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

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

The Orthodox Greek Church.

LAUSANNE will see in August a world conference on Faith and Order, for which long and careful preparation has been made. From the Eastern Churches there may attend representatives of the Churches of Rumania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Russia, Georgia and Armenia; but more ancient and more picturesque will be representatives of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Patriarchate of Antioch, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the Church of Cyprus and the Church of Greece. The last of these indeed has a separate technical existence only from last century; but these names recall us to apostolic days when Paul went from Jerusalem to Antioch, Cyprus, and Greece, when Apollos came from Alexandria, when the first gospel closed with a command for Œcumenical preaching.

For four hundred years the Greek churches were the backbone of Christianity; only with Jerome and Augustine did the Latin churches begin to compare in importance, while the Syriac or Persian Church was later still in its splendid missionary career. At Antioch, Ephesus, Constantinople and throughout Asia Minor, heroes are too many to cite, while the names of Irenæus in Lyons, Hippolytus in Rome, Origen and Athanasius in Alexandria, show how far the Greek influence extended. The early great Councils were of Greeks; Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, saw eight of these recognized as Œcumenical; not till 1123 A.D. was any important council held outside Greek lands.

The emperors at Constantinople played such a strong part in controlling the Greek Church, that large dissenting Churches arose in Egypt and Syria, which attracted most of the nationals, and left in the State Church few beyond the Greek colonists and officials, who were nick-named Melchites, Imperialists. After the days of Cyril, very few Alexandrians cared about the Patriarch of Alexandria in that capacity, though often he was Governor also. The Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem was little better off. The Greek Patriarch of Antioch maintained his importance rather longer. The Greek Patriarch of Constantinople alone remained of real eminence, though as he lived under the shadow of the Emperor he was under constant State supervision. Since the constant metaphysical debates had split the Greeks into rival Churches, these four dignitaries of the State Church assumed the title of Orthodox, which they retain to this day.

The Moslems were welcomed by the rival Churches, which were assured of toleration and fair play. It then became evident that in the East, outside the Greek-speaking lands, the peoples

followed almost entirely the Coptic and Syriac and Armenian patriarchs. With these we are not concerned, but only with the four Orthodox Greek Patriarchs, who have tried to keep up a constant succession, with fair success considering the numerous depositions and murders. The conquests of the Crusaders introduced new complications, and sets of Latin patriarchs. Curiously enough, the Moslem capture of Constantinople elevated the Patriarch there, who was officially recognised by the Sultans as Œcumenical, the political head of the "Roman Nation," that is, the Greek Christians within the Turkish dominions. As the flocks of his ecclesiastical colleagues dwindled, and learned to speak Arabic, the three other patriarchs tended to desert their posts, and come to live in Constantinople.

The extreme complexity of the situation fifteen years ago may be seen in the case of Antioch. There are many Patriarchs of Antioch; one for the Monophysites, one for the Maronites, one for the Melchites, one for the Catholic Syrians, one for the Latins, besides the Orthodox Greek Patriarch. Not one of these rivals lives in Antioch itself; the Greek resided at Damascus, and before the French took control he may have had a flock of some 250,000, about as many people as live in Shropshire.

The Patriarch of Alexandria has a following fewer than the inhabitants of the Isle of Wight, so that till lately he had no bishop under him. Much more shadowy is the archbishopric of Sinai, with just one important convent and a few score of wandering Arabs.

The Patriarch of Jerusalem really does, or did, live in the city whence he takes his title; and there is a good income both from endowments and from pilgrims. The census of the country taken by the British showed 73,026 Christians of all sorts. Now there is a Latin patriarch at Jerusalem, a Melchite patriarchal vicar at Jaffa, a Maronite patriarchal vicar at Jerusalem, an Armenian patriarch at Jerusalem, a Jacobite maphrian of Jerusalem at Mardin, with his vicar in the city, a Coptic bishop of Jerusalem at Cairo, and an Anglican bishop in Jerusalem: it would seem that of the Orthodox in the old Greek Patriarchate there are barely six thousand. Most of his people speak Arabic, but the best paid posts are held by Greeks. Of these Orientals, in the very nest of Christianity, three remarks are made by a Scot, long resident on the lake of Galilee:—As a whole, these Christian churches are corrupt and superstitious: the priests are often illiterate and degraded; their chief duty is not the care or cure of souls, but the management of the hospices, shrines, and other buildings associated with their religion, and attendance at the endless formal ceremonies and processions carried on in a spirit of coarse materialism. If Jews turn to them,

they are presented with a metaphysical plan of salvation, and theological theories as forbidding as the Talmudic law. There is a sickening superstition and an absence of a sense of sin.

The Church of Cyprus, independent of any patriarch for nearly 1500 years, may claim continuity from the days of Barnabas. It has about as many members as there are people in Dorsetshire.

The Œcumenical Patriarch at Constantinople was till lately a far more important personage. In the days of our Charles I., Cyril Lukar held that post till he was executed for treason: a man educated at Venice and Padua, rector at Wilna, Patriarch of Alexandria whence he sent the splendid Codex now in the British Museum, influenced at Constantinople by an emissary from Geneva, where he had printed a version of the Bible made by himself into modern Greek: he tried to reform his Church on Calvinistic lines, but failed. None of his successors have been specially noteworthy. Now at Lausanne a treaty has been made, and the Turks are determined to have a homogeneous State, free from entanglement with any Church. They abolished the Moslem Caliphate and the Christian Patriarchate; and as Constantine V. could not reconcile himself to this loss of status, they deported him. From their dominions they deported or massacred the Christians generally. And since Constantine's death, the locum tenens is outside the city so long occupied, and the number of people who look up to him is very uncertain.

For most Greeks to-day are in the kingdom of Greece, and there has been for scores of years a Church of Greece, not governed by any patriarch. Greeks in every part of the world look up in practice to His Holiness the Metropolitan Chrysostom, at Athens. Their Holinesses the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, and the locum tenens of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, are like the Habsburgs and the Hohenzollerns, heirs to great traditions.

If the bishop of Argyll from the midst of Presbyterians of whom many speak Gaelic, with the bishop of Tuam from the midst of Roman Catholics, of whom many speak Irish, with the bishop of St. Davids from the midst of Calvinistic Methodists, of whom many speak Welsh, together with a representative of the Primate of All England, who does not live at Canterbury, go to Lausanne; then although their followers are incomparably more numerous, they will quite easily understand the position of the four Greek dignitaries. And it is a matter of great satisfaction to many Anglo-Catholics, that their orders are now recognised by most of these Patriarchs of ancient lineage, with the Apostolic Succession at Antioch from the days of Paul.

W. T. WHITLEY.

The Kingdom of Heaven

II.

