal laymen. No city has had a finer benefactor to Baptist church extension than Birmingham in William Middlemore. It was in this same city that William Carey found in 1792 the friend (Thomas Potts) that met the cost of his pamphlet. It was called an *Enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen*, which Dr. George Smith describes as "the first and still the greatest Missionary Treatise in the English language."

J. Shirrow Wright, M.P. for Birmingham, belongs to us, Sir Joseph Bright, and W. Hunt of Nottingham; Sir Edward Wood and Alec Tyler, both of Leicester; the Wherrys of Bourne; the Fellowes of Bromsgrove and Cradley Heath; Thomas Smith of Dudley Priory; S. A. Daniell, E. M. Mitton,

and J. Player, all of Birmingham; Thomas Cooper, the Chartist; Thomas Cook, the founder of modern methods of touring; and many another enriched our church life.

There are countless others of whom brief mention must suffice. Joseph Hooke, who died in 1736, and was a messenger or superintendent of the G.B. churches from Sheffield to Wisbech. John Macgowan, the author of *The Dialogue of Devils*, at Bridgnorth in 1760. "The Seraphic Pearce," M.A., founder of the first auxiliary of the B.M.S., whose ministry in Birmingham, 1790-99 was all too short. Abraham Booth, born at Blackwell in Derbyshire, 1734, author of the *Reign of Grace*, trained deacons who founded Stepney College; Isaiah Birt, two of whose sons entered our ministry, and of these, Caleb was President of the Baptist Union in 1836. J. F. Winks, the pastor who became printer, editor and publisher of no fewer than five monthly magazines. Charles Vince, the pastor, who by speech and act was one of Birmingham's greatest citizens. Samuel Cox, D.D., founder and first editor of *The Expositor*, of Nottingham. Jabez Tunnicliffe, founder of the Band of Hope, native of Wolverhampton, began his ministry at Cradley. William Landels, D.D., and Arthur Mursell, who both left Birmingham for the Metropolis. Thomas Barras, the Nonconformist Bishop of Peterborough. J. C. Jones, M.A., whose pastorate of sixty-five years at Spalding, is the longest in our denominational history. J. B. Myers, S. A. Tipple and James Stuart, who all served the church at Wolverhampton. Forbes Jackson, M.A., of Worcester, who became Principal of Harley College. J. P. Mursell (President of the Baptist Union, 1864), Dr. N. Haycroft, M.A., James Thew, of Leicester. Robert Gray, J. Jenkyn-Brown, Arthur G. O'Neill (another Chartist), and John Hulme, who gave their lives to Birmingham. E. Hall-Jackson, of Louth, the poet, politician and historian. R. M. Julian, the secretary of the B.M.S. Centenary gatherings at Loughboro', first general superintendent of the West Midlands, who saw a Memorial Hall erected to the memory of his work in Calcutta during his lifetime. James Smith, whose ministries at Cheltenham were unique. George Howard James, of Derby and Nottingham, Octavius Winslow, D.D., of Leamington, William Cuff, the Gloucestershire boy who became the Apostle of East London. R. F. Handford, of Loughborough.

The half has not yet been told, the Lamb's Book of Life alone holds the record.

ARTHUR S. LANGLEY.

MILES HARRY, who founded Pen-y-garn church, 1727, worked the first printing-press in Monmouthshire, issuing in 1740 a reply to George Whitefield.

History of Baptists in Scotland.

A SUBSTANTIAL volume of more than 300 pages, well designed, well written, well illustrated, shows a new departure by the Library Committee of 1898. We appreciate the compliment by the now Glasgow Baptist Publications Committee in their adoption of our format.

There are hints at a very early emergence of Baptist principles. John Knox inveighed against Scottish Dippers: it would be interesting if some antiquary would follow up the clue and find some more about these men; that would give Scotland a very clear priority. As matters stand, the earliest man who is more than a name, appears to be Gilbert Gardin of Tallyfruskie—a place not catalogued in modern gazetteers. When a campaign of persecution, ordered by Cromwell, was carried out by Monk, a graphic description was given by Robert Pitilok in 1659. Of Gardin he said that he was "known to be pious and of a blameless conversation, who merely for conscience' sake about seventeen years since suffered the sentence of excommunication by the national ministry in Scotland; and since for the same cause close imprisonment by their power above a year's space and a half." Is it possible that there was a pure indigenous Baptist movement in 1642?

It is clear that the second movement, of Sir William Sinclair, did depend on his being on military duty in England. He carried north one good Baptist innovation, and produced the first hymn book for Scotland, where the followers of Knox had limited themselves to Psalms of David.

Although Carmichael and M'Lean do not seem to have thought of mutual baptism, and the former did go to be baptized by Dr. Gill at the Barbican baptistery in 1765, yet the movement was so original that "Scotch Baptists" were long noted for their decided views on church order and worship.

The volume traces with care how another stream of influence came from the Haldanes. If they had been quickened by hearing of Carey, yet they were not precipitate in their advance from Mission work to the full Baptist position. But then they contributed the emphasis on Education which had hitherto been lacking; and their work at Grantown-on-Spey provided trained men for the wide evangelism in highlands, islands, lowlands.

Francis Johnstone contributed another element a generation

later. Trained at Bradford, he brought back that sense of perspective which is not always developed among stay-at-homes. Ample justice is done to his statesmanship. We are not rich in men who survey the field, try to realise needs and opportunities, then to persuade a denomination. Johnstone sketched a programme in 1843 which has hardly been improved upon after eighty years. He left, however, for Cambridge in 1856. Again and again we find this migration. The gain of England and the Colonies has been very great. But it may be questioned whether Culross, Landels, and others, might not have exercised an even greater influence in their own land.

The various movements began to coalesce in 1850, and since then the progress has been fairly steady. It is traced with some care, and the only point left obscure is the nature and the influence of Sunday-schools; perhaps they do not differ widely from those in England, but we have a suspicion that there is something the south might learn, if it only knew. As it is, there are ample materials for judging the contributions to Foreign Missions, to Literature, and the attention given to Social Work.

Half the volume is thus very readable and interesting. The other half presents an enormous mass of facts as to the separate churches. There have been 231 Baptist churches in Scotland, of which 154 are alive at this day. The full story of each is given, with occasional interesting detail, and a good picture of its present home. Then one skilful packer has compressed the whole into fifteen pages, which will be invaluable for reference.

The band of writers may be heartily congratulated on their presentation of the story, and we trust that their enterprise will both quicken the denominational life in Scotland, and awaken English Associations to complete a similar survey south of the Cheviots. For Yorkshire, Lancashire, Worcestershire the work has been done; for London it is nearly ready, and Lincolnshire is in good hands. Other districts will find a good model in Scotland.