

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/robbadshaw>

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

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

Editorial.

THE appeal for support to *The Baptist Quarterly*, as a means of service to the Baptist denomination, has so far met with an encouraging response, and has won upwards of forty new members to the Baptist Historical Society. But a careful examination of the costs of publication shows that, in order to meet them, the existing membership must be doubled. We therefore ask the present members to make an individual effort to obtain new subscribers. *If each will obtain one new supporter, the difficulty will be met.* We are confident that there is a sufficient number of those who sympathize with our aims, within personal reach of our present membership. The needs and objects of the Society have only to be made known to command sufficient support to enable it to "carry on." Will our readers show their appreciation of the unpaid labours of our contributors by each becoming an agent of the Society to the extent of gaining *one new member?* Names, with the subscription of ten shillings (which entitles to membership and the receipt of the *Quarterly* post free for one year), should be sent to Mr. F. J. Blight, of Tregenna, Wembley, Middlesex.

* * * *

At the Leicester meetings, Thursday afternoon, 4th May, can be spent thus: Char-a-bancs will be at the door of the morning meeting, leaving at one o'clock for Arnesby; lunch aboard. A half-hour talk at the country church served by the two Robert Halls. On to Sutton-in-the-Elms, mother church of the Particular Baptists in the county, where a second talk will be given. Through Bosworth, with a pause at the battle-field, to Barton-in-the-Beans, mother church of the New Connexion. Tea there, and annual meeting of the Baptist Historical Society, with reports and elections. Back in Leicester by six o'clock, in ample time for the evening meeting. Members and other friends who desire to go on this excursion will be the guests of the Local Committee if they send their names and registration fee of two shillings to Dr. Whitley at Droitwich, not later than Friday, 28th April.

* * * *

The Baptist Bibliography, volume II., registering five thousand books and documents relating to our history between 1777 and 1837, has been sent to subscribers in class A for the years ending with 1921. It may be bought from the Kingsgate Press for a guinea, net.

The Value of Baptist Witness To-day.

WHATEVER else the discussions on Church Union have done, they have certainly brought into prominence the distinctive contributions of the denominations to the common life of the Church. Again and again it has been said that no union is at all possible which does not allow for the full utterance of that particular emphasis for which each branch of the Church is historically famous. The possibility of our merging our life in the larger life of the whole has forced on us the question: what is the distinct witness for which we stand? And the minute we ask that question, we are compelled to go on to another: do we really need, in these modern days, to keep alive our independent testimony, that testimony which has made our Baptist Church what it is? And, without any prejudice to the question of Church Union, we venture to answer: the times in which we live call for a strong emphasis on that aspect of religious life which it has been the glory of Baptists to demonstrate in modern times.

What are the needs of to-day which call for a Baptist witness?

I.

Both modern thought and modern life call for an emphasis on and an interpretation of the principle of Authority. This principle is admitted to be necessary in every department of life. In the spheres of morals, civil life, and religion, it is the belief in some Authority which constitutes the greatest power to appropriate action. From this belief springs the binding power of morality, and the driving power of religion. Authority is real, is always present with men, and without it the true development of life and character cannot be achieved. Every religious man demands some authority, some eternal sanction, which can urge on all that is within him to advance towards God.

Now these modern days of ours have witnessed the discrediting of one kind of authority after another. The props on which men have been accustomed to lean have fallen away. This might be illustrated in the region of political theory, but it finds a ready example in religious life. It was perhaps inevitable that eighteenth-century rationalism should combine with nineteenth-century materialism, to undermine the traditional bases of our faith. In face of this double attack, many sought refuge in a closer following of that Church where the matter of authority is quickly settled. But for those who could not see their way to a blind acquiescence in either a series of Church Councils or the dicta of a Pope, the matter remained—and remains—a grave problem. "What *are* we to believe?" cry men and women all around us. "Give us some sure ground for our feet," they plead. And we believe that the Baptist, following, as he does, the New Testament as closely as it can be followed, is in a position to point the way to an Authority for life and thought.

We decline to rely altogether upon the traditional utterance of a Church, however hoary and reverend it may be. We are not committed to the sincere but antiquated statements of several centuries ago. We direct ourselves and others to the revelation of God in Christ: we present the essence of religion as the relation of the individual conscience and God: we disclaim any authority that is merely external: we trace all authority up to God, and believe that there the will finds purpose and energy, the heart passion, and the mind truth and reality. To God in Christ we owe absolute loyalty and obedience. And a world which is suspicious of mere tradition, which looks askance at the fiats of bygone ages, may well find its driving force in an immediate and personal contact with that Christ Who is God's everlasting Yea to all our problems. As a denomination we have affirmed the right of freedom from outward control. In this assertion the true aim has not been so much to establish the rights of individual congregations as to insist on that spiritual condition which alone can make the true spiritual Church. As far as the question of authority is concerned, it is a mistake to regard the Baptist position as merely that of men who cannot bear anything other than local independence. We have no genius for mere

separateness. Our aim is the emphasis on the principle of spiritual freedom as necessary to the true life of the Church. And we believe that this emphasis, which drives a man back to the New Testament will do much to meet the modern need.

II.

A second great need of these days is the restoration of conversion to its central place in any religious life. There is no doubt that conversion has been discredited in many modern eyes by its frequent accompaniment of great emotionalism. It is, after all, not so very long ago that enthusiasts were stating that the only genuine kind of conversion was that of the instantaneous and emotional type. The attempt to force all religious experience along this line into one channel, and one channel only, was spiritually and psychologically a mistake. And the effect of the restricted outlook on conversion was that many were prompted to assume rather a cynical attitude in regard to it. There were those who said they would rather stand with the Emersons and Theodore Parkers and Walt Whitmans, the "once-born," than with the others who claimed to have an experience of a new birth. Happily, the careful investigations of psychologists like Starbuck and William James have done much to restore conversion to its true place in religious thought. They explain to us the experiences of both "once-born" and "twice-born." They point out that conversion is a normal adolescent phenomenon, and not something extraordinary, as many supposed. They say that not even backsliding can eradicate the good . . . "that it (the conversion experience) should, for even a short time, show a human being what the high water mark of his spiritual capacity is, this is what constitutes its importance—an importance which backsliding cannot diminish, although persistence might increase it" (W. James).

Especially in the minds of the young people of our Churches to-day does this need to take firm root. They have not escaped the cynicism which a too rabid emotionalism has produced. And no church can hope to maintain its spiritual life at the highest level which does not do justice to the place and power of conversion.

This, then, is a great need to-day. And the Baptist is well qualified to give to conversion all the emphasis it deserves. Our rite of Believers' Baptism can only justify its position in so far as it declares clearly its testimony to the reality of the New Birth. To regard Baptists merely as people who believe in immersion is to fail to understand them. Baptists do believe in, and practise, immersion, but the emphasis should fall, primarily, upon the word *Believers*. The fact that *only believers*, they who can of their own free will, and with a clear mind, declare their faith by immersion, is a clear testimony to the meaning of baptism in regard to conversion. There is no other kind of Baptism which does so clearly speak of the meaning of conversion. The candidate for Believers' Baptism is expressing outwardly what is a profound inner experience. His baptism means that there has occurred in his inner life a complete change of attitude. He has surrendered his will to Christ. He is a converted man. He has lost himself, only to find himself anew in Christ. Believers' Baptism, therefore, symbolises that complete surrender which, says Starbuck, is essential to conversion. Every time a Baptist Church holds a baptismal service, it is saying in plain words: "We believe in the necessity of conversion, and this rite is a symbol of that experience."

Nor should it be overlooked that the Baptist, in his distinctive rite, is expressing the individuality of conversion. There is no such thing as affecting the great transformation by proxy. There is no genuine faith apart from individual faith. Only when a man faces the great realities by himself, when he appropriates for himself the glory and power of Christ, can he be said to have entered the inner shrine of religious experience. And is not this the very thing for which our young people are clamouring? "Let us think it out for ourselves," they say; "let us test our fathers' views and our fathers' standards, and make them our own." And when they say this they are doing more than declaring again the inborn love of youth for independence: they are testifying to the great fact of all religious experience—that to be genuine, it must be individual. It is not here claimed that either in thought or practice the Baptists have always kept up to the high level of this principle. We are not free from the charge of trying

now and again to force the experience of our young people into the grooves we ourselves have made. This is a charge of which probably no section of the Church is guiltless. But it is claimed that in the Baptist emphasis on Believers' Baptism we do declare our conviction as to the supremacy and the individuality of conversion. And it will be difficult to find any other Baptismal rite which does that. We are not alone in our following of this principle, but we live as a denomination by our central emphasis on it. Without this, we might very well cease to be. With it, we are prepared to meet the needs of many to-day.

III.

If the religion of the Churches is to have any deep influence on the world to-day, it must have some reference to the social and industrial problems with which the modern world is beset. We are under no illusions as to the proper place of the Church in this matter. It is not for the Christian preacher or the Christian teacher to usurp the place of the economist or the politician. We have neither authority nor definite programme for that. But there is one thing we cannot fail to do, and that is to express, and express fearlessly, the social implications of the Gospel of Christ. The day is passing—we hope it is almost gone—when the Gospel can be preached as if it applied to the Sabbath delectations of the church-going minority, and to them only. We have outgrown the idea that Salvation is something which applies to the soul in vacuo. Divorce the Gospel from the common, everyday activities of mankind, and you have strangled it. Even the Apostle Paul had to remind some of his flock that there were other Christian duties than waiting for the Second Advent, viz. attention to work and play of every day, and bringing to bear on them both the spirit of the Master. It may be that in the history of the Church we have occasionally forgotten this: but the modern need has drawn our attention to it again, and the eyes of all are turned to the Church to see whether she has any word of enlightenment for the perplexities of our social life.

That the world needs enlightenment on this matter cannot be doubted. Who is satisfied with the tone and temper of,

say, democracy, to-day? Is there anyone who does not feel the abject spiritual poverty of so many of our social panaceas? Take a place in any crowd of men gathered together for the airing of grievances and the propagation of new ideas, and you will feel that the level of it all is, generally, materialistic. The practice of modern democracy has become less and less democratic. The apostles of freedom have become less and less tolerant. The opponents of class divisions have allowed themselves to be drawn into class warfare. And there has been a relegation of the claims of religion to a place far in the rear.

Now all this constitutes a challenge to every branch of the Christian Church. And if it be a general challenge to all, it is a particular challenge to us, whose witness is that of a spiritual democracy. We claim to take our stand upon the revelation of Him who laid down the very conditions on which democracy is alone possible. No one emphasised the supreme worth of every individual soul as much as Jesus did. No one set forth man in a nobler light. No one believed in men and women more than He. And if we deduce from His teaching certain principles which form the ideal of democracy, we must be careful to go as far as He did, and state clearly the spiritual basis of it all. Now the Baptist Church, in common with others, has emphasised the democratic side of organised church life. Our method of Church government is surely none other than that. And in the sacred sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we have as beautiful an embodiment of the democratic spirit as you will find anywhere. We are so constituted, therefore, and have such a tradition, that we may well claim to speak a word to the masses of men to-day.

What is that word? It is surely a word of warning. We shall not be true to our Master if we fail to point out the disastrous consequences of any policy that does not partake of the spirit of Jesus. We have no commission to supply theories of political government: we have no mandate to dictate to either side in the great struggles of industry. But we have a decided mandate to get into the pages of the New Testament, explore the mind of Christ, and then declare it with apostolic boldness and singleness of heart. If it is our proper work to declare the revealed mind of God about sin, it is no less our

proper work to declare His mind about sins—sins in the particular, sins as we find them in the common life of industry and social life. Doubtless any definite attempt to do this would arouse a storm of protest. There will probably always be those who are sensitive about a Gospel which descends from the general to the particular, but they have neither reason nor authority on their side. Any Church that has a passion for the following of our Lord's teaching, when that teaching has been correctly understood and practically interpreted, will draw the men and the women of to-day into respect and response.