When we endeavour to account for this fact that the phrase "the Kingdom of God" very early fell out of the vocabulary of the Apostolic Church, we are safe in concluding that it was due to its intensely Jewish significance. It was a phrase of the older Judaism, and the idea, at least, is of frequent occurrence in the literary remains of the period between the Old and the New Testaments. Apocalyptic literature of the age before Christ contains not a few descriptions of the blessings of the coming "Kingdom of Heaven," and that fact helped to give the phrase, and the often vague conceptions it connoted, ready currency in the Rabbinic schools and through them, amongst the common people themselves. Of the canonical books this idea is most clearly expressed in the Prophecy of Daniel—which probably belongs to this period (circa 300 B.C.) where the prophet speaks of the Kingdom set up by "the God of Heaven" and given to the "Son of Man" (Dan. ii. 44; vii. 13-14). But the idea, though possibly not the phrase, is much older than that, and may be traced back to the early beginnings of Hebrew history, for it is really the development of the ancient idea of the theocracy entertained by the Jews in the days prior to the establishment of the monarchy —an idea which persisted even after that event and the Jews had adopted the form of government practised by their neighbours. And hence, the frequency of "the Kingdom of Heaven" on the lips of Jesus was largely due to, and a natural consequence of, His education in Jewish literature and Old Testament history. His home belonged to the grand order of the "Prosdechomenoi," wherein He was trained by His mother in the hopes and aspirations of those who waited for the "consolation of Israel." This glorious company of pious and expectant souls was probably much larger and more widespread than we perhaps imagine, so that the idea and hopes of the Kingdom were very much in people's minds in the time of Jesus, and by adopting the phrase as the comprehensive term for His "Glad-tidings," the Master was able to place Himself and His teaching in direct relation with both the past history of His nation and the present expectations of His hearers.

And this is the explanation, at once, both of the use so largely made by Jesus of this phrase and of the disuse into which it early

fell amongst the Apostles. In the teaching of the Master it was a "point of attachment" with the minds of His fellow countrymen, whereby He was able to attract and secure their attention to His message. That does not mean, however, as Wellhausen seems to maintain, that the idea was merely a Jewish survival in the mind of Jesus, from which He could not escape, "but which He so permeated and changed by His Spirit, that it is of no permanent significance, like an iceberg in a tropical sea (vide *Christianity in the Modern World,* by D. S. Cairns, page 167). But it does mean that Jesus, consciously and deliberately, adopted the phraseology of His time, and by transforming and ethicising its conceptions, made it a fit and proper vehicle for conveying His message to the hearts and minds of His hearers. They—the disciples included—believed that a material Kingdom, which signified the literal reign of Jehovah upon earth, was to be inaugurated by a martial and conquering Messiah who would destroy the domination of the Roman power, and would achieve the complete triumph of "the children of Abraham" over the other nations of mankind. Jerusalem, not Rome, would then be the metropolis of the world, from which would go forth God's light and truth to the uttermost parts of the earth. Jesus, however, in using the idea, purified it—as He did many other current conceptions—and gave it a more spiritual content. "The Kingdom of Heaven," with Him, *did* mean the reign of God upon earth, but it was a spiritual rule in the lives of those who received His word and obeyed His commandments. The new era *was* to be inaugurated by a conquering Messiah, but He was a Messiah the symbol of whose power would be a cross and achieving His conquest of humanity by His sacrificial death. The coming time *would* involve the triumph of "the children of Abraham," but it would be the triumph of the moral character of those who were the real "children of Abraham," because they were the children of Abraham's God, the true "Father of the Faithful." *That* was "the Kingdom of Heaven" as taught by Him who perfectly embodied its spirit and teaching and in whose Person it came, and although, as Dr. Stalker points out, it is impossible to forecast what the history of Judea and the world would have been if the Jews had accepted Christ's teaching, one thing at least may be said with certainty, viz., that had they done so "all the happiness and glory depicted by the prophets would have been realised" (*The Christology of Jesus,* page 150; *The Ethic of Jesus,* page 49).

But the intensely Jewish significance of the phrase "the Kingdom of Heaven" also explains why it so very quickly fell out of use amongst the early followers of Jesus. Had the phrase been retained in the vocabulary of the Apostolic Church it is

almost safe to say that Christianity would have been strangled in the first few years of its history. As it was, the task was difficult enough for Paul and his co-workers to rescue the Evangel from Jewish confines and give it widespread proclamation in the terms of its universal significance. The Judaizing party in the primitive Church—to which, at one time, even Peter seems to have belonged—desired to keep Christianity as narrow as Judaism itself, whereas, as the great Apostle was swift enough to see, the new wine of the Gospel would burst the old bottles of tradition and be lost. And so the wine was poured into another vessel. Phraseology—even the Master's phraseology—was compelled to make way for terms which would find acceptance in the Gentile world. Language which had significance for the Jews only was converted into that which could be understood by the other peoples of the earth. To talk about a "Kingdom of the Heavens" to those not educated in Jewish history and literature might easily have spealt disaster for the Gospel, especially in view of the fact that those who might have been expected to understand—the Jews themselves—largely missed the meaning of Jesus and, therefore, crucified their Messiah though He spoke the language they knew. Had the Apostles retained Jesus' phraseology their action might have gained the adherence of the Jews—though that is doubtful; it certainly would have spelt failure amongst the Gentiles. Had they spoken only as Jesus spoke they may have had a message for "the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; they would have had no good news for the lost sons of the Father's heart. Moreover, if they had extensively preached about a King and a Kingdom, in those very terms, they would have come into early conflict with the Roman power, and that at a time when, perhaps, the Church was not strong enough to fight the battle, which at a later day she fought and won. As it was, Paul was once indicted on a charge of treason against the sovereignty of Rome. He was accused of having preached "another king Jesus" (Acts xvii. 7), though it is certain that the Apostle was not guilty of sedition in the sense intended by his accusers. It is even doubtful whether he spoke of Jesus as King at all on that occasion—at any rate, judging from verse 3—but if he did it was, of course, in a spiritual sense and without any prejudice to the reign and rights of Caesar. Still, the incident is illuminating in so far as it shows the difficulties which would have had to be faced by the Apostles had they gone over the Roman world preaching "the Gospel of the Kingdom" in the language of their Master. Those difficulties they met and surmounted in a splendid and tactful manner, which, as it happened, was along the line of least resistance. Guided, no doubt, by the Holy Spirit, they dropped almost entirely the intensely Jewish phrase used by Jesus, proclaimed the

essence of the Gospel He embodied, preached in language suited to the world at large, and organised the groups of believers into Churches, which in the providence of God were to be the means of the establishing the Kingdom in the world. Thus did they themselves endeavour to realise the prayer their Master taught them to offer. "Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven."

III.

It will be noticed that so far we have dealt almost entirely with the *place* of the Kingdom in the New Testament. It now remains for us to consider briefly, the *import* of this conception which, as we have seen, occupies so large a place in the preaching of our Lord. And at the outset, we can pass by the question whether the original form of the expression on the lips of Jesus was "Kingdom of Heaven" or "Kingdom of God." Judging from Matthew's Gospel, Jesus used both expressions, though possibly the former was the more usual one. Mark and Luke report Jesus as invariably using "Kingdom of God," but the probability is that they have adopted it instead of the more Jewish "Kingdom of Heaven," as, perhaps, more suited to the Romans and Greeks for whom they wrote. More important is the question whether the Kingdom in Jesus' idea of it is simply a present reality already existing upon earth when He Himself moved in and amongst men, or whether it was something entirely in the future, an order of life purely eschatological to be established at the "Parousia" of "the Son of Man." Some scholars, like Ritschl and Wendt, hold the former view; others, especially the younger Weiss, proclaim the latter; and the way in which these two views are expounded by their different authors would make it appear that they are absolutely antagonistic and irreconcilable conceptions. But, in reality, such is not the case, as both Dr. James Moffat (*Theology of the Gospels*, chapter 2) and Dr. D. S. Cairns (*Christianity in the Modern World*, chapter 4) very convincingly point out. For it is evident from the two sets of sayings preserved in the Gospels that both views were simultaneously held by our Lord, and although we are confronted with the problem of how both were psychologically possible for Jesus, yet no estimate of His teaching is just and fair which does not do full justice to *all* the data supplied by the Gospel records. *All* the facts must be taken into account in any attempt to arrive at the import of this conception in the mind of Christ and one group of our Lord's declarations—whether ethical or apocalyptic—must not be minimized or overlooked in the interests of the other. We must possess no critical bias that will induce us, unconsciously, it may be, to twist the facts of our Lord's teaching given to us in the

Gospels to fit in with a preconceived, though, perhaps, not fully elaborated, theory. This is rendered all the more necessary by the fact that Jesus Himself does not always use the phrase "in the same sense or with the same breadth of signification. Sometimes one aspect, sometimes another of His rich complex idea is intended by this term" (*Christian View of God and the World*, by Orr, page 355, footnote). Neither does Jesus ever formally define what He means by "the Kingdom of Heaven," though as a recent writer suggests, it is possible that the phrase is defined nowhere in the Gospels, because it is defined everywhere (*Jesus and Life*, by Mcfadyen, page 158). And this makes it all the more important, in endeavouring to arrive at a just estimate of Christ's teaching concerning the Kingdom, that we do not omit to take into consideration every aspect of His comprehensive view.

In order to arrive at this "just estimate" of the Kingdom we may conveniently consider it from a threefold point of view, under which the whole of Christ's teaching upon this subject may be ranged.

1. *As an Experience in the Heart.* This is the undoubted suggestion of the Johannine phrase "eternal life"—a phrase, which, by the way, also occurs in Synoptic passages which speak of the "Kingdom of God"; e.g., the incident of the rich young ruler (Matt. xix. 16-26; Luke xviii. 18-27). It is, therefore, a Kingdom already existing in the world, though not of it. As Dr. Moffat says: "Life eternal is not an eschatological boon, but the immediate experience of faith. The judgment is not a dramatic catastrophe at the close of the present age, so much as a process of inward discrimination conditioned by the attitude adopted by men to the person of Christ" (*The Theology of the Gospels*, page 45). The passage which most clearly indicates this view of the Kingdom as something already existing when Jesus taught the multitudes and healed the sick is the much-disputed one in Luke (chapter xvii. 20-21). The point of debate in this passage is the force of the preposition translated either as "the Kingdom of God is within you," or as "among you." (The rendering "upon you" may be rejected as having very little to commend it.) Of these two renderings the former is to be preferred upon linguistic grounds, though classical usage does not exclude the latter. The context, however, is declared by some to be against the former translation in this case, for the words of Jesus are held to have been addressed to the Pharisees only and the Kingdom could hardly be said to be within *them*. Yet the context is not decisively against this rendering, for in combating the idea that the Kingdom was to come with observation and outward pomp, Jesus could easily have meant by His declaration, "the Kingdom is essentially spiritual, not outwardly visible. It is something in your souls, *if*

you possess it at all" (Plummer in *International Critical Commentary* on "Luke," *ad. loc.*). Besides, though originally addressed to the Pharisees, this saying, as Wellhausen points out, was by no means confined to them. "The Kingdom of God here, as in the parable of the leaven, is conceived as a principle working invisibly in the hearts of individuals" (quoted in *The Theology of the Gospels,* page 49). This view of the Kingdom, however, is not dependent upon our interpretation of a single saying of our Lord. It is involved in His demands for repentance and faith, obedience and righteousness, it is the plain supposition even of those parables, like "the Tares" and "the Great Supper" which seen entirely eschatological. "The Kingdom of Heaven" is thus, with Jesus, an already existing fact in the hearts of those who receive His message and obey His word—something that will grow in the life of men and nations, until the rule and sovereignty of God are firmly established the wide world over.

2. *And this brings us to the second aspect of Jesus' teaching upon this subject; viz, as a process in history*—a divine process, the ultimate outcome of which would be the permeation of all human affairs—national and social, industrial and domestic—by the spirit and teaching of Christ. The Master's "manifesto of the Kingdom" was not "an emergency code" to help the disciples through the short period that was to elapse before the arrival of the rapidly approaching end of the age; it was the declaration of the principles and laws of the Kingdom of God which would, as their significance was gradually unfolded in the experience of humanity, lead men and nations into the way of righteousness and truth. And so the Kingdom itself was to be realised as these unfolding principles and laws were accepted and obeyed by the sons of men, who through faith and trust in, and loyalty and allegiance to, the King, would become the citizens of this ideal Kingdom. That surely is signification of many of Jesus' most striking parables—those of the sower, the mustard seed, the leaven and the tares. "Whilst His contemporaries were expecting some mighty intervention that would suddenly bring the Kingdom ready made from heaven, He saw it growing up silently and secretly among men. He took His illustrations from organic life. Its progress was to be like the seed hidden in the earth, and growing day and night by its own inherent germinating force" (*Christianity and Ethics,* A. B. D. Alexander, page 137). Jesus believed in the purifying and illuminating power of truth and righteousness, and so He spoke of His Kingdom as a process that, like the grain of corn, only gradually, slowly and imperceptibly reaches its culmination—the complete transformation of the ideals and institutions of humanity. He believed in the contagion of character as the method and means of establishing His Kingdom,

and so He described His disciples as the salt and light which would save the world of men from moral corruption and spiritual darkness. He believed, too, that His Kingdom would be a realm without boundaries, knowing no barriers or limitations of nation, race, colour or class, but embracing all humanity within its fold, and so He dreamed of the day when many shall come from the east and west, from the north and south, "and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. viii. 11). Such a Kingdom is the ideal and goal of the race.

> The one far-off divine event
> To which the whole creation moves.

It involves and includes the social redemption, as well as the spiritual emancipation, of humanity, although it may possibly be true, as Ritschl held, that Jesus originally preached the Kingdom in a purely religious and ethical sense. It is, therefore, wide enough to embrace all the elements of the life of man, those of state, family, art, commerce, culture and science. Indeed it is, in its very essence, the Kingdom of love, righteousness, and peace, where-in all the relationships of human existence are regenerated and transformed.

3. *But the "Kingdom of Heaven" is not only a divine process in the history of the world. It is also a process to be divinely consummated in that day* when the Son of Man will come in all the glory and power of His Father (Matt. xvi. 28), and girded for the task of being final arbitrator of the destinies of the nations of the world (Matt. xxv.). Here, of course, we are touching upon one of the great problems of New Testament theology—a problem around which there gathers from time to time, in our religious press, great controversy—and about which, therefore, it would be unwise to dogmatise. One thing, however, may be said with certainty, viz., that of the *fact* of this glorious consummation the teaching of Jesus leaves us in no doubt. Not only are there parables—such as those in Matt. xxv.—which speak in unmistakable terms about what is known as the "Second Coming," but there are also explicit statements such as those contained in the "Parousia" discourse of Jesus, as recorded by all three Synoptists (Matt. xxiv; Mark xiii; Luke xxi.). From these parables and statements there is no escape, except by a process of critical violence to the Gospel narratives, and they all teach very definitely and explicitly indeed the "Second Advent" of our Lord. When, however, we come to consider the manner in which these sayings are to be interpreted we reach the quicksands of controversy. One school of interpretation is still bound in the graveclothes of Rabbinical tradition and holds tenaciously, and even uncharitably, the idea of a literal, visible, spectacular coming