The value of our Baptist witness to-day, consists, in a sentence, in our power to preach Christ Crucified as the solution of the enigmas of life. We can preach Him so that He is not hindered in His work. We can point men to Him, and tell them that they need no other. We can proclaim that, not by this outward ceremony, not by that priestly mediation, do men need to approach God, but in the Living Way, God's revealed Way, Jesus Christ. We can show religion to consist in the relation between the individual man and God. We can proclaim the necessity of conversion; and our distinctive rite, as we have seen, stresses the individuality of true conversion. We can point men to the New Testament, and never feel that when they get there they will be able to prove us wrong. We can stand before the world as a Church built upon the New Testament and the New Testament's Lord—a Church which exists to work the work of God in the world.

All this is said without prejudice to the matter of larger union. For whatever path church union will take when it comes, it cannot be that which ignores vital and conscientious witness on the part of any Church. That union will come, not by the sacrifice of any vital principle or particular emphasis, but by the widening of our religious horizon to make room for all contributions, be they vital and sincere.

One point more. There is truth in the statement that Baptists have not been distinguished by breadth of outlook or the spirit of tolerance. We who stand upon the principle of freedom have not always been careful to allow it in matters of religion. And if Baptist testimony to-day needs one thing more than another, it is this freedom as applied both to the interpretation

of the Scriptures and to the expression of Bible truth in practical terms. The policy of putting on dogmatic blinkers when we look into the Bible will assuredly fail to influence men to-day. We have been, perhaps, a little too fond of heresy hunts, and it has worked us harm. Let us open our minds to the truth of God from whatever quarter it may come. Let us rid ourselves of theological prejudice. Let us be willing to allow the light of any kind of learning to beat upon the sacred page, and be confident that the Word of God will speak all the more clearly if we are willing to listen to it with open minds as well as open hearts. If we spend our time in trying to understand those who differ from us, rather than in cursing them roundly for heretics, we shall be a little nearer the spirit of our Master, Christ. And if we, in His spirit, open our minds and hearts to the reception of His message: if we take our stand upon the teaching of Jesus intelligently understood: if we apply our principles fearlessly: if we do these things, we may safely claim to have a distinct message for these modern times.

F. TOWNLEY LORD.

The Missionary Appeal for To-day.

WHEN William Carey one hundred and thirty years ago published his "Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens," the attitude of mind which he had to face in his readers was in many respects very different from that which confronts one who to-day commends the missionary enterprise to the conscience of Christian people. The evolutionary view of the history of the world, the comparative study of religions, the critical examination of the sacred literatures of the world, and a more general and more intimate knowledge of life in foreign lands, are all features of the modern situation which were absent from that in the midst of which Carey wrote.

One often hears it suggested that these new factors have greatly weakened the force of the old arguments in support of missions. The object of this article is to consider whether this is really true, and to set forth as clearly as possible the reasons for still believing in full view of the larger knowledge of to-day, that foreign missionary work is an integral part of the responsibility of the Christian Church. With the inevi-

table antagonism of the non-Christian man of the world to foreign missions and to all for which they stand we are not here concerned. Our argument is addressed to Christian people. Why should the Christian men and women of to-day feel it incumbent upon them "to use means for the conversion of the heathens"?

I.

Our first and main reason must still be found where Carey found his, in our Lord's evident intention that His gospel should be declared to all men. Christ's will must be the law of life for all who have committed themselves to Him. If, therefore, it is His desire that His name and teaching should be proclaimed throughout the world, there can be no doubt that it is our plain duty to do anything we can towards the accomplishment of this purpose.

It is important that we should realise that the proof that Christ intended His kingdom to be world-wide does not depend merely upon the oft-quoted commission to His disciples to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Even if we were to accept the view of many modern scholars that we have no certainty that Christ ever spoke these words, we should still be entitled to say with confidence that they are merely the formal statement of an idea which underlies the whole of His teaching.

It is true that there is a school of thought which bids us see in Christ a teacher whose horizon did not stretch beyond the narrow limits of Israel. Those who hold this view maintain that but for Paul Christianity would never have been anything but a Jewish sect. We must admit that Paul certainly was in God's providence the means of preventing the Gospel from being cramped and fettered by the narrow nationalism of some of the other leaders of the early Church. But in the controversy on this point it was Paul rather than his opponents who represented the mind of Christ Himself. The universalism of Paul is implicit in the whole of the teaching of his Master. To suppose that our Lord limited His outlook and His conception of His mission within the bounds of a single people is to reduce His teaching as to God and man to absurdity. The great principles of the Gospel preached by Christ are either of universal application, or they are meaningless. In his attack upon the Judaisers in the primitive Church Paul was not adding any new element to the Gospel, but was simply stating in definite form one of its fundamental principles, and saving it from the kind of perversion and distortion which the teaching of a great soul only too often suffers at the hands of his smaller-minded followers. The open secret

of God's will, that He purposed in the fulness of the times to sum up all things in heaven and in earth under the headship of Christ, was revealed to Paul, not as a new truth, but as the innermost meaning of the truth already proclaimed in the words and deeds, in the life and death and resurrection of Christ Himself.

Here then we have the fundamental justification of the belief that it is the Church's bounden duty to preach Christ to the ends of the earth. *Hoc Christus vult*; this is the will of Christ Himself; and that being so, there cannot be for any man or body of men, calling Him Master, any hesitation or turning back until His will is completely carried into effect.

II.

If it is clear that loyalty to Christ demands that we claim the whole world for Him, it is no less clear that we owe it to our fellow-men everywhere to share with them the life we have in Him. If Christ is to Christians what they claim He is, and if they have learnt from Him that the only true life is a life of service rendered to one's fellow-men, it follows inevitably that all Christian people are debtors both to Greeks and to barbarians, that they cannot rest so long as any man in any land is left in ignorance of Him.

It is sometimes suggested that this missionary motive, the motive of compassion towards our fellow-men, has lost a good deal of its force in these modern times because we nowadays take more hopeful views of the ultimate destiny of those who have never heard of Christ, and therefore cannot be charged with rejecting Him.

There was a time when Christian people had no doubt that every human being who had not definitely and formally during his earthly life accepted Christ as his Saviour, would be eternally lost. There are, of course, still Christians who profess to believe this, and who base their missionary appeals upon the belief. But many of us, perhaps most of us nowadays, prefer to believe with Peter that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him"; or with Paul, that "when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel"; or with our Lord Himself, that "many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." We feel

that there is far more hope both in this world and in the next for many a man who has never heard the name of Christ, than for those who have knowingly rejected Him, or for those who know Him and profess to serve Him, but do nothing to make Him known to others. We refuse to accept the view which appears to be suggested by the more hysterical type of missionary appeal, that God will condemn anyone to perish everlastinglly because someone else takes a necessary furlough.

But does our acceptance of this more liberal and, as it seems to us, more Christian view, mean that we are therefore bound to be less eager to spread the knowledge of God's love in Christ, and to win men to love Him in return? It is a remarkable fact that missionary enthusiasm was at its lowest ebb in the ages when Christians were most positive in consigning to eternal perdition not only all those who had not accepted Christ, but even all those who did not hold the same opinions about Him as themselves;¹ whereas in these later days when more generous views prevail, the cause of foreign missions is receiving ever-increasing support from all sections of the Church. We are less inclined, perhaps, to dogmatise about the details of the last judgment; but we have found in Christ such joy and peace and power that we simply cannot keep Him to ourselves.

III.

Let us turn now to a consideration of the value which missionary effort has in relation to the life of the Church itself.

(a) A self-centred Christian Church involves as complete a contradiction in terms as a self-centred Christian. In proportion as a Church cares only for itself it is less than Christian; for, whatever other legitimate tests of vital Christianity there may be, it is quite certain that the one supreme proof that any man or body of men has a right to the name Christian, is to be found in the possession of the mind and spirit of Christ Himself, who came "not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many." The Church that does not reach out, in proportion to its power and opportunity, to great enterprises for the good

¹ Dr. Weitbrecht Stanton in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. viii., page 728, points out that from the 16th to the 18th century the Reformed Churches were doing practically nothing in the way of foreign missionary work. "Indeed, their divines, when they touched the subject of the Christian obligation to evangelize the world, were mainly occupied in elaborating arguments to show that the command of Christ to do this had lapsed in their day."

of the whole human race, can scarcely claim to be the representative of, or hope to obtain the approval and blessing of Him who said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." And as a matter of actual experience, it is found that the spiritual prosperity of the Church always varies in direct ratio to the intensity of its care for the world for which Christ died.

(b) The foreign missionary enterprise has for the Church a particular value and importance in the region of apologetics and Christian evidences. It is from the foreign mission field that we get the most striking and convincing experimental proofs of the redemptive and regenerative efficacy of the Gospel. True, the Gospel has its triumphs in our own land. But the influence of Christ has become so inseparable a part of our environment, that we often fail to see how much we owe to it; whereas upon the mission field it comes on the scene as a new force, and it is more easy to argue from cause to effect. Moreover, if Christ is really the Saviour of men, He is the Saviour of the world. If the Gospel is really what the Church claims it to be, it must be capable of meeting the needs of men all over the world; it must be valid for all mankind. When the Church sends forth its missionaries to the ends of the earth and the Lord Jesus Himself works with them, confirming the word with signs following, this testimony to His saving power is a most effective means of building up the Church and establishing its faith.

(c) If Christ is the Saviour of the world, and not merely of a particular section of it, it follows that the whole world must be brought into relation with Him before all the meaning of His salvation can be made clear. No merely sectional, national, or racial view of Christ can be regarded as containing all the truth. Not until every nation and tribe and tongue has made its own distinctive contribution to the interpretation of the incarnate Word of God will the Church Universal be able to enter into her whole heritage, and possess the full-orbed truth of God. We need the help of India and China and Africa if we are to realise the fulness of the riches that are in Christ. Without them we cannot be made perfect. There are aspects of Christian truth and experience that we have overlooked, and other aspects to which, perhaps, we have given undue prominence. We need to correct our own interpretation by the experience of races that approach Christ from a different angle, as it were, and are therefore able to see in Him beauties that we have missed. And so, in order to enlarge her own vision of Christ, if for no other reason, the Church must reach out to the ends of the earth, and call men and women of all nations to explore with her the unsearchable riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God, which have been made available for mankind in Christ Jesus.

IV.

Not only for her own sake, but for the sake of the world, the Church must find room in her plans for foreign missions; for it is only so that she can perform her divinely appointed function of leading the world towards the ideal of a redeemed and regenerated humanity, so that it may become what God meant it to be—a true commonwealth of nations.

During the last few years it has been brought home to us as never before, that the world is one, that no nation can live to itself. There are some short-sighted people who, in face of the difficult problems that arise from inter-racial rivalries and colour prejudices, advocate a policy of segregation, on the principle that the best way to obviate friction is to avoid contact. But we may as well make up our minds that this is an impossible policy. Mankind is one, and as one it must work out its destiny. Nothing that happens to one nation, no fresh experiment that it initiates, no discovery that it makes, no new movement of thought that affects it, can be without its significance for, and its influence upon, all the other nations of the world. A nation that is depraved and demoralised not only loses its own soul, but it becomes a cancerous growth, eating into the moral life of humanity. If we allow ourselves for a moment to imagine a China, or a Japan, or an India, equipped with all the material and resources of modern civilization, but untouched by the Christian gospel, we shall realize at once that, even if there were no other reason for Christian missions, for our own sakes and for the sake of humanity at large, we dare not leave any part of the world outside the range of the Church's missionary activity.

V.

An objection to foreign missionary work, of which one hears a good deal nowadays, is that those who advocate it and engage in it lose sight of the lofty truths and elevating ethical teaching to be found in many non-Christian religions. Moreover, it is urged that even in the popular religion of uncultured tribes there is a beautiful primitive simplicity, well-suited to the needs of unspoiled children of nature, and that it is a pity to disturb this simplicity and to attempt to impose upon these people an alien system of thought. Such ideas are an outcome of the more thorough and sympathetic study of non-Christian religions which has been undertaken by scholars of late years. We have been presented with collections of gems of thought gathered from the Scriptures of Buddhism, Hinduism, Mahomedanism, and other non-Christian faiths, and we have been asked how we can have the impertinence to preach our views to people capable of such thought, and to talk of them as pagans who need evangelising.

It is, of course, quite easy to reply that this view ex-

aggerates the amount of lofty moral enthusiasm and true religious insight to be found in the non-Christian religions. We may point out that the small quantity of gold is buried in a great accumulation of dross, that the value of such truth as these religions contain is neutralised by a far greater mass of error, and that the actual ethical outcome of their teaching in the life of non-Christian societies is extremely unsatisfactory.

But it may be doubted whether such a reply, *if it is all that we have to say*, is either quite fair or quite wise. If, as we profess to believe, God loves the whole world, and would have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, it would surely be very surprising, to say the least, if He had left Himself quite without witness in any age or country. There is no need to deprecate or belittle anything that is true or beautiful or uplifting wherever we may find it. There is nothing good in man's life or thought in any land, but it has come from God. Unwillingness on our part to recognize this would bring us perilously near to the sin against the Holy Spirit, who has most assuredly been at work in every land, and has left evidences of His working in some places where we should never have thought of looking for them. It is true that again and again we find the thoughts of man's sinful heart mingling with, and counteracting and confusing the truth of God. But we ought frankly to recognise that this phenomenon is not peculiar to the non-Christian religions. The Bible itself is one long record of a progressive revelation; in it we can trace the way in which God's truth gradually disentangled itself from human imaginings, until in the fulness of the times the Divine Word became incarnate and dwelt among men. And even now, we do well to remind ourselves, we have this treasure in earthen vessels. The truth as it is in Jesus is mingled in the minds of all of us with more or less of human error; and the name and sanction of Christianity have been claimed, and still are claimed for many things which certainly do not tend to impress the non-Christian nations with a sense of the superiority of the Gospel over their own faiths. If, when our attention is called to lofty teaching or undoubted truths to be found in the non-Christian religions, we can only reply by pointing to degradation and immorality existing in non-Christian lands, we can scarcely be surprised if the apologist for paganism points in turn to some of the scandals, not only of our Western civilisation, but also of our Christian Churches.

The only fair way in which to judge of any religion is to estimate it by its highest expressions and achievements, and not by its lowest. The missionary need not be afraid to thank God for anything that he finds of truth and divine illumination in any non-Christian faith. He may take it and use it as a

beginning on which to build. We cannot too often remind ourselves that, after all, it is to actual human experience that we always have to come back if we would find a solid foundation for religious thought. The missionary carries with him to the foreign land his own experience of Christ and His Gospel, together with the story of the experience of the Christian Church throughout the ages. In that land he meets individuals and a nation also possessing an experience. This, if he is wise, he does not set out to decry; he rather seeks to approach it with sympathy and respect, realising that it is in this experience that he must find some point of attachment for his own message. He endeavours to obtain a pooling of experience, a comparing of notes. He frankly concedes the possibility that he may have something to learn, as well as something to teach, and he is not in such a hurry to teach as to leave himself no chance to learn. He will encourage the people, to whom he has come, to share with him their experience, so that he may know how to communicate his own to them. He will realise that without mutual respect his position becomes an impossible and even an impertinent one.

Certainly if the Christ of whom the missionary comes to speak be indeed the Saviour of the world, there can be nothing to fear from this way of presenting His claims upon the human heart, for He needs only to be truly known to be loved and trusted and worshipped; and the line of approach suggested above is the surest way of getting the non-Christian to come into vital touch with Him.

This conception of missionary work frees it from any attitude of patronising superiority towards the people to whom the missionary goes. If they have already met in their own religious books or in their personal experience any of the truth and beauty that are in Christ, the missionary can gladly welcome this as proof that God's Spirit has been there before him, as part of the Old Testament of human experience which God has been writing in every land, and which He can and does use as a pedagogue to lead men to Christ.

There is no need that a people should disown its history or cut itself adrift from its past when it comes to Christ. It should rather find in Christ the fulfilment of all those things towards which it has been, sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously, striving in the past. For Christ is Himself the centre and key of all human history and experience. Everything that was before Him led up to His appearing, and everything since has been for the unfolding of His meaning and value for man and for the hastening of the time when all things, whether in earth or in heaven, shall be summed up under His headship, and every tongue shall confess Him to the glory of God the Father. W. SUTTON PAGE.

Our Theological Colleges. (II) In Scotland.

FOR the earliest Baptist Churches in Scotland, of which we have any record, the question of providing trained ministers can hardly be said to have arisen. The "Scotch Dippers" were fiercely denounced by John Knox, but the first churches which have left any trace were founded by certain officers and men belonging to Cromwell's army of occupation, and these doubtless "edified themselves." The oldest of our existing churches—Keiss, in Caithness-shire—was shepherded and taught by its founder, Sir William Sinclair, who had imbibed in England the Baptist faith.

Later the so-called *Scotch* Baptist Churches not only of necessity but by reason of their distinctive principle supplied their ministry direct from their membership, by means of a "*plurality of elders*," or pastors, who, while earning their living at ordinary callings, ministered to the church according to their gifts. Thus, though in certain cases the churches granted a salary to a pastor for special service, the problem of ministerial training did not present itself. Indeed, as late as the middle of the nineteenth century a doughty protagonist of "Scotch Baptist" views—Mr. Ninian Lockhart of Kirkcaldy—wrote extensively and passionately against the un-wisdom, the unspirituality, the unscripturalness of withdrawing young men from ordinary work or business and training them for the ministry as a calling by which they should earn their bread.

With the rise and spread of the Haldane movement, a new element entered into Baptist life and history in Scotland. The opposition of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland to "unauthorised preachers" drove the brothers Haldane outside that fold, and their heroic labours for the evangelisation of their native land issued in the formation in many places of Independent or Congregational Churches. Preachers being required for these and also for their extensive evangelistic enterprises, the brothers Haldane at their own expense organised seminaries for the training of men for the gospel ministry, and it is said that these schools furnished most of the 185 men sent out for work in Scotland, Ulster, and the North of England by the

Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home during the nine years ending 1806. The Glasgow School was the forerunner, if not the foundation, of the Scottish Congregational College. When the Haldanes became Baptists, they naturally enough continued this plan, and from it came the first organised effort to train in and for Scotland Baptist missionaries and pastors. In 1820 Mr. Robert Haldane arranged that classes should be held in Grantown-on-Spey, under the care of Mr. Lachlan Macintosh, and some twenty men were sent and during their training supported by him. Among these was John Leechman, M.A., who, after labouring in Serampore, held pastorates in Scotland and England, became noted for a book on logic, of which three editions were published, and received in recognition from his Alma Mater, Glasgow University, in 1859, the honorary degree of LL.D.

Meantime several churches had been formed after the ordinary *English Baptist* order, with a recognised minister (as distinguished from the *Scotch Baptist* order with its plurality of pastors drawn from the Church's own immediate membership). These churches were frankly dependent on England for a supply of leaders—so much so that in 1837 there was formed *The Baptist Academical Society for Scotland*, which, finding it "impracticable" to train students in Scotland, sent them to Baptist Colleges in England. Their experiences, however, were not encouraging, and after a year or two the Society ceased to exist. According to the preliminary circular issued by its successor, of thirty students sent to England only six returned to work in Scotland—the lure of the bigger, better Southern land having evidently been too much for the others.

In 1843 there was formed the first Baptist Union of Scotland, but it comprised only that section of the Baptist Churches in which "a free gospel" was declared with the Three Universals, as they were called in Scotland—God loves all men; Christ died for all men; the Holy Spirit strives with all men. The older and stronger Churches being Calvinistic, stood aloof. One of the leading spirits in the Union movement was the Rev. Francis Johnstone, then of Cupar and later of Edinburgh. Mr. Johnstone had himself been trained for the ministry in Bradford (now Rawdon) College, after a full course in Edinburgh High School and Edinburgh University. In 1845, though unsupported by any Committee, he determined to do what he could for ministerial training among Scottish Baptists, and at Cupar gathered several likely young men around him. On his removal to Edinburgh in 1846 he was able to form *The Baptist Theological Academy (Scotland)* with a committee to manage its affairs—the Rev. James Taylor of Glasgow being appointed chairman, and he himself tutor. The committee, in issuing an appeal on behalf of ministerial educa-

tion deeply lamented "that so many years have rolled over the Baptist body in Scotland without the institution of a Theological School, where holy and talented young men might acquire such biblical knowledge as would fit them for more extensive usefulness." They then went on to say, "We exceedingly rejoice that for some years educational committees have been at work in Edinburgh and Glasgow with a view to a better state of things amongst us. For all the good they have been the means of doing we are truly thankful. Still, we look upon the plan generally pursued hitherto of sending the young men to England as being a great deficiency. [They had already lamented that of thirty sent only six were then labouring in Scotland.] Some might plead for the advantages of such a plan. One thing, however, is evident—that the very same advantages would be gained by other bodies were they to send their students across the Border; but the very suggestion of such a scheme would by them all be justly deemed preposterous and worthy of contempt and ridicule. No reason for such a conclusion could be assigned by them which might not also be employed by the Baptists."

For ten years this Theological Academy did excellent work—the classes being held first at Cupar, and then, on Mr. Johnstone's removal to the capital, in Edinburgh. The course of study prescribed was fairly comprehensive and ambitious. "The regular course of study shall consist of four consecutive terms of nine months each, viz. from 15th August to 15th May, during which period the students shall be instructed by the tutor in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, Theology, Church History, and Biblical Criticism, and shall attend classes in the University for Greek, Latin, Logic, Mathematics, Moral Philosophy, and Natural Philosophy, except in cases where all or any of these classes have been previously attended."

Notwithstanding scanty resources, the work actually done by this academy was of a notably high order, and the results achieved were most encouraging. Among the men sent forth were such fine spirits as Finlay Forbes (the father of Principal J. T. Forbes, D.D., of our present Scottish College), Dr. James Culross, who became Principal of Bristol College, and Dr. Oliver Flett of Paisley. But with Mr. Johnstone's removal to Cambridge, in 1855, this enterprise, and also the first Baptist Union itself, came to an untimely end.

The question of ministerial education, however, remained, and its pressure became such that in 1860 *the Baptist Association of Scotland* was formed for purely educational purposes, and during its nine years of existence some twenty students were brought under the able tutorship and inspiring guidance of Dr. James Paterson, the founder and minister of Hope Street Church (now Adelaide Place), Glasgow. The plan of training

followed included both a university and a theological course, its only drawback being that both ran concurrently and were compressed into the same period of time. Three of the men trained in this way under Dr. Paterson are still happily with us, and all of them so imbibed the spirit and purpose of their teacher that they have been fearless advocates and tireless helpers of the cause of adequate ministerial education for the Baptist ministry. One of them, the Rev. Alex. Wylie, M.A., has just retired from the staff of the Theological College after more than forty years of service as lecturer in Biblical and Systematic Theology, in which his great erudition and fine scholarship were amply proved. Another, the Rev. P. J. Rollo, as convener of the Board of Studies and leader of the College Devotional Classes, still carries on his inspirational task—while the Rev. Geo. Yuille, until recently the honoured secretary of the Union, has loyally supported the aim and effort for a thorough Baptist College.

In 1869 the Baptist Association gave place to the present Baptist Union of Scotland, which, as one of its purposes, took over what had been practically the sole function of the Association, namely, to make provision for the theological training of students, and Dr. Culross, then minister of Stirling, was appointed tutor. The road then seemed clear to a really satisfactory system of Baptist training for Baptist students in Scotland, and the new plan of university attendance in the winter six months, and theological instruction in the summer, promised to obviate difficulties previously encountered. Had it been possible to retain Dr. Culross for an extended period, the troubled history of succeeding years might have been spared our Union and our Churches, but his transference to an English pastorate changed the whole course of events.

At first the difficulty created seemed insuperable, but in 1871 the Rev. Hugh Anderson, of Bratton, being able, through special circumstances, to offer whole time service, the Committee gladly appointed him. His early and unexpected death just at the close of his first session with the students again threw the whole matter into the melting-pot. So difficult was the position that a motion was made in the Union Council in 1873, "that it be suggested to the Educational Committee that it is desirable in the meantime that the Committee, while taking a vigilant oversight of the students of the Union, should send them for their theological instruction to some one or other of the Theological Halls of the country." This motion, though influentially supported, was not accepted, and though its idea cropped up again and again, it was fortunately never approved. In their difficulty, the Union turned to Dr. Paterson in his retirement, and responding to the emergency, he faced the work again, conducting theological classes for the next

three summers. In 1878 Dr. Culross returned to Scotland as minister of Adelaide Place Church, Glasgow, and he was at once invited to assist again in the work of ministerial education, and that same year Dr. Paterson, now an old man, served his last session.

The story of the next dozen years is one of such embittered controversy that, even if it were desirable, it is impossible to trace it in any detail. Three policies or plans divided the brethren. I. The first proposed to have one tutor responsible for the whole course of theological teaching, and devoting all his time to the care of the students—he to be free to call to his assistance from time to time occasional lecturers on special subjects. II. The second, alleging that the denomination in Scotland had not men sufficiently qualified in theology to teach it, proposed that Baptist students should be sent to Presbyterian or other Theological Halls, already in existence, their course to be supervised by the Union Committee, or, alternately, that they should be sent to Baptist Colleges in England. III. The third plan, urging that the first placed an impossible task on one man and could not be fair to the students, and that the second was neither true as to the fact on which it founded nor wise from the point of view of the denomination, since logically followed out by the members of the Churches it would mean the end of the Churches themselves—the third plan set out the ideal of a denominational college, fully equipped and adequately endowed, and proposed to work towards that by instituting a collegiate system of theological instruction, three or four ministers competent for the task being asked while still retaining their pastoral charges to teach the subjects deemed necessary.

All these plans—save the alternative suggested in II.—had in view the great difference then existing between Scotland and England in the fact that the Scottish Universities were—as they still are—open on equal terms to all comers, so that there was no need for the denomination to provide anything in the way of general education, but only the definitely theological training. In 1880 the third plan was actually in being, with twenty-two students under the guidance of four qualified teachers—Dr. Culross, Dr. Flett, Jervis Coats, M.A., and Alex. Wylie, M.A. That year, however, at the Annual Meeting in October, plan number one was again proposed, and in 1882, by a large majority, the Council definitely adopted it and invited Dr. Culross to give himself wholly to the work. The divided vote and the urgent call of Bristol College led him to decline the invitation. From that point on the controversy grew ever hotter, threatening at times to break up the Union itself, hindering the work of the Churches in many ways, and embittering lives not a few. Ostensibly concerned with rival

plans of organisation, it was, or became, a strife as to who should teach. Charges of heresy were freely flung about, and as always proved a futile and fatal game. The wonder is that in such an atmosphere there were any students left to teach. Finally, by 1893, the Educational Fund was in such a parlous state that to the relief of all it was agreed that the work of educating students for the ministry should cease to be one of the objects of the Union, and that another independent organisation should be formed for the purpose. Thus, in 1894, was born the present Baptist Theological College of Scotland, which, taking over the students then under the care of the Union, set itself to carry through the third plan outlined above, combining a full university course for winter months, with a summer course in theology. Dr. Joseph Coats (Professor of Pathology in Glasgow University) was appointed the first President of the new college, and for five years, until his death in 1899, graciously and generously guided its affairs. Three tutors, or lecturers, were appointed—Rev. Jervis Coats, M.A., D.D. (Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis), Rev. Alex. Wylie, M.A. (Biblical and Systematic Theology), Rev. T. H. Martin, D.D. (Baptist History and Homiletics)—and together, in addition to large and busy pastorates, set themselves to lay broad and deep the foundations of the college. Theirs was a long and radiant fellowship in service, unbroken until the lamented death in 1918 of the youngest of them, Dr. Martin. The Rev. P. J. Rollo was also appointed to care for the devotional and social side of college life, and to guide the students in their course and career—a work he still carries on.

During the years of strife the protagonists on both sides constantly affirmed that Scottish Baptists were of one mind as to the absolute necessity of having a properly trained ministry. And in Scotland, with its traditional faith in, and devotion to, education, and with the shining example of the Presbyterian ministry—"the most highly educated in the world"—that should perhaps have been true without qualification and without exception. But memories of "Moderatism" in the Church of Scotland, and the fact that examples not a few still existed in Presbyterian and other Churches of culture minus evangelical experience, made many Scottish Baptists more than a little doubtful. These had a profound distrust of what they called "man-made ministers," and though they would not have put it so, they shared that feeling which Dr. Whitley in last issue described as fairly widespread in England, that somehow "education led to heterodoxy and that orthodoxy had some special affinity with ignorance." In any case, the constant controversy in the Union over educational methods and teachers increased their dislike of the whole subject, and the want of

a sufficient number of trained men left the Churches too often to find ministers as and where they could—a condition of affairs and a temper of mind by no means yet wholly overcome.

With the formation of the College there came outward peace, but the effects of the strife lingered for many years. For one thing, the College had to start without an endowment fund, and with but a very modest annual income—which meant that the allowances to students towards university fees and the honoraria to the lecturers were, to begin with, rather meagre. This was the more vexing because, in 1881, there had been submitted to the Union a scheme of ministerial education to be backed by a permanent fund of £25,000, towards which, given a certain amount of agreement as to policy, the promoters were assured of immediate contributions of at least £20,000. Unfortunately, the necessary agreement could not be attained, and the plan was not pursued. From 1894, however, steady progress was made. The Endowment Fund began to take shape and substance, until in 1913, the family of the late Mr. Thomas Coats, of Paisley, who had been one of those interested in the earlier scheme, generously gave in memory of their father over £17,000 to it, so raising it to over £22,000. This enabled the Committee the following year to invite the Rev. Jervis Coats, M.A., D.D. (Glasgow), to become Principal, devoting all his time to the College, and to add to the staff a fourth lecturer in the person of the Rev. J. T. Forbes, D.D. Dr. Coats' work proved invaluable, and in spite of the strain of the war years, the influence of the College grew until to-day it stands secure in the affection and confidence of the Churches, and with a widening basis among them of annual subscription income.

One chief difference between the Scottish Baptist College and the English ones is that it is not residential. Some, no doubt, will think this a disadvantage, but many if not most Scotsmen think it more an advantage. So far, indeed, the College has had no premises of its own, but has been dependent for class room and other accommodation, upon the generous hospitality of Adelaide Place Church, Glasgow. This, however, may be remedied before long as there is now a project on foot for a united effort by the Union and the College to secure a Scottish Baptist Church House, in order to bring all our denominational enterprises under one roof. The course of study prescribed is a strenuous one. Students of approved Christian character and likely preaching gifts, are accepted only on the express understanding that they will take the full university course for the M.A. degree, and that they will graduate. Wherever possible, men are urged and encouraged to take an honours degree, or to qualify for the B.D. degree, and several have done so. Inasmuch, however, as many of the

men seeking admission are, though otherwise satisfactory and promising, more or less backward in education, there is an arrangement by which they are accepted as probationers, and at the expense of the College put under the guidance of an expert tutor (a head schoolmaster), who prepares them for the University Preliminary Examination. Anything up to two years is allowed for this stage, and during it a bursary of £20 is allowed towards maintenance. On completing the Preliminary Examination, such men become full students, and a bursary of £30 is allowed. After the first year of the M.A. course has been taken the students enter the theological classes which, during three or four years, they attend each summer for ten weeks. The present theological curriculum is as follows: Biblical Theology and Ethics (J. T. Forbes, M.A., D.D.), New Testament Interpretation (W. Holms Coats, M.A., B.A., Oxon.), Homiletics and Baptist History and Principles (Thos. Stewart, M.A.). Provision is also made for full tuition in Elocution by competent teachers. The whole course usually takes from five to six years. That it places considerable strain on the students is true, but few years have passed without some of them taking high places in the University prize lists. The excellence and thoroughness of the training thus given is evidenced both by the places taken in our ministry on both sides of the Border by the Scottish College men, and by the constant and increasing applications for admission. To the College the average cost all told of each student fully trained is round about £500.

The experience, both of the Union and of the College, of the system outlined above is conclusive proof that in its broad lines it is essentially sound and eminently suitable. That it has reached its final form no one would for a moment affirm. From the first it has been the aim to secure such endowments and such a subscription income as will justify asking two or more men to give all their time to theological teaching. This would necessarily involve a longer course for the students, and therefore increased allowances towards their support during training. The attainment of this ideal was brought appreciably nearer by the splendid increase of the endowment fund in 1913, and from 1914 until his lamented death last year, Principal Jervis Coats, M.A., D.D., gave his whole time to the work of the College, which owes almost everything it has in permanence, purpose, and possibility to his unwearied devotion through more than forty years to the cause it represents. His principalship also proved invaluable to the Churches and to the Union. In the emergency created by his death, however, the Committee have reverted to the former plan in order to secure the services of the Rev. J. T. Forbes, M.A., D.D. (Glas.), as Principal, an arrangement cordially and generously endorsed by the

Church at Hillhead to which Dr. Forbes has ministered for the last twenty years. Under his leadership, however, it is confidently hoped that it may be possible so to extend and strengthen both the endowment fund and the annual income, that ere long the full ideal may be reached. The vacancy on the teaching staff created by Dr. Coats' death will, it is hoped, be filled ere long by the appointment of a fourth lecturer. But further progress will depend not only on college resources in teachers and money, but on the policy and position of the denomination as a whole. Presently, as in England so in Scotland, half the ministers in our churches have not been through a denominational college, too many of them not through any. How far this can be remedied will depend on several factors. The power of college men really to preach and to do that work of evangelisation by which our Churches live and which in Scotland at any rate is the chief reason for their existence, will greatly affect the future. But so, also, will the fact that many of our Churches, especially in the Highlands and Islands, are very small and can hardly hope ever to be more than mission stations and outposts. Almost half of our Churches are dependent, some heavily dependent, on central funds to secure the very modest minimum salary set out in our Sustentation Scheme. That minimum may not deter young men from offering—no student ever expects that he will be on the Sustentation Fund, or figure in the superintendent's "exchange" list! But it will deter parents and friends in many cases from giving the needed encouragement and support through years of training. Against that has to be placed the high appreciation of the ministerial office, as such, which is still shown in Scotland generally, and in most of our Churches. But the position will not be satisfactory until the whole problem of the supply and training of men for the gospel ministry becomes the concern of the Churches as a whole rather than of individuals, and they, as Churches, give heed to the Master's words, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth labourers into His harvest."

THOS. STEWART.

Early Leicester Baptists.

LEICESTER is an interesting town from the point of view of Baptist history inasmuch as it has seen connexions with the three main types. From the beginning it had both General and Particular, the former coming to light in 1651 with Conyers Congreve and Thomas Rogers, the latter about 1654 with Richard Coleman, while the group which afterwards joined the New Connexion began to be formed about 1741.

GENERAL BAPTISTS.

By 1651 the General Baptists must have been very strong in the Midlands, for in that year no fewer than thirty congregations sent two delegates each, who together framed a confession of faith, the first on record as a joint General Baptist manifesto, though the Particular Baptists of London had led the way in 1644. Within twelve miles of Leicester itself there were other Churches at Wymeswold, Walton-on-the-Wolds, Mount Sorrel, Whitwick, Earl Shilton, Theddingworth; and a letter to Cromwell about this time from a group more to the west, signed by Congreve and Rogers as representing Leicester, shows that there was another church within reach at Bitteswell. In 1654 we hear of George Fox being strongly opposed by Baptists at Swannington, near Whitwick, and two years later of William Inge and Thomas Christian being sent to a conference at Stamford, where they engaged to stir up Earl Shilton and Mount Sorrel towards the support of two messengers who should evangelise in the Midlands.

The next light on the General Baptists is from the incumbent of St. Margaret's, Leicester, who reports to the Bishop of Lincoln in 1669 that about forty poor Anabaptists met in his parish, the leaders being William Inge, William Wells, jnr., William Mugg, William Christian, and (Richard) Farmer from Kilby. From similar reports in neighbouring parishes we find that Farmer was doing a great work in Kilby, Arnesby, and Blaby, and Richard Iliffe at Fleckney. Out of these village groups was gradually concentrated the Church known to-day as Arnesby, whose early history has already been sketched in our *Transactions* I, 181, along with another group that finally centred at Sutton-in-the-Elms.

Other hamlets with Baptists at this time were Sileby,

Rothley, Barkby, Ratby, Thornton, Leire, Lutterworth, and Wigston; and some of the leaders here, notably Laurence Farmer and William Christian, were important enough to be thrown into jail, whence they were liberated by the great "Quaker Pardon," 1672.

A Leicestershire Association was presently formed out of this abundant material, and we may reasonably think that, as with Lincolnshire, this habitually met at the county town, though no minute-book is ever alluded to.

The next notice is of Henry Green attending the Assembly at London in 1692; then thirteen years later six Anabaptists are reported from St. Martin's parish; while by 1709 we find them provided with a meeting-house where Thomas Davye, scrivener, and Zacharias Staughton were ministers. The latter attended Assembly in 1714, and five years later a new meeting-house was put in trust.

Davye himself was a very prominent man evangelizing at Tur Langton, Coventry and Netherton, so that before 1732 he was made Messenger or General Superintendent for the Association. He and the Church had adhered to the Orthodox Assembly in the split of 1709, and are found at the re-union in 1732. Three years later they made a clear affirmation of their belief in the Trinity, and declined to ban congregational singing, leaving it to each church to settle. On Davye's death about 1750 a new church book was opened—the earliest that survives. It shows nineteen men and twenty-four women, with four ministers, lay preachers we now style them. Feeling the need of a pastor they applied to the Assembly, were settled by 1756, then something went wrong, and after two more applications in 1758 and 1761, the Church settled down to bleed to death, though the cause in the county continued to flourish.

THE PARTICULAR BAPTISTS.

The earliest known leader of the Particular Baptists was Richard Coleman, the apothecary of St. Martin's parish. He had been on the Common Council from 1642 before he became a Baptist in 1654, and even after the Restoration he was chosen Alderman, but by 1667 he was committed to prison after repeated presentation for not conforming and excommunication. Apparently he was soon free, though how he secured his freedom is unknown. His connexion with John Bunyan is our next important fact.

Bunyan had been freed by the "Quaker Pardon" of 1672 to which we have already referred. He had apparently been in Leicester in a draft under Major Ellis from the garrison of Newport Pagnel, defending the town in May 1645 against Prince Rupert at the New Work (commemorated at

our Newarke Street Church). Evidently he must have formed some strong ties with the town, either then or during his imprisonment, for though he was now pastor of the Bedford Church, and might have been expected to celebrate his release there, yet the very first Sunday he was out of jail he appeared at Leicester, called on the Mayor, and exhibited his license to preach, and actually did preach at the house of one Nicholas Kestian who had been ejected from Gumley, a village with several Baptists, and who now held a license for his house in Leicester. We have no clue as to the reason which led an unimportant mechanic, who had languished for twelve years in jail, to rush fifty miles away from his church to a town he seems never to have visited again, but we may agree with Professor Lyon Turner (whose interpretation of the facts we dissent from in other respects), that his visit stirred up Richard Coleman to obtain a license for his own house, as a Baptist, in December 1672. At this time Bunyan was quite obscure, whereas Coleman was rich and influential. While Bunyan had been unable to preach, Coleman had been evangelizing as far afield as Watford, which he had supplied since 1655, and which he continued to serve till his death about the end of the century. He had laboured also amongst his own kindred, for Henry Coleman, who in 1672 had been licensed for Tur Langton, afterwards became pastor at Kilby, drawing it over to the Calvinists, and himself attending the Assembly in 1689.

However, in those days Leicester was not able to maintain two Baptist Churches, a General and a Particular, and by 1706 the Particular Baptists were on the roll of a Church whose meeting-house was at Arnesby with Benjamin Winckles as pastor. The situation was awkward, and nine years later John Evans recorded the exceptional fact that the Leicester Church was General and Particular mixed, with Davye, Henry Trail, and Zachary Staughton as ministers. It is not surprising that other Calvinists preferred to go on the roll of Sutton-in-the-Elms, which under Benjamin Moore had joined the Midland Association in 1707. Moore died in 1739 in his eightieth year, and after a long vacancy, the Leicester members of his Church plucked up courage and applied in 1750 through John Brine to the Londoners for help to build. Within six years they had a meeting-house in the town, though the Harvey Lane Church dates its separate organisation by dismissal from Sutton—in 1760.

The later history, how Christopher Hall came from Cumberland, how his brother Robert was accepted on his recommendation by the Church at Arnesby, and how the latter's son, Robert, the great preacher, came to Harvey Lane, after it had been hallowed by the ministry of William Carey—all

this is too well known to need mention. The great names are kept in memory by the Carey Hall and Robert Hall memorial churches.

THE NEW CONNEXION.

Space allows only the briefest reference to the New Connexion Baptists in the county, though the story of the rise and progress of the movement which came to centre in Barton-in-the-Beans is one of the romances of Baptist history. It began as an outcome of the Methodist revival and severe persecution, the later independent reading of the Bible leading the church to adopt the Baptist position. From the villages it gradually spread to the towns, and one of the pastors at Loughborough came over occasionally to preach at Leicester. Here he heard of the old General Baptist Church, the merest handful of people, served five or six times a year by Richard Green of Earl Shilton, who drew the rents of the property. He roused their consciences, brought Dan Taylor to evangelize, and by 1786 the town church had seventy-five members, with John Deacon as pastor. It was now a constituent of the New Connexion, and worshipped in a new building in Friar Lane. Before the century closed, some members had formed another church at Archdeacon Lane, one had gone to Baltimore in Maryland and founded a church there, while the pastor had undertaken the responsibility of compiling a hymn book for the Association. It is an example of how a decrepit church was rejuvenated by evangelistic fervour.

Meanwhile the church in the county had caused the formation of the New Connexion, of which it has always been the centre of gravity, insomuch that the Academy was long in Leicester. It continued its progressive work, establishing branches as far apart as Melbourne, Hinckley, and Longford and Wolvey. Its work on behalf of the Orissa Mission is well known, and the names of Goadby and Barrass—to mention only two—are a guarantee that its devotion and service will not easily be forgotten.

Samuel Moyer was a London Baptist, who held important posts in the customs from 1643, was on the committee of sequestration from 1650, was a councillor of state from 1653, with lodgings in Whitehall. Under Charles II. he was lodged in the Tower, then at Tynemouth, was released 10 May, 1666. The Angus Library has just acquired the only known copy of *Prison Meditation*, published 1666 by S.M., being sermons written in prison and sent to his relations and friends. It will rank in the Bibliography as 21-666. The title may have been suggested by Bunyan's *Prison Meditations* of 1664, but these were verse.

The Hollis Family and Pinners' Hall.

THE Pinners' Hall on Old Broad Street in London, was held on lease for ninety-nine years from 1678 by the Hollis family, and by them was sub-let for several religious purposes. A description of the six Baptist churches which used the Hall was given in our *Transactions*, V. 75. An article has appeared in the Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society for October 1921, classifying one of these churches as mainly an Independent foundation, and challenging the view that the Hollises were Baptist. It seems, therefore, desirable to present the evidence more fully. As a preliminary the Hollis pedigree may be set forth so far as is relevant.

Thomas Hollis (1) was of Rotherham, where he was buried 4th February 1663-4. His son, Thomas Hollis (2), 1634-1718, migrated to London 1654, settled in the Minories where he dealt in Sheffield goods; he established a Hollis trust in Rotherham, maintaining schools there and at Doncaster, contributing to the support of a chapel at Sheffield, for whose building he was the largest subscriber in 1700, and maintaining a hospital there for aged women; it was he who took the long lease of Pinners' Hall. His son, Thomas Hollis (3), 1659-1731, was the chief benefactor of Harvard College in Massachusetts, and his example was followed by his brothers Nathaniel and John. Nathaniel had a son, Thomas Hollis (4), who had a son, Thomas Hollis (5), 1720-1774, Fellow of the Royal Society and Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, whose life was published in 1780, and of whom a sketch is given in the Dictionary of National Biography. His uncle Timothy, son of John was his heir, and with the death of Timothy's grandson, John, the name is supposed to have died out, though all the Hollis trustees in Yorkshire are descendants by various daughters. It is not important to place Samuel Hollis, Baptist minister at Shifnal 1813-1829, but it is worth while noting that Thomas Brand Hollis only assumed that surname in recognition of a handsome bequest.

The ecclesiastical connections of the family must next be traced. Thomas Hollis (2) attended the parish church at Sheffield till he left that town about 1654. When his funeral sermon was preached in 1718, it was said that he

had walked in communion with the church that heard the sermon for above sixty years. This London church therefore existed by 1658. It is unfortunate that its minute-books are unknown, but from contemporary notices we can recover much of its history. The first point is that it arose by 1658, and therefore was not founded by Anthony Palmer who was rector of Bourton-on-the-water till 1662. There is, however, no reason to question the statements of Calamy, copied frequently without verification, that this church soon after 1662 enjoyed the services of Palmer and of George Fownes. Calamy says of Palmer that he was of the congregational persuasion, and Wilson adds that he was somewhat inclined to the distinguishing sentiment of the Baptists. Fownes was the vicar of High Wycombe, but quitted the office voluntarily before 1660; Wilson attributes this to his embracing the sentiments of the Baptists. When Palmer died in 1678, Fownes removed to Bristol where he succeeded Hardcastle, the Presbyterian minister of Broadmead. These facts give the clue to the exact nature of this congregation; it was neither Pedobaptist nor Baptist, but contained members of both opinions, and was equally indifferent in the choice of its ministers. The same was true of Jessey's church in London, of the Broadmead church, of the Bedford church. What this church desired was a cultured ministry; Palmer and Fownes were both masters of arts, they were succeeded by Wavel, an Oxford B.A., then in 1705 came Jeremiah Hunt of Leyden University, in 1744 James Foster from the Barbican, to whom Marischal College gave D.D. four years later, in 1753 Dr. Caleb Fleming, the last minister. Of these six, Foster was a Baptist, Fownes is said to have been, Palmer is said to have been inclined that way; Wavel, Hunt and Fleming were Pedobaptists. And it was to this church, a Mixed-membership or Union church as it might have been styled to-day, that most of the Hollis family belonged.

The church sought a license for Pinner's Hall in 1672, but was refused; an unusual thing. A license was given for a place on London Bridge. In 1678 Thomas Hollis (2) took a lease of the Hall, and devoted it entirely to Nonconformist purposes. His own church used it for worship on Sunday morning, and on Tuesday morning the Merchants' Lecture was delivered there by six ministers in rotation. These were all Pedobaptist, except that in 1692 Elias Keach seems to have lectured two or three times. On Saturday morning a Seventh-day Baptist church worshipped, and another in the afternoon; these amalgamated, and migrated elsewhere in 1721. On Sunday afternoon, from 1708 to 1724, a Baptist church worshipped there under Joseph Maisters and Thomas Richardson. Then in the afternoon from 1741 till the end

of the lease, a Baptist church under Weatherley, Barron, Kimber and Jefferies used the place, sharing it after 1771 with another Baptist church under Joseph Brown. From 1717 to the end of the lease, the Hall was the headquarters of the Particular Baptist Fund. In 1719, when the meeting of ministers called for Salters' Hall broke into two, the "orthodox" section assembled at Pinners' Hall for its later meetings. It thus appears that the Hollis family, who controlled the building throughout, acted uniformly on a neutral basis, as between Pedobaptists and Baptists. There never was a baptistery on the premises; there is no evidence that any believer or any infant was baptized there.

Now as to the personal attitude of Thomas Hollis (2). In 1678, the very year when he took the lease, he helped the Sheffield nonconformists secure the New Hall for worship, and when the Upper Chapel was built in 1700, he was the chief subscriber; he also bought the New Hall and converted it into almshouses, endowing them. So says the minister emeritus, who adds that the trust is for the free worship of God, the chapels of Rotherham and Sheffield being "of an Independent foundation, though intended for common worship by Protestant Dissenters generally"; all of these have devolved "by natural course into the hands of the Unitarians." On such points he is an excellent authority; but not as to London. It is next to incredible that Oliver Cromwell had worshipped in Pinners' Hall, which from 1649 till his death was used by a Baptist church; this statement is enough to cast doubt on all the statements about London and the Hollises there. In the funeral sermon preached for Thomas Hollis (2) it is said that he trained up his children in the knowledge and practice of religion, a point interesting in connection with his son, to be considered presently. Hunt is very reticent as to the exact position of Hollis; "his charity was not confined to a party, though it might extend more to these who were of his own persuasion." So we can draw no inference from the facts that he was a liberal founder of the Particular Baptist Fund, and that he was appealed to by Benjamin Stinton on behalf of the Pennsylvania Baptists, and that he joined John Taylor of the Baptist church in Wild street and sent them a large number of books. But Stinton asserted that he "was a Baptist by profession"; and Crosby printed that statement in 1738, whereas it has just been denied that any such statement can be traced before 1780. Even that later book, in a family biography, is fairly good evidence; while Stinton's is contemporary.

Thomas Hollis (3) is even less understood by the Unitarian student, though he knows his great benefactions to Harvard. Out of the many sermons preached on his death in

1731, may be taken this plain statement by Benjamin Colman, reprinted by Crosby in 1738:—"He was not strictly of our way, nor in judgment with us in the point of infant baptism." And professor Wigglesworth, Independent, Hollisian professor of divinity, in his sermon expressly dilated on his goodness to "us, who are christians of a different denomination from himself." He also refers to "the very modest reservations" Hollis had made "in favour of his own denomination among us," namely that in the ten scholarships for divinity students there is an absolute preference for Baptists. These statements ought to have prevented any doubt; but the matter is beyond all dispute within the denomination; he was one of the first treasurers of the Particular Baptist Fund. Ivimey also declares, without giving his authority, that about 1680 he was baptized on the profession of his repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. Thomas (3) was succeeded by his brother John as treasurer of the Fund; he in his life and at his death gave large sums to it. The two brothers in 1716 built, mostly at their own expense, the first baptistery in London north of the Thames. Its records have recently been deposited at Dr. Williams' Library; unfortunately after the first few years, no names of people baptized are given, only the names of the ministers baptizing; so that we are unable to say whether any Hollises of the next generation thus pledged themselves. In the generation after, it would appear that interest in religion was superseded by addiction to politics.

Horley was for a few years the centre of an old General Baptist Church of Surrey, Sussex, and Kent, whose records are at Dr. Williams' Library. It is first heard of in 1668, and for a century met in the homes of its members. By 1760 it was concentrating at Horley and Charlwood, and sought help from other congregations. Five years later it contributed to Dan Taylor's house at Birchcliff. The meeting-house at Horley has been identified by Mr. T. Rowland Hooper, of Redhill, by the help of some deeds. It seems to have been wholly set apart for worship, and was notified as the law required, in 1760. A library was housed here in 1771, given by William Ashdowne, of Dover. The meeting-house ceased to be used as such in 1790, when Nutfield became the centre. The building was then used as a bakery, and was till lately known as the Old Bakehouse.

London Churches in 1682.

M R. E. G. ATKINSON of the Public Record Office has furnished a transcript of document 55 in volume 419 of the State Papers Domestic for the reign of Charles II. This is the report of a spy as to dissenters in and near London. The agitation connected with the Popish Plot was over by 1681, and next year there was a violent Tory reaction, when the Whig stronghold of London was betrayed by its mayor, and preparations were made for vengeance on all nonconforming ministers, political leaders, and conventicles.

The names of all the minsters with thire Repactive meting houses and numbers of pepell be longing to each meting hous in the boror cu feldes too my knoldg

nams	houses	nombrs
Mr. Matox. h.	—o1	aboutt 0300
Mr. Rossell. h.	—o1	aboutt 0550
Mr. Chestr. h.	—o1	aboutt 01500
Mr. Vinsett. h.	—o1	abutt 2000
Mr. Ford. h.	—o1	abutt 1000-3
Mr. Dodes. h.	—o1	aboutt 0040
Mr. Dedrom. h. Plos.	—o1	aboutt 0600
Mr. Caslik h.	—o1	aboutt 0250
Mr. Flaynell h.	—o1	aboutt 0030
Mr. Rafson h.	—o1	abutt 0500
Presbyterons	10	5420
Mr. Ceah 3	—o2	abutt 350 pirtiler baptises
Mr. Jonse 5	—o3	abutt 200 the same
Mr. Claiton 6	—o4	but 1500 ginarall baptises
Mr. Adoms 4	—o1	butt 300 monerky Judgment
Mr. Plantt 6	—o2	but 1000 ginerall baptisenes
Mr. _____	—o1	aboutt 050 the same
Mr. Lann 4	—o1	aboutt 500 the same
Mr. Ginings 1	—o1	aboutt 600 the same
Mr. Danvers 7	—o1	aboutt 600 monerkey Judgment
Mr. Grifeth 3	—o2	aboutt 450 ginerall batises
Mr. Knoleses 9	—o2	about 200 pirtikler baptises
Mr. Hars 5	—o3	aboutt 600 the same
Mr. Loveday 6	—o1	
battisenes 63	22	4250
of several Judgments		

NOTES BY W. T. WHITLEY.

William Maddocks, ejected from Kenilworth, succeeded William Whitaker in charge of a congregation at Long Walk, Bermondsey, licensed in 1672 to preach at Bartholomew Lane, active in securing licenses for others.

Thomas Rosewell, ejected from Sutton Mandeville, chaplain and tutor in three families, reported from Tisbury in 1669, licensed for Ferne in 1672, succeeded James Janeway at Jamaica Row, Rotherhithe.

John Chester, ejected 1660, licensed in 1672 for his own house in Maiden Lane, Southwark, formed a church which is now housed on the Old Kent Road, and puts out incredible claims to be a church whence some Pilgrim Fathers sailed.

Nathaniel Vincent, ejected from Langley March, gathered a congregation which in 1666 built on St. Thomas street, Southwark, reported 1669; licensed 1672 for Farthing Alley.

Stephen Ford, ejected from Chipping Norton, has chiefly been known as raising the famous Independent congregation at Miles Lane in the city, for which he was licensed 1672; but even in 1669 he had preached at Mill Lane, St. Olaves, and evidently he continued this.

William Carslake, ejected from Werrington, seems to have been first pastor of a church in Horslydown.

Phineas Flavel, brother to John of Dartmouth, was chaplain to lord Russell, and was not known to Calamy as in charge of a congregation.

Jeremy Ralphson is well known as involved in the Farnley Wood plot; he died in Newgate prison in 1684.

The ten Presbyterians do all seem connected with the Borough or the fields near; we are not however concerned to examine closely the doubtful points in their cases. Our interest is with the Baptists, and only the first four of them belong south of the Thames, whereas nine are north, in the fields outside the city. The spy also seems more interested in them, giving many more details; if he were Constant Oates, he probably belonged to the family of Samuel and Titus Oates, and had inside knowledge.

This is a welcome addition to our knowledge for the period of persecution; it should be compared with the parochial reports of 1669, the licenses in 1672, the reports by spies to Danby in 1676 now printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in the Duke of Leeds' papers, and the 1683 reports by another spy, printed in the Congregational Historical Society's Transactions, III, 6.

This spy estimates that Baptists of all kinds near London had 63 pastors and ministers, used 22 houses, and numbered 4,250. These numbers suggest that while they were out-

numbered by the Presbyterians in Southwark alone, they were to be reckoned with. Moreover the spy seems to have left the city proper to some comrade, for there are twelve more churches known, with possibly four others not quite extinct. Detailed notes may now be added on the separate churches, referred to by numbers used in the Baptist Bibliography to denote the order of their emergence.

22. Benjamin Keach with three ministers and two meeting-houses. We know the two houses, Goat street and Rotherhithe, but the name of only one minister, George Barret. Keach had been Elder of a General Baptist church, and when he adopted Calvinist opinions had to begin again; this glimpse shows he had not yet taken rank as the great leader.

4. James Jones, with five ministers and three meeting-houses. He was the senior among the Particular Baptists, ministering to one of the churches which in 1644 had put out the London Confession, signed then by Thomas Shepherd and Thomas Munday. Since then George Tipping and Edward Waters had ministered, Daniel King preached at Pickle Herring Wharf in Southwark. Jones had an honourable career, preaching probably at his coffee-house in St. Olaves, and ready to test the laws under which he and others were persecuted. He attracted members as far off as Watford. His other houses may have been Three Cranes, Little Maze Pond, for at both these places we know of Baptist worship. Jones died between 1684 and 1688, and probably his church with its ministers and houses amalgamated with Keach, so making that church such a tower of strength.

2. John Clayton with six ministers, four houses, 1,500 adherents. This was the famous church which first comes to light in 1624 under Elias Tookey, known by the correspondence with Amsterdam. Clayton's head place was at New Shad Thames; one of his branches was in Winchester Park near Lownand's Pond, both being reported in 1683; another perhaps at Deptford. At one of his branches Benjamin Keach had succeeded William Rider in 1668, but he split this by adopting Calvinism, and began again. William Marner was one of the six ministers. This church has an extraordinary history, full of change both as to place and doctrine; it amalgamated with another more than a century ago, and now is found, "Unitarian Baptist" on Church street, Deptford.

35? Richard Adams with four ministers, one house, and 300 Fifth Monarchy adherents. This is quite news, but it fits in with other facts. Adams seems to have had no fixed principles, being a pupil of John Tombes, who had few. He took charge of a parish in Leicestershire, preached there after ejection, turned schoolmaster, was reported from Loughborough 1669, sought a license at Mountsorrel 1672.

Hitherto the next light on him had been that after Clayton's death, he was called to Shad Thames, which he represented at the Particular Baptist Assembly in 1689. Now it appears that he had meanwhile been close by, at a Fifth Monarchy church. This can probably be identified with the church at Winchester House in 1692, under Richard Baxter and David Towler, a church presently disowned very emphatically. The other man at this time may have been John Wheeler.

14 Thomas Plant, six ministers, two houses. This was the most important church north of the Thames, meeting chiefly at the old playhouse in Paul's alley, Barbican. It had been founded by Gosnold, always had several ministers, and was exceptionally liberal to them. It always sought to avoid controversy on Calvinism, requested its ministers to be silent on disputed points, dismissed one who would not; it once offered to subscribe to the Particular Baptist Fund, but was not allowed; it is here classed as General. Its records from 1695 till its dissolution in 1768 are full, and have often been studied.

19. The General Baptist church without pastor, with only fifty adherents, at one house, is identified by a process of exhaustion, as that which then met at Glasshouse alley in Goswell street. It had been gathered by Francis Smith the bookseller, who in 1672 took a license to preach at his house on Cornhill; he was now in very hot water, nearly ruined by fines and confiscations, perhaps in prison at the moment. In 1688 it ordained Thomas Kerby. Its extant records begin 1740, when it was flourishing, as it is still; Winchmore Hill is its present home.

26. Isaac Lamb with four ministers shepherded about five hundred people, meeting at one place. Another spy says it was "in a carpenter's yard near the Hermitage" in Wapping; and soon afterwards it was at the corner of Penington and Virginia streets, in a building subsequently used by the church now at Seven Kings. Isaac was son of Thomas Lamb, the great General Baptist leader; the father was a soap-boiler, the son a shoe-maker. Among the ministers may have been already Humphrey Burroughs and Arthur Egge, who in 1712 were thus received at Paul's Alley on amalgamation.

1. Jonathan Jennings with one minister, and a congregation of six hundred, at one place. This is the original General Baptist church, formed in Amsterdam, and in Spitalfields by 1612. Its books are all in the Guildhall library, and show that in 1681 it had taken a lease of White's Alley, Richard Allen being the assistant minister.

15. Henry Danvers with seven ministers and a congregation of seven hundred Fifth Monarchy men, at one

place. The place was probably in Houndsditch; the church abounded in ex-service men and was a cause of constant anxiety to every government. By 1688 Edward Man was its pastor; it amalgamated with another within ten years, and died in 1760, when a lease of Maidenhead Court ran out.

10. John Griffith and three ministers, 450 people, at two houses. These were apparently Dunning's Alley and "Meetinghouse Alley near Bishopsgate Church." Griffith died in Newgate within two years, and the church died out by 1727. The church book at Amersham gives many details of Griffith's troubles in 1683.

8. Hanserd Knollys with nine ministers and two hundred people at two houses. In 1676 he had been at Booby Lane, Wapping, for apparently his lease of the old Artillery Ground had been cancelled; in 1683 he was at Broken Wharf, George Yard. He was often away trading in Holland, so the church needed other help, but nine was the most liberal allowance known.

5. Edward Harrison, with five ministers and six hundred people, meeting at three houses. The chief of these was his own house in Petty France, for which he had been licensed in 1672, and whence he was excluded on 27 May, 1683; other places previously had been the Seven Stars in Cheapside, and in Thames Street above the bridge. The ministers probably included Nehemiah Cox the doctor and William Collins, both ordained 21 September, 1675, John Gammon who left in two years to be pastor at Petticoat Lane, Benjamin Dennis who was sent this year to the Association, and his colleague Williams. The son, Thomas Harrison, emerged only in 1689.

11. Samuel Loveday, with six ministers, at one house. Next year he was reported at Looking-glass Alley in East Smithfield (copied by mistake as West Smithfield); to-day this church meets at Seven Kings.

The spy does not report some congregations which certainly existed; perhaps in some cases it was because he regarded them as really branches of churches and summarised them. But from contemporary sources we can add:—

3. The original Particular Baptist church, now under Hercules Collins, which had joined the Association in 1680, and was reported in 1683 as meeting "near Shadwell Church."

6. Kiffin's church, reported in 1669 with two meeting-houses, for one of which Daniel Dike took a license in 1672. It had opened a new roll in 1678, and added many members in 1683, when it was reported as meeting on Bishopsgate Street without, Devonshire Buildings.

9. The open-membership church, once shepherded by Henry Jessey, was ministered to in 1676 by Fitten and Forty. Two years later it was in great straits, trying to get Hardcastle

back from Bristol, while his friend John Abbot, once rector of Fishbourne, was preaching to them at Moorfields as a spy reported on 25 June. This is the last known about the church; the tradition is that the remnant melted into Kiffin's church.

13. The General Seventh-day church to which Chamberlen had ministered, and whose Elder John James had been executed, was flourishing, as its minutes attest; and in 1689 it registered at Westminster its meeting-house in Peacock Court, St. Mary's, Whitechapel. Subsequently it went to Mill Yard.

16. The church founded by Jeremy Ives, worshipping in Old Jewry, had a severe shock at his death. It may possibly have called William Russell from Glasshouse, or that church (17) may be new after 1689, and this may have died out.

18. The Particular Seventh-day church once served by John Belcher the brick-layer, which had met in Brick lane, Bell Lane, Fenchurch street, was reported in 1683 as at Wentford street.

20. The Particular church at Bow, Stratford, Mile End Green, served by George Barret and Benjamin Dennis, may have been too far out for this spy.

21. The Particular church of Lawrence Wise in Moorfields is not yet traced after 1676; probably it had died with him.

23. The open-membership church meeting since 1679 at Pinners' Hall under Richard Wavel was reported next year as "Presbyterian." See page 78 of this issue.

24. The church which was wrecked in 1680 by John Child conforming, and was salvaged in 1684 by Du Veil, was too obscure this year to be noticed; in 1683 it was reported as at "St. Martin's Hill near Crooked Lane."

25. George Barrett's Rotherhithe congregation was evidently reckoned with Keach.

27. Bampfield's Seventhday church meeting at Pinners' Hall since 1681 probably escaped notice because it assembled on Saturday; but next year he was arrested while conducting worship.

28. The General Baptist church at Deptford was probably reckoned as one of Clayton's branches.

29. The church which in 1689 met at Joiners' Hall is probably that reported in 1683 as at Chequer Yard on Dowgate Hill.

30. Thomas Wilcocks' church at Three Cranes may have been reckoned as part of Jones or Keach.

John Richard Jones.

IN the *Transactions* last year, Vol. VII, pages 147-181, appeared an article on the M'Leanist and Campbellite Baptists of Wales, which has by permission of the Baptist Historical Society been reprinted, with corrections and additions, in the weekly of the British Campbellites, the *Christian Advocate*, for January to March 1922. Reference was made at page 159 to the disputes between Archibald M'Lean of Edinburgh and John Richard Jones of Ramoth, the respective founders of the "Scotch" Baptists of Scotland and Wales. It was written in the midst of these controversies, and has never been published in either English or Welsh. The English of Jones is his own, very creditable for one who spent all his life in the Welshiest part of Wales and had no education beyond that supplied in his early boyhood at a Welsh village school. This letter was copied by me from the original in the possession of our friend Percy G. Waugh, W.S., of Edinburgh, a successor of Mr. M'Lean's. It may be interesting to know that the Baptists in Wales, of all colours are arranging to celebrate the centenary of the death of J. R. Jones in the summer of this year.

BANGOR,

T. WITTON DAVIES.

February 26, 1922.

To ARCHIBALD M'LEAN, EDINBURGH.

RAMOTH, 5TH FEBV., 1806.

MY DEAR BROTHER,

I received your favour dated 4th October, 1805, and have noted the contents deliberately. I have been since visiting the few churches and societies in our connection in North Wales;—and have now the pleasure to inform you that they are all "walking by the same rule, and minding the same thing"; and apparently alive to their profession in general. Our profession is too simple, unindulgent and self-denying to attract many followers, nor yet many hearers. However the few churches in our connection are upon the whole increasing, though slowly.

I have lately published a small Collection of Hymns, intended as an Appendix to my former Collection of Psalms and Hymns. This last collection is mostly a translation of some choice Hymns out of your Collection of Psalms and Hymns; and out of Mr. John Glas's Collection of Christian Songs. I have also published in my native language, a second edition, with large additions of my former publications, entitled, "A Summary of Scriptural Principles, and Christian

Practices, Published by Elders and Brethren of Several Christian Churches in North Wales," pp. 62, 12mo.

I received a letter last month, from a few Baptists in *Lleyn*, Carnarvonshire, about 40 Miles westward from this place. The letter is signed by *Nine* men, and *five* women, wherin they declare that they have conscientiously separated from the popular Baptists, in that country, and that from the same principles as we formerly did; and they invite me to pay them a visit, and with a view to form a junction with our connection &c. I have since wrote them a letter, signifying my wish to know something more of their *union*, and of their assembling together every first day of the week. For christians must not only be separated from the profane and religious world, but be united together as a visible society, in order to observe whatsoever Christ hath commanded. I hope to hear from the said people, not long hence. Now to your letter.

1. I can now say that I fully agree with your explanation of that ambiguous sentence in your former letter, with respect to the preacher's work in "*pressing home* the truth which he declares upon the hearts, consciences, lives and practices of his hearers." But one might think from the position of the sentence in your former letter, that the preacher ought to do something to influence the passions, and wind up the affections of his hearers into lively frames and feelings, as they are called by some. However, the illustration in your last gave me full satisfaction, and am sorry that I have so far mistaken your meaning in that sentence.

2. I think we should be always very cautious in forming our judgment of God's people, while they are in unscriptural connections, since they are not then "to be measured by the rule of God's word," as you partly allow. And if you think that "the Sandemanians, and some others are too liberal in their censures and harsh judgment of other professors"; are you not apprehensive of the danger of verging towards the opposite extreme; namely the Antinomian charity which so much prevails among the fashionable professors of the present day? I am fully persuaded that there is so much danger in "justifying the wicked, as in condemning the just; for each is said to be abominable in the Divine sight." And there is a safe medium in doubtful cases, namely to suspend the judgment until we have a scripture warrant for either. I think that this way is more safe than the *harsh judgment*, on the one hand, and the common *favourable opinion* on the other.

Although I highly approve of your late pamphlet on Marriage; yet, the concluding sentence always causes me to hesitate and stagger. It runs thus. "And though this does not prohibit christians of one denomination to marry those of another; yet they ought to marry none but such as they can

esteem real fearers of God, and believers in Jesus Christ." Here, you do not inform your readers what limits you have to these "Christian denomination." You know that Papists, Socinians, and Swedenborgians are commonly called *christian denominations*. Are you of opinion that some of these parties considered *as such* "can be esteemed real fearers of God, and believers in Jesus Christ"? And if christians are to be known as such, and to be married while they are in unscriptural connections, I would wish to know who is to judge of the christianity of such persons; whether their lovers or others. I suppose that their lovers have "the most intimate acquaintance with them," in order to form a judgment in that case. But we shall find them always very partial, and sometimes very erroneous in their judgment respecting that critical subject.

I must confess that I cannot understand the following sentence in your last letter. "I have known several persons who have differed from me in their sentiments as to certain particulars, whom yet I could not but esteem as real christians, who knew the saving truth and loved it, and had a conversation becoming the gospel." As you do not inform me what are those *certain particulars* wherein those good people have differed from you, I might think that such particulars do not include any part of the obedience of the gospel, since you declare that those people "had a conversation becoming the gospel." However, be it far from me to say that any of the most serious and devout professors "have a conversation becoming the gospel," while they live in disobedience to the institutions of the gospel. A conversation becoming the gospel and a decent and devout conversation may be yet two different things.

3. I rather wonder at the lame shift you made to turn away the force of my objections to your view of the Millennium, and the first resurrection. I was hoping that you would either confute the objections, or else, that you would own and acknowledge the force of them—but I was disappointed in both these respects. Then I have thought, and still think that such is the state of the human mind, even in the best of men, that when it once attains a superiority in knowledge and critical learning, it distains to yield an inch, to those whom it deems as its inferiors. Although I can sincerely declare that I have been much instructed and edified by the perusal of your writings, and do still highly esteem your understanding, judgment and knowledge of the scriptures; nevertheless, I do not think you infallible or perfect in your judgment, nor yet correct and sound in your sentiments of the Millennium, and the first resurrection. You refer me to the connection of Rev. xx. 11-12 with Math. xxv. 31-32, but this connection does not clash with my views of the

subject; for our Lord in that passage does not speak a word about the resurrection of the dead, but only of the glorious proceedings of the last judgment. The *resurrection of the dead*, and the *eternal judgment* are two different things, and the former must precede the latter. And as I find the words *hour* and *days*, in John iv. 21-23, 2 Cor. vi. 2 including a period of more than thousand years, I see no reason why the Millennium should be thought a period too long to be expressed by the same words. And I am the more confirmed in this view of the subject, when I find the second coming of Christ termed, "The *times* of restitution of all things." Acts iii. 21. I also might refer you to a very striking connection in the following texts. Rev. i. 10. Chap. xxi. 1 Thes. iv. 16. But if this last text "does not shew whether the dead in Christ, or the wicked dead shall rise first";—I see no reason why the apostle affirms that "*the dead in Christ*" shall rise first. But if *all* the dead both *just* and *unjust* shall rise together before the *alive* shall be changed, I cannot find any propriety in the scriptural phrase, "*the dead in Christ* shall rise first." I have also the same reason to believe that *all* God's people shall *reign on earth*, as I have to believe that they are *all* made kings and priests unto God. Rev. v. 8, 9, 10. Chap. xx. 4-6. As to the binding of satan, you ask me "if I allow any sense to that expression." Yes, my dear Sir; I am persuaded that the Son of God is that "Angel coming down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit." (Rev. xx. 1. Compare with Chap. i. 18. Chap. xii. 7-9), and I believe that he will "bind satan for a thousand years, and that he will cast him into the bottomless pit, and will shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he shall deceive the nations no more till the thousand years shall be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season." And if any man will ask me "How can these things be?" I am ready to reply in the words of the learned and judicious Dr. Newton on the Prophecies. "Prudence as well as modesty requires that we should forbear all curious enquiries into the nature and condition of this future kingdom; as how satan should be bound for a thousand years, and afterwards loosed again, &c. &c. These are points which the Holy Spirit hath not thought fit to explain; and folly may easily ask more questions about them than wisdom can answer. Wisdom, in the mysterious things of God, and especially in the mysterious things of futurity, will still adhere to the words of scripture; and having seen the completion of so many particulars, will rest contented with believing that these also shall be, without knowing *how* they shall be. "It is of the nature of most prophecies not to be fully understood till they are fully accomplished, and especially prophecies relating to a state so different

from the present as the Millennium." Dissertations on the Prophecies. Vol. III. p. 252. And when we consider the imperfect knowledge we have of *future events* it is natural to expect some difficulty in understanding the *predictions* of them. A disputer might have raised many objections against the literal sense of the ancient predictions respecting the first coming of Christ; yet his coming shewed that the most mysterious parts were to be literally fulfilled.

With regard to your objection on 1 Cor. xv. 26, I still find this argument starts an objection which is common to both opinions. For let the saints be raised when they may, still it is after the resurrection when death is destroyed that all the wicked are cast into the lake of fire. Let my dear friend remove this objection from himself, and he will have also removed it from his unworthy correspondent.

I shall here add a few Arguments more, which lead me to differ from your view of the Millennium, and the first resurrection.

1. If I am not to believe that what is declared in Rev. xx. 4, 5, 6, will literally come to pass; I see no reason why I am to believe that what is declared in ver. 11, 12, will literally take place. Some, I suppose, have run the metaphorical sense, even to this length! But I have often thought and still think that no plain Christian of common capacities, without the help of some skilful and artful expositor would never have understood *the first resurrection* in a metaphorical sense. Such explication of scripture would be highly pleasing to our modern deists and philosophical writers.

2. Your view of this subject clashes with itself, by taking *the first resurrection* in a *metaphorical sense*, and the *thousand years* in a *literal sense*. I think Dr. Priestley, in former years, was more consistent with himself concerning this subject, for he was then of opinion that the *first resurrection* signifies only the *revival of religion*; and that the *thousand years* should be interpreted *prophetically*; then every *day* would signify a *year*, and the Millennium would last for 365,000 years! This opinion is, indeed, to be found in his *Institutes*, published many years ago, but latterly he has inclined to the *personal reign of Christ*, as you may see in his *Farewel Sermon*, preached at Hackney previous to his immigration to America.

3. The literal sense of the first resurrection and the Millennium may be traced up to *Papias*, a bishop of a church in Hierapolis, and a disciple of John, who wrote the Revelation. It also appears that this sense prevailed until about the time of the rise of Antichrist, when it gave place to the prospect of reigning in this mortal and imperfect life. See Newton on the Prophecies, vol. 3, p. 209-213.

4. When Christ is spoken of as destroying the Man of

Sin, who sits in the Temple of God, the context leads me to think of His *personal coming*, 2 Thes. ii. 1-9, but according to your views Antichrist will be finally destroyed a thousand years before His coming.

5. Your opinion of the Millennium carries in it a strong reflection on the hope and expectation of the primitive Christians in their sufferings and tribulations, and coincides with the popular delusion of the present day; for every popular party that I know of, is full of expectation that its own distinct way in the Christian profession shall soon prevail over every other party, and over all the world!

6. It would be a very poor encouragement to sufferers for Christ's sake to rejoice in affliction and death, in hope that some other persons in time to come should live happy and reign, on account of their calamities. Our Lord made no use at all (as I can recollect) of such arguments to encourage His followers in their sufferings for His sake; but the self-denied obedience, labour of love, and sufferings of His people are always personally connected with the immortal reward in the most literal sense. But this view of the subject clashes with your view of Rev. v. 9, 10, chap. xx. 4, 6.

7. I cannot reconcile your view of the Millennium with that excellent passage in your book on the Commission. second edition, p. 200, 207. Though I have more objections to your views of this subject, I shall not trouble you with them, as I find at the close of your letter that you are ready to account my questions and arguments, as "means of gendering strife and contention among brethren." However, the brethren in North Wales can bear testimony that the investigation and discussion of this subject has been productive of much good, and godly edification which is by faith.

I have showed your last letter to our brother, Edmund Francis, of Carnarvon. We are both of the same opinion respecting this subject, and our Welsh brethren in general seem to be of the same view.

You intimate that you wish to know "What it is I condemn in Mr. Fuller's Pamphlet on the Great Question." But I find that this subject must be reserved for another opportunity, as I have neither time nor paper to enlarge here at present. I suppose that I have told you formerly that my Remarks are composed in reference to the *Welsh translation* of Mr. Fuller's Pamphlet. I never saw the original, and for that reason I cannot refer you to the pages. There are some excellent passages in Mr. Fuller's Pamphlet, as I acknowledge in my Preface to my Remarks; and for that reason I think it much more pitiable to find the author jumbling several things together as he does in the said and same pamphlet. And I am still of opinion that he has not only left the Great Question un-

answered, but enveloped the subject in darkness and confusion.

I shall conclude this long letter, and shall be very thankful if you please to show it to your colleagues, with my Christian Respects to both of them, and accept the same yourself, from

Yours affectionately in the Gospel,

JOHN R. JONES.

PS.—My colleague writes with me in Christian respects to you, and all the church in Edinburgh. We are both glad to hear that you are now engaged in publishing your whole works. May the Lord bless your labours to promote primitive Christianity and the cause of pure and undefiled religion.

Books on English Baptist Church History.

THE Baptist Bibliography, published 1916, 1922, by the Kingsgate Press, catalogues all sources from 1525 to 1837, manuscript and printed.

Seven volumes of the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society contain much original material. And in Welsh, the Transactions of the Welsh Baptist Historical Society. The Hanserd Knollys Society published early records of the Broadmead, Fenstanton and Hexham churches, with Tracts on Liberty of Conscience, 1614-1661. William McGlothlin edited in 1911 several Baptist Confessions of Faith from all parts of the world, 1609-1879. The works of John Smyth, 1603-1612 were published by the Cambridge University Press in two volumes, 1915. Roger Williams' Bloody Tenet of Persecution by the Hanserd Knollys Society in 1848. Stinton gathered by 1719 much early material, which was printed hurriedly by his brother-in-law Thomas Crosby in four volumes, 1738-1740.

Modern studies of origins are: The Early English Dissenters [1550-1641] with illustrative documents; by Champlin Burrage, 1912; John Smith, Thomas Helwys, and the first Baptist church in England; by Walter H. Burgess, 1911. Benjamin Evans in 1862-4 did good work in his Early English Baptists. Lofton in 1899 dealt with the English Baptist Reformation (1609-1641); and Shakespeare in 1906 with Baptist and Congregational Pioneers.

The parochial reports of 1669 and the licence documents of 1672 were published by Lyon Turner as Original Records (three volumes, Fisher Unwin, 1911-14). Evans' census of 1715 is in the B. H. S. Transactions, II, 95. Studies of 1750 are in volumes VI and VII for England, Wales, and the colonies. Thompson's census of 1773 is in the Congregational Society's Transactions, volume V.

Magazines give current information. Rippon's Register lasted 1790-1803, and contains earlier antiquarian collections by Stinton. The General Baptists published 1790-1890. The Baptist Missionary Society began in 1794, and still continue two monthlies and an annual. The Baptist Magazine ran 1809-1907. The Baptist Reporter was of importance after 1830. The Church, the Primitive Church, the Gospel Standard, the Gospel Herald, Seren Gomer, the Freeman, should be remembered. Associations began printing their reports from 1752, and the example was followed by colleges, societies, and the Union.

In 1901 the American Baptist Publication Society published contributions by thirty writers, edited to exhibit a worldwide Century of Baptist Achievement.

In general church history, sections on Anabaptists and Baptists are either wanting or absurd in most cases. The best introduction is Newman, Antipedobaptism till 1609 (American Baptist Publication Society 1897). Lindsay's History of the Reformation, volume 2 (Clark, 1907) has two fine chapters on continental Anabaptists. Newman's Church History (American Baptist Publication Society, two volumes 1890, 1893) displays in perspective the part Baptists have played generally.

Neal's history of the Puritans should be read only in Toulmin's edition of 1796, with his continuation of 1814. But this is superseded by H. W. Clark's History of English Nonconformity (Chapman and Hall, two volumes, 1911). Stoughton's eight volumes on Religion in England, have interesting and relevant chapters.

Of histories limited to Baptists, Ivimey led the way; his four volumes bring the story to 1820, with plenty of biography and sketches of separate churches; he is strongest for London, and hardly goes beyond the Calvinists. In 1848 David Benedict published a large volume where 360 pages are given outside America; Armitage in 1887 gave 200 out of 1,000, and illustrated. Cramp in 1875 did better on a smaller scale of which Carlile in 1905 and Vedder in 1907 are the best specimens.

For sectional studies. The minutes of the assembly of General Baptists, 1654-1811, have been published in two volumes at the Kingsgate Press in 1909-1910: Adam Taylor's 1818 study of General Baptist history should be read with these. The Fifth-Monarchy movement has been studied in connection with the Baptists by Louise Fargo Brown, who published in 1911 through the American Historical Association. The Seventh-day Baptists of America have printed enormous masses of material, treated most uncritically; this section ceased to be of interest in England after 1750. The story of the New Connexion was given by Adam Taylor in 1818, and by J. H. Wood in 1847. The General Baptist churches in the west which became unitarian were dealt with by Murch in 1835. H. S. Burrage published in 1888 on Baptist Hymn writers, and Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology completes the subject. J. J. Goadby in 1871 explored many Bye-Paths in Baptist History.

For geographical studies, Joshua Thomas broke ground in 1778 with a history (in Welsh) of Baptists in Wales, and followed with his 1795 history of the Association. His revised version, published in 1885, is superseded by Spinther James. Walter Wilson in 1808-1814 published four volumes on the dissenting churches in London. The Western association had its story told by J. G. Fuller in 1843, the Northern by Douglas in 1845; the Midland put out a volume in 1905, the Berkshire in 1907, the Yorkshire in 1912, the Lancashire and Cheshire in 1913; Lincolnshire is being studied. The Victoria County Histories sometimes have trustworthy sections.

Separate churches have often published memorial volumes; the early pages usually need scrutinizing with care. Biographies abound. S. A. Swain's *Faithful Men* weaves many into a sketch of Bristol College. For Americans and Canadians, Cathcart's *Baptist Cyclopedia* of 1881 is to be consulted; for scores of British, the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1901. Our Transactions last year contained an index to hundreds.

BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

THE fifteenth annual meeting will be held at Barton-in-the-beans on Thursday, 4 May, at five o'clock. Reports will be submitted, new members, committee, and officers elected. The outgoing officers are:—President, H. Wheeler Robinson; Vice-Presidents, J. C. Carlile, John Clifford, J. H. Shakespeare; Secretary, W. T. Whitley; Treasurer, Francis J. Blight; other members of Committee, W. E. Blomfield, J. H. Brooksbank, J. Leslie Chown, Arthur Dakin (joint editor), A. J. D. Farrer, Harold Knott, A. S. Langley, F. Townley Lord, J. T. Marshall, J. W. Thirtle, A. C. Underwood, Horace Warde. Nominations should be sent to Dr. Whitley at Droitwich by Thursday, 27 April. Conveyances leave Leicester at one o'clock on 4 May for Arnesby, Sutton, Thurlaston, Bosworth, and Barton, returning to Leicester by six o'clock; registration fee (two shillings) should be sent to Dr. Whitley at once; optional lunch and tea will be provided.