on the clouds of heaven. But it seems much more natural, and certainly is much more in keeping with the mind of Jesus, to consider these sayings as being highly poetic figures, expressing profound spiritual truths. At any rate, that is how the author of the Fourth Gospel seems to interpret Christ's references to "last things," for it is generally admitted by critics that it is a spiritual coming which is alluded to in the Johannine record of our Lord's discourses in the upper room. Even in the Synoptics the disciples are bidden to take heed lest they be deceived by a visible Christ or be led away by merely outward signs. "Not in a visible reign or personal return of the Son of man does the consummation of the Kingdom consist but in the complete spiritual sovereignty of Christ over the hearts and minds of men. When the same love which He Himself manifested in His life becomes the feature of His disciples; when His spirit of service and sacrifice pervades the world, and the brotherhood of man and the federation of nations everywhere; then indeed shall the sign of the Son of Man appear in the heavens, and then shall the tribes of the earth see Him coming in the clouds with power and glory" (*Christianity and Ethics,* page 139). But, whatever be the interpretation of Christ's teaching on this point, this consummation is an event to be devoutly wished for by every loyal follower of the Master. It is an event which a New Testament writer tells us we can hasten as well as expect (2 Peter iii. 12)—a fact which Jesus Himself declared when He taught His disciples to pray and work for the coming of the "Kingdom of God."

Lo, as some venturer, from his stars receiving
  Promise and presage of sublime emprise,
Wears evermore the seal of his believing
  Deep in the dark of solitary eyes.

Yea, to the end, in palace or in prison,
  Fashions his fancies of the realm to be,
Fallen from the height or from the deeps arisen,
  Ringed with the rocks and sundered of the sea.

So even I, and with a heart more burning,
  So even I, and with a hope more sweet,
Groan for the hour, O Christ! of Thy returning,
  Faint for the flaming of Thine advent feet.

JOHN PITTS.

A Prayer of St. Paul.

THERE are two prayers in the Epistle to the Ephesians. The first is at the end of the first chapter, and the second is the passage we are now studying (iii. 14-21). They are both of importance for showing us the spirit of Paul's religion, his attitude to the churches, and the fulness and profundity of his religious ideas. But the dominating conceptions of the two prayers are different. The first revolves round the idea of spiritual enlightenment as the supreme need of the churches, and the second round the idea of spiritual strength in order that the Christians may seize with both hands the great gifts which God has freely given to the churches.

The connection of this prayer is rather broken. In the second chapter of the Epistle, Paul builds up the doctrine of salvation. First, he shows how God has dealt mightily with the Christians in Jesus Christ. Just as He raised Christ from the dead in order that He might sit on the heavenly throne, so He has raised the Christians from the dead and given them the privilege of sharing in the heavenly power and splendour of Christ. That is the depth of God's saving purpose for men. Then He shows the breadth of it. God's grace is not confined to the Jews: it embraces all men. Christ is the peace of all the world. Those who were afar off, estranged from the commonwealth of God, are brought near in Jesus Christ, and are built up together with the Jews into a sacred edifice, the Church, of which the Spirit is the inspiring breath, and the corner-stone is Christ. Then he proceeds to draw out the ethical implications of it all. Paul is essentially an ethical teacher, always aiming at building up the characters of his converts, but he always makes his ethical lessons strike deep in abiding religious principles. His moralisings are never in the air: they always have as their foundation the rock of divine grace. In order to make a telling emotional appeal, he addresses his readers as the bondservant of Christ, so as to urge them to live worthily of the Gospel. But the phrase calls up memories, and in a perfectly unpremeditated fashion, he pours out his heart in thanksgiving to God for calling him to be an apostle to the Gentiles. Then he prays that his readers, by the power of the Spirit and the indwelling Christ, may have the strength to grasp the immeasurable nature of the love of Christ in order that they may grow into all the fulness of God.

Before we discuss the prayer, it will be well to examine the view of God put forward in it. It may seem criminal to dissect

a prayer in order to discover the theology it pre-supposes, but we have to remember three facts. The first is that it is just in a man's prayers that he reveals his theology. If they are honest, it is just there that he shows his most real thoughts and desires, stripped of the veneer and technicalities of the theological system. That is as true of Paul as of anybody else. The second is that the prayers of Paul in his letters are literary. They may be the spontaneous expression of the heart, but so also is a good deal more of what he says. They form an integral part of his letters. They follow a well-known literary device in the ancient world. Which all means that they are not quite as spontaneous as they sound, and that we may legitimately use them as criteria for estimating his theological outlook as well as for studying his spiritual life. The third is that, seeing that Paul intended his letters to be read, he accepted responsibility for what was in them, whether it took the form of prayer or not. It may seem irreverent to examine a man's prayers under the microscope, but no man of prayer ought to be afraid of the examination.

Paul speaks of God as the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, and he prays that the Father will grant various blessings to the Christians according to the riches of His glory. Three points call for mention here.

(1) First, Paul speaks of God as the Father in an absolute sense. His predominant idea of God was that of His grace. His whole experience as a Christian man and a Christian preacher was due to the pouring out of the grace of God into his life. It was natural for him, therefore to follow his Master in speaking of God as Father. It is certain that the source of this conception of Paul is to be found in Jesus rather than in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, although the Fatherhood of God is taught, it is His Kingship that receives the emphasis. Even in the Psalms, the Hebrew book of devotion, the name Father is not applied to God. And even where the Fatherhood of God is taught, it is as a special relationship which He holds with the nation rather than as a loving relationship with individuals. He is Father because He has an interest in the nation as a whole, and because He has chosen it out to be the medium of His revelation to the world. But Fatherhood is not the predominant conception of God, and it is not yet seen that Fatherly love and grace are the essential elements of His moral nature. But the Fatherhood of God is fundamental in the religious thought of Jesus. That Paul is dependent upon Jesus can be seen by the instances in his letters in which the Aramaic word for Father as it was actually used by Jesus in prayer is used side by side with the Greek word. It is as though *Abba* had become so endeared to the early Christians because of its associations with Jesus that unconsciously

they slipped into it, even though they used the Greek word *Pater* in the same breath. But Paul is not only dependent upon the teaching of Jesus. Christ is to him regulative of the Fatherhood of God. God is the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. It is only as the Father of Jesus Christ that the Fatherhood of God is seen at its highest and best. Through his experience of the saving grace of God in Christ, Paul has been led to see that Fatherly grace is the essential quality of the Godhead. God is eternally and essentially Father because Christ is eternally and essentially Son. What Paul teaches is not a bare, abstract Fatherhood, but a Fatherhood revealed through Jesus Christ, and through Christ made the common possession of all those who put their trust in Him. Vital experience of God the Father belongs only to those who have vital experience of Jesus Christ His Son.

(2) The Fatherhood of God is regulative of every other Fatherhood. God is Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named. The word *patria* is hard to translate. It is used to describe not only a family but any body of people, however large, a tribe or even a nation, which derives its being from a common ancestor. God is the Father of every race in heaven and earth. And the union of a single race in its common ancestor has its symbol in the union of the whole race of men in God. This is a very pregnant conception, and we must give it careful study. It is assuredly legitimate to draw out the following points.

(a) God is creator. He called all men and angels and worlds into being. It is His power that made them and it is His providential interest and care that keeps them alive. But that is not the deepest or most fundamental part of the conception. That much could be said by the majority of religious teachers.

(b) The whole universe is built up on the pattern of Fatherhood. The relationship of Father and Son, with its intimacies of fellowship and the ethical responsibilities that it lays upon the shoulders of men, lies at the very heart of things. God has made the world in His own image and the image in which He has made it is that of Fatherhood. God is immanent in the world, but He is immanent as Father. Just as all the sons of Abraham are in the loins of the patriarch, and all the sons of Adam are mystically present in their father Adam, so all the sons of men are mystically present in God and were known by Him before the beginning of time. Fatherhood is regulative not only of Paul's theology, but also of his ethics, and angelology and cosmology.

(c) It is possible here perhaps to see the influence of the Platonic doctrine of ideas, yet not coming to Paul directly from

Plato, but as meditated through Hellenistic Judaism. The things of earth are only transitory and a shadow of reality. The reality is to be found in the archetypal ideas. There is very little of this kind of thinking, however, in Paul. There is much more of it in John and Hebrews.

(d) We see coming out again the thought which is very common in Colossians and Ephesians, of the essential unity of heaven and earth, and the Lordship of God in Christ over all created things. Salvation in the real thought of the New Testament is never merely spiritual: it embraces the whole personality, body and soul alike. But it is not men only who are to be saved: the whole physical universe is groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for the redemption. When the Messianic Age fully comes, all things in heaven and earth will be gathered together, every kind of evil will be put down, and Christ will be all in all. That is one side of Paul, and that side is the logical outcome of Hebrew thought which has come under the influence of Christ. But there is another side, derived from the dualism of Hellenistic Philosophy, in which Paul is made to look upon matter as essentially evil, with salvation as the deliverance of the soul from the prison-house of the body. Unfortunately, the Greek and the Hebrew in Paul never fully met, and in fact, I suppose, it would be impossible for them to meet.

(e) God is more than creator. He is even more than Father of all men. He is the archetypal Father, from whom every other Fatherhood derives its being and significance. The name Father to Paul is no mere symbol to set off certain spiritual qualities in God, a symbol taken from the relationships of earth: he says, indeed, that the very idea of Fatherhood has its origin in God and not in man. The Fatherhood of God is eternal and essential: that of man is but derivative. There can be Fatherhood on earth only because there is Fatherhood in heaven. Paul would have disputed the idea that God is man writ large: he would sooner have said that man was God writ small. Or, to be more accurate and more true to Scripture, he would have said that in Fatherhood as in everything else, man is made in the image of God. Like a true Hebrew, Paul makes his thought move from God to the world and men, whereas the philosopher makes thought move from the world and men to God. The difference between him and other Jews was a difference in the conception of God.

(3) What does Paul mean when he asks that God will give blessings according to the riches of His glory? In the Old Testament, the Glory of God means roughly the manifested splendour of God, the revelation of His essential nature. Through the influence of Isaiah, this becomes spiritualised in tone, until the

whole natural world and the long course of human history is seen to be the manifestation of God's power. The Glory of God is revealed in the mighty structure of the universe and in the handiwork of men. But comparatively early in Hebrew thought, the phrase begins to be used to describe a theophany, the manifestation of God in human form. That is the case, for example, in Exodus xxxiii. 17-23, which comes from the seventh century. In Ezekiel, the phrase quite clearly describes a physical occurrence. Ezekiel really sees in his visions the movements of the Glory of God. This is taken further in the Priestly Code, which comes from the fifth century, where men are described as seeing the Glory of God with the naked eye in their waking moments. In Paul, the phrase sometimes has an ethical significance. That, for example, is the case in Rom. iii. 23, "we have all sinned and come short of the Glory of God," where obviously what Paul means is that men have fallen short of the standard of ethical perfection set them in God. But often it is to be interpreted literally. Thus, his conception of the future existence of the faithful as sharing in the Glory of God has a quite physical reference. Sometimes, Paul seems to give the idea that the divine Glory is a brilliant, dazzling light, on the lines of the Shechinah, surrounding the Spirit, which is a super-sensuous substance, and which is passed on by God to Christ and thence to men. But in such a phrase as we have here, he is simply using a figure of speech, and it must not be analysed too minutely. For Paul, as for the Scriptures as a whole, the Glory of God stands for the manifested splendour of God. Sometimes the symbolic meaning is uppermost, and sometimes the literal, but invariably it is the holiness of God, the essence of God on its ethical side, which is being emphasised. The revelation of the Glory of God is a revelation in such a way as to act upon human thought and to influence human conduct. It is not mere spectacular display. What Paul prays for here is that the whole fulness of the glorious perfection of God may be granted to the Ephesians. He does not want then to touch merely the fringe of the divine nature; he wants them to be absolutely saturated with the divine perfection.

There are three prayers offered for the Christians. He prays (1) that they may be strengthened in the inward man according to the Spirit, (2) that they may be strong enough to apprehend the greatness of Christ, and (3) that they may be filled with all the fulness of God. We will study the three petitions in turn.

(1) First, he asks God that the Christians may be strengthened with power through the Spirit in the inward man, that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith, to the end that they may be rooted and grounded in love. Three points call for notice here.

(a) We are introduced to one of the most characteristic of Paul's ideas, the conception of the Spirit as the source of spiritual power and life in the Christian. By nature, men are fleshly, weak, under the influence of sin, incapable of doing the will of God. The Spirit is a power coming into them from the outside, from a higher world, and miraculously transporting them into a new realm of being. The Christian is transformed at the very centre of his life. He is renewed in the inward man. The springs of his life are changed. He is no longer under the corrupting power of the devil, but under the life-giving power of the Spirit of God. Sometimes, it seems that Paul views the change as gradual. There is a continual approximation towards spiritual life. The carnal part of man gradually decreases in power as the spiritual part of him increases. But his general idea is that the change is made miraculously and immediately at the very moment of conversion. Just as Christ, at His resurrrection, passed at one stroke from the earthly life of the body to the heavenly life of the Spirit, so, at the moment of baptism, at one stroke, the Christian, by mystically entering into the resurrection act of Christ, passes out of the life of the flesh into that of the Spirit.

A good many have condemned Paul for teaching a purely magical change. But he is not guilty of that. For first, he realises that the Christian, even though he is living the life of the Spirit, still has to live the same physical life as before, and still has to resist the enticements of the flesh. The saints have to be warned against evil. Paul knows that even he has not yet fully apprehended all that there is to apprehend. Secondly, the reception of the gift of the Spirit is ethically conditioned. It is given as a result of the opening up of the heart and the surrender freely of the will to God in faith. Thirdly, the fruits of the Spirit are ethically defined. They are love, joy, peace, and so on. High above all the miraculous gifts, such as the Glossolalia and the power of working miracles, stand faith, hope and love, and highest of all is love, which is at once the dominant ethical motive of the Christian and the highest gift of the Spirit. And fourthly, Paul recognises that there has to be continual growth in the life of the Spirit and continual appropriation of the Spirit's gifts. The Spirit is the earnest of the future immortal life. The essential change of the Christian at baptism is not conspicuous. The change is evidenced only by the different ethical fruits produced by the spiritual man. But these are the proof that the real substantial nature of the change will one day be made conspicuously manifest. This is one more evidence for Paul's thought that all is of grace. The gift of the Spirit is not the result of human endeavour. It is very much the other way about.

Moral change comes only because the Christian has had implanted within him the real Spirit of God.

(b) Paul prays that Christ may dwell in our hearts. The connection of this is not quite clear. It may mean that the indwelling Christ is the result of the strengthening by the Spirit. That would imply a progress in thought, but it would also imply what Paul never elsewhere does imply, that the possession of the Spirit is necessary before we can possess the indwelling Christ. Or it may mean that the power of the Spirit is inseparable from the indwelling Christ, and that Christ is the source of spiritual life in the Christ. That is, without doubt, the sounder interpretation. That being so, several facts require notice.

(1) Christ dwells in our hearts only as we have faith. To Paul, faith never means the mere acceptance of a creed. It is one of his great words, one of his imperishable words. Faith is the opening up of the heart to God in Christ. It is allegiance, fidelity and love. It is enthusiastic loyalty. It is the quality which makes a man willing to be the offscouring of the earth for the sake of Jesus Christ. It is the response of the whole personality to the gracious will of God. That is essential before Christ can completely dwell in the heart. At first, faith may be only weak and childlike. But in the progress of the years, it becomes strong and virile, the concurrence of every element of the personality, so strong as to command the very presence of God. This is a sign of Paul's ethical and religious sanity. When you get to the bedrock of his thinking, he is not influenced by any magical conceptions. All the work of God in the soul is ethically conditioned. And yet he would have said that even faith was not the work of men: it was the gift of God.

(2) What Paul asks for is the abiding presence of Christ in the heart of the Christian. It is no mere spasmodic visitation in hours of spiritual enthusiasm or spiritual crisis, but a permanent, unbreakable, familiarity of intercourse between Christ and the believer. Christ is to dwell at the very centre of the personality, casting out the old ego of sin, and forming the new ego of life and Godliness. All the powers and fruits of the Christian's life are the result of the indwelling Christ.

(3) We must at least notice the close connection between the Spirit and Christ. So close indeed is the connection that many scholars have said that, to Paul, they are the same. The historical Jesus has ceased to have any meaning for him. He desires no longer to know Christ after the flesh but only Christ after the Spirit. And Christ is little more than a name to define the divine power which dwells in the heart of the spiritual man and which is working for the overthrow of all materiality in the world. It would take too long to examine this theory

properly, but it does not seem to be substantiated. The historical Jesus was not nearly so foreign to Paul as many think. He made zealous efforts to keep true to the older Christian tradition. He obviously modelled his ethical teaching on that of Jesus. The appearance which led to his conversion was that of Jesus whom he was persecuting. Salvation was rooted in historic facts, the death and resurrection of Jesus. Jesus Christ was a real historic personality who had been the fulfilment of the Messianic promises of the Jews. And yet He is not merely a man of the past. He is one who has regained by death and resurrection what He lost before birth. He has been elevated to the rank of divinity, and can dwell as an abiding spiritual presence, not merely a sacred memory, in the hearts of those who trust Him. Paul holds the two conceptions side by side.

And yet though Paul does not regard the Spirit and the indwelling Christ as the same, he regards their functions as very much alike, and, in the last resort, we cannot keep them apart. He can speak of the Spirit or the Spirit of Christ or the Spirit of God, as though they were the same, and he can pass from one idea to the other without seeming to realise it. The fact is that, although for several reasons, Paul felt it to be necessary to stress the reality of the Spirit, yet it was not a real part of his thought, any more than it was a real part of the thought of Jesus or the Fourth Evangelist. Paul's use of the doctrine of the Spirit lay partly in its prominence in the earliest Christian thinking, partly in his own possession of outstanding spiritual gifts, partly as a result of faulty analytical examination, and partly owing to his essentially practical and ethical interests. His mind was so occupied with the work that God actually did in the soul, that he was not interested in examining how precisely the work was done. The functions of Christ and the Spirit are almost identical. His fundamental conception is not that of the Spirit, as it is in the earlier thought of the Church, but rather that of the indwelling Christ who has taken upon Himself all the work of the Spirit.

(c) The third point is that the Christian's life should be rooted and grounded in love. Here what is meant is not the love of God or of Christ, but love as the foundation principle of Christian life. There is no need to spend time on this. It is familiar to every reader of Paul. Love is of absolute worth. There are all kinds of gifts of the Spirit and qualities of the personality which are necessary for wholeness of life, but in worth they are incomparable with love. Love is also indestructible. It is the absolute, eternal, all-embracing, ethical ideal.

(2) Paul's second petition is that the Christians may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the length and

breadth and height and depth, to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. There is an advance of thought in the petitions. First, he asks for spiritual power. Without the Spirit, no man can be in the fullest sense a Christian. But some Christians are "babes." These accept the plain facts of the Gospel, which can be apprehended by faith and love. And those facts are fundamental. They lie at the centre of his preaching. But other Christians are "men." They know the secrets of the Gospel. They can search the deeps of the nature of God and understand the love which passeth understanding. In his ordinary teaching, Paul kept rigidly to the main facts of the Gospel message, the love of God, the saving power of the cross of Christ, the need for repentance, the reality of the indwelling Christ. But to those who possessed the insight, he undertook to unravel the mysteries and to lay bare the plan of salvation. What these secrets were we do not know, but they could be grasped only by those of a refined spirituality. Nor do we know how these secret things were made clear to him, whether by his own reflection or in the hours of ecstasy and mystic revelation. But we know this, that the knowledge was the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit was the agent of revelation. And it was the directing power in reflection and enquiry. Whether as ecstatic or thinker, the Christian was under the control of the Spirit. It was only the Spirit of God which could reveal the deep things of God. Paul here shows himself to be influenced by the Hellenistic idea of Gnosis. Revelation to the Hebrew is confined to the ethical nature of God; His work in the history of man, His will for the world. For Paul, revelation goes further than that. It deals with the world of truth locked up in God, which can never be discovered merely by human reason. Revelation in the highest sense, Gnosis, is the possession only of those who are very much under the control of the Spirit. But again his sanity must be must be noticed.

For (a) this knowledge is open to all the saints. It is not reserved for a few select souls. It is meant for the whole body of the Church. There were grades of Christians, it is true. Some had greater insight than others. Unconsciously the way was being prepared for the time when it would be thought that there were two kinds of Christians, the lower sort who walked by faith and the higher sort who walked by Gnosis. But, according to Paul, all Christians could rise to the level of knowledge. There was no reason why they should be satisfied to remain "babes" all their days.

(b) The knowledge of the love of Christ is not an individual possession: it is the possession of the Church as a whole. The united work of all is needed before the real greatness of Christ

is to be understood. The whole Church is to share in the belongings of every individual. Each is to make his contribution to the body. One Christian sees one thing in Christ, and another sees something else. And each has his function with a view to the building up of the Church as a whole. Knowledge of Christ grows only as it is imparted. What is selfishly kept to oneself is eventually lost. It will take all the saints of the Church together to understand the love of the Christ who is the Lord of all the Church.

(c) The greatest secret of God is the love of Christ. Gnosis is of value only as it is understanding of the love of God. And the knowledge of the love of God is of value only as it aids us in living the life of God. Gnosis which ends only as Gnosis is not real Gnosis. Paul always guarded the Church against becoming stranded in subjectivism or non-moral mysticism.

(d) It was the Spirit which was the agent of revelation. In spite of the Hellenistic colouring of his thought, he kept true to the Hebrew tradition. The prophetic Spirit which always served an ethical purpose and interpreted the will of God for men's lives, revealed the deep things of God.

(e) Christians themselves had to respond to the leading of the Spirit. They had to exert themselves to progress in knowledge. They had to seize with both hands what God gave to them. They had to have strength to apprehend. They had to consecrate themselves to the task of following the Spirit.

(f) In the last resort, the love of Christ cannot be known. It passeth understanding. We may know a little of its principles and its manner of working. We may see a little the diligence with which it seeks for the sinner and builds up the life of the saint, but the length of it and the breadth and the height and the depth, nobody can know. Even the man of Gnosis cannot have complete Gnosis. The love of Christ is immeasurable. It is beyond the grasp either of intellect or insight. Even the Spirit cannot adequately reveal it.

(3) The third petition is that the Christians may be filled with all the fulness of God. This is the climax of the prayer. It defies analysis. And yet by the aid of other sections of the epistle, we can draw out the salient points.

(a) Christ is the fulness of God. He gathers up into Himself the totality of the divine manifestations. To understand the nature of divine revelation and the purpose of God to save the world from sin, the only work of God in which the religious man, *qua* religious man, is interested, there is no need to seek the guidance of men or angels. Jesus contains the whole of God's revelation in Himself. He is the consummation of all that went before and the principle of all that is to follow. Through Christ

alone, men enter into the knowledge of the saving purpose of God.

(b) Just as Christ is the fulness of God, so the Church is the fulness of Christ. Through the presence of Christ at the centre of the Church's life, the Church becomes the incarnation of Christ in the world. It gathers up into itself the totality of the manifestations of Christ.

(c) Christ is mystically present in the Church. He is the head of the body, the inspiring breath of the Church's life, the invisible essence of it. Through organic connection with Him, it gains the possession of His characteristic qualities. It lives and dies and rises again in Him. The life blood of the Church is not human but divine.

(d) It is the Church that is the fulness of Christ. It is the whole body of believers, striving together as a whole, that is to attain to the full measure of the stature of Christ. The Spirit is given to the Church, and it is only as a man shares in the life of the Church that he shares in the life of the Spirit. The individual is but a partial reflection of Christ, and is a reflection at all only because he shares in the life of the Church. And even the Church is only a partial reflection of Christ. Christ is eternally the fulness of God. But the Church is only a gradual approximation to the fulness of Christ.

After his prayer, Paul breaks out in a doxology. It looks very much as if he quotes one of the common doxologies of the Church. The appearance of it gives that impression. But whether his own or not, it marks the high-water mark of the epistle. All the blessings that come to men are the work of an eternal God and have their ultimate source in His age-long purpose which embraces the very ends of the earth. The entire epistle is an elaboration of that theme.

H. J. FLOWERS.

FROME. A group separated about 1700 under Pauling or Paling. They met in a chantry near St. Catharine's Hill, organised as a church 1707, and built a meeting-house next year. William Hendy, a pupil of Davison at Trowbridge, was their pastor 1706-1741. Edward Henwood was colleague 1825, successor, died 1753. John Sedgfield was colleague 1745, and successor. Job David was colleague 1773, and successor, in 1775 when Sedgfield retired, leaving 98 members. These statements were made that year to Josiah Thompson, probably by David. The church became all but Unitarian under him, but under John Foster took a different turn, as Sheppard's Barton.

Notes on a Recent Hymn Ballot.

DURING the early part of last winter the writer of these notes endeavoured to elicit from his congregation an expression of opinion on their favourite hymns. His primary purpose was to discover to what extent his general choice was meeting the needs of his people. Ballot sheets were issued, with space for the titles of six favourite hymns, with the tunes preferred. About two-thirds of the papers were returned, and from these a careful analysis of the selections was made. By restricting the choice to six we were able to get a real expression of the preference of our people, and one was led to feel that not only did the ballot serve its primary end, but that it also provided food for much further thought. Hymns may be favourites for a variety of reasons, the melody or dignity of the tune, the beauty of the words, the appeal to changing moods, the link with old associations, or familiar aspects of truth—but, most of all, because they express, more or less adequately, the needs and aspirations of the worshippers. Thus we may be justified in assuming that in such a free, collective expression as the results of a ballot would give, we have the spiritual outlook of the congregation made articulate. It is on this assumption that the following notes have been written.

Not the least interesting feature was the range of the choices. Votes were cast for 235 different hymns, although of these 112 received only one each. More then ten per cent. of the total number chosen were children's hymns, a sufficient indication of the value of the little people's portion in the morning service; possibly also a hint that any addition to the Baptist Church Hymnal might profitably include more of this kind of hymn. A few of our great hymns were entirely passed over by the voters, as, for example: "Now thank we all our God"; "Let us with a gladsome mind"; "O God of Bethel"; "Glorious things of thee are spoken"; "Awake my soul and with the sun"; the last omission, perhaps, being due to the later hour, or the greater honesty, of our modern worship. Conversely, some hymns not at present included in our book were chosen, notably Luther's great "Ein feste Burg."

The argument from silence is said always to be precarious, but one could not help feeling that the ignoring of hymns which had a strong theological emphasis or colour, was not accidental. For instance the absence of those which realistically describe the Atonement in terms of blood, such as "Jesus, Thy blood and

righteousness," and "There is a fountain filled with blood," seemed to present a clear reflection of the modern mind in this respect. The lack of interest in hymns descriptive of the Lord's Day in the phraseology of the Jewish Sabbath was also significant. Their place seems to be taken by hymns of worship. The particular type of appeal in the evangelistic hymns apparently drew little response from the congregation. The uncertainty that prevails in some minds as to the efficacy of prayer, with the consequent neglect of it so common to-day, was reflected in the complete omission of such hymns as "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire," and "My God, is any hour so sweet." The eschatological hymns, so popular in a previous generation, found no supporters, which was true also of those which express the evanescence of this present life. The small place taken by missionary hymns is perhaps accounted for by the nature of the ballot, while the absence of those expressive of the passion for social righteousness and service is due to their absence from our hymn book, with one solitary exception. One of the most significant things on the negative side was the movement away from the martial hymns which bulked so large in popular pre-war worship. Does this reflect the changing outlook on war itself, or only a weariness of martial music in general? Precarious as the argument may be, there is food for thought in the silence of a congregation on these matters.

To turn from the omissions to the positive choices made by the voters is reassuring. A glance through the list of the chief favourites shows the heart of the congregation to be sound, and confirms the view expressed with regard to modern religion, that, while we believe less, we hold what we do believe with greater sincerity. The following is a list of the hymns chosen as the six favourites, in order of choice :—

1. "O! Love that wilt not let me go."
2. "Lead, kindly Light."
3. "Jesus, Lover of my soul."
4. "Still, still with Thee."
   "Rock of Ages."
5. "Beneath the Cross of Jesus."
   "The day Thou gavest."
   "Dear Lord and Father of mankind."
6. "At even ere the sun was set."
   "Abide with me."

It will be seen that, while these hymns are non-theological in phraseology, they clearly express the essential elements in the Christian faith. Through them, as through those also that tied for the next six places in the ballot, there run those notes with which the human heart has vibrated down the ages; the sense of sin and

the need for forgiveness; the assurance of Divine grace as greater than human failure; the glad acceptance of the redeeming FACT of the Cross; the expression of personal aspiration and faith; while men hold fast to these there can be no doubt as to the future of religion. At the same time we cannot but feel that the religious experience reflected in these chosen hymns indicates a certain wistfulness of spirit. There is missing the note of virile assurance, which blends individual aspiration with a burning zeal for the salvation of men. What, for example, would be the characteristic note in the hymn singing of Fuller's congregation at Kettering, one hundred and twenty years ago; or of the Methodists at Wesley's Chapel about the same time; or, later, of Binney's at the Weigh House; or of Spurgeon's at the Metropolitan Tabernacle? Would not a comparison reveal these very elements, so evidently lacking in the spiritual outlook of to-day?

As regards the musical aspect of this ballot, it will be observed that each of the favourite hymns chosen is linked to one appropriate, if not in every case fine, tune. There can be no doubt that the appeal of a hymn is helped or hindered by the tune with which it is associated. "When German hymnody was at its height," says a writer on this subject, "hymns and tunes were treated as one and indivisible." One cannot but feel that some of our finer hymns do not take their rightful place in congregational singing because they have been unfortunate in this respect. For instance, "Praise to the Holiest in the height," may, in our book, be sung to any one of four tunes, whereas in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, the principle of one hymn, one tune (almost invariably followed, except in the supplements), has linked Dykes's "Gerontius" inseparably with the great words of Newman. The Free Churches might do well to re-consider the value of the old German principle. To-day one may worship in a Baptist, Congregational, Methodist or Presbyterian Church, and sing the same hymn in each, but every time to a different tune! The further consideration of this subject, however, would lead beyond the limits of the present purpose.

To return to the question of the tunes selected in our ballot, it need hardly be pointed out that the compass, in every case among the favourites, was well within the range of the average singer in the congregation. Our people do not like tunes in which they have to leave the top notes to others more musically agile than themselves. Where definite opinions about tunes were expressed, conservatism, as would be expected, predominated. There may be a danger in conservatism, but there is no disguising the fact that congregations do become wedded to tunes. Innovations should therefore introduce themselves with better references

than mere impatience with the customary or time-honoured. It would seem, also, that tune books are not so much used in the congregation as formerly, and that there is less part singing. Possibly this may be due to the tendency of choirs to usurp the place of the congregation in hymn singing, or to the practice of some organists, who introduce eccentric harmonies, and so drive the congregation back on unison singing, or sullen silence. Whatever the cause, the revival of community singing throughout the country, and the publication of four part community song-books has its challenge for the churches. We must encourage part-singing in congregational worship, in spite of the more fastidious musical critics. The average worshipper probably knows more about music and singing than did the previous generation, and there is little danger to-day that free congregational singing will be merely "making a joyful noise."

In conclusion one feels that the result of such a ballot as this offers more challenge to the preacher than to the musician. The broad principles that make for success in congregational singing remain unchanged, but the task of leading men and women into a fuller, richer, more expansive spiritual life, demands constructive thinking, creative preaching, and a quality of life in the preacher himself, which shall keep him ahead of his people in spiritual passion and achievement. Out of this may spring creative hymn writing, to give modern rhythmical expression to that larger truth which has still to break forth from God's word.

A. J. KLAIBER.

THE FREEDOM OF THE FREE CHURCHES.

DR. SELBIE has published at Memorial Hall a sixpenny pamphlet of 39 pages, re-stating for this generation what the Free Churches hold as to the Church, its Ministry, the Sacraments; and pleading that they move toward a wider Catholicity. We entirely agree with his statement: "All the members of a Church should be Christians: this principle is now accepted by all Churches, but very few of them carry it to its logical conclusions."

JOSEPH FOULKES WINKS. 123-825. *The General Baptist Juvenile Magazine.* Volume I. Loughborough, pp. viii., 164, iv.

This volume, hitherto uncatalogued, is in the hands of R. D. Dickinson & Co. It appears to be the first form of what appeared next year as the *Baptist Children's Magazine,* 50-826. Winks had just settled at Melbourne, and was beginning his career as author and publisher.

John Gibbs, 1627-1699.

THE Bedford tinker's son and his book will never be forgotten. The memory of his preaching and imprisonments is cherished because of his book, though for their own sake they deserve the honour of posterity. The Bedford cooper's son wrote no *Pilgrim's Progress*, but the glory of the ministry and sufferings of John Bunyan's associate should not be allowed to dim with the passing of the centuries.

The fathers of John Bunyan and John Gibbs, Thomas Bunyan the tinker and Samuel Gibbs the cooper, were probably well known to each other; for 300 years ago the population of Bedford and Elstow was not above 2,500; and their trades are not so widely separated as to rule out the possibility of a business contact.

In 1627 John Gibbs was born, and in the next year John Bunyan. Of the relationship in their childhood we know nothing definite. Dr. Brown, in his life of Bunyan, points out that if the "Scriptural Poems," published in 1700 in the name of Bunyan were genuine, it would end the uncertainty regarding his schooldays, and would show that he had attended the Grammar School founded by Sir William Harpur, where William Varney was master. In any case Bunyan might have gone there, and John Gibbs almost certainly went there, though in the one known reference to his schooldays the master's name appears as "Varnill." It is a matter of interesting speculation whether these two who were afterwards so closely associated had been school chums. If they were, neither of them had very happy times, for a petition referring to a date about 1640 complains that William Varney, the schoolmaster, had not only charged fees which he had no right to do, but had also grossly neglected the school by frequent absence from it, by night-walking, and mis-spending his time in taverns and ale-houses, and was also very cruel to the boys, when present.

On November 30th, 1644, on his sixteenth birthday, John Bunyan was drafted into the army. The muster rolls of the Newport Pagnell garrison show that he served in the Parliamentary Army, and was with the garrison for two and a half years. The soldiers in the town were greatly influenced by the Puritans living there, and Bunyan, as yet unconverted, was already in touch with the very circle to which John Gibbs should

shortly minister, and whose sufferings in after years he himself should share.

Seven months after John Bunyan went to Newport, John Gibbs, on June 26th, 1645, now seventeen years of age, was admitted as a sizar to Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. The same year he matriculated, and in the session 1647-1648 obtained his B.A. degree.

In 1648 the Rev. Samuel Austin, M.A., Vicar of Newport Pagnell, was "thrust out" by Cromwell's party. The Vicarage was still empty in 1650, but either late in that year or very soon afterwards, John Gibbs was appointed in Austin's place.

John Gibbs was an ardent opposer of "Infant Baptism"; but, like Bunyan, he did not believe in a church that made baptism obligatory, though it should be noted that their adversaries always regarded both of them as "Anabaptists."

In Newport Pagnell there had already been a bitter controversy concerning Infant Baptism, and Captain Paul Hobson, afterwards Chaplain at Eton, had been put in custody for preaching against it; and John Gibbs was no sooner settled there than he had a public dispute on the question in his Church with one Richard Carpenter. This extraordinary man was Jesuit, Episcopalian, or Independent, as it suited his convenience. When the dispute ended, both sides claimed to have had the best of the argument, but Carpenter was not satisfied until he had proclaimed his supposed victory to the world, which he did by publishing his own version of the affair in a book entitled *The Anabaptist Washt, and Washt and Shrunk in the Washing.* The British Museum copy of this book has the date 1653 added to the title page in ink, and it is probable that the dispute took place about 1652.

In January 1656/7 the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers settled upon Gibbs an augmentation of £40 for his better maintenance and encouragement.

Though he was Vicar, Gibbs did not accept the Episcopalian position, for he was a Congregationalist as far as his Church practice was concerned. This was not unusual in Commonwealth times. Five such Churches and their Rectors were already in close touch with one another. These were St. John the Baptist, Bedford; where John Gifford was Pastor until his death in 1655, when John Burton succeeded him; Pertenhall, Cranfield, Yelden, and Newport Pagnell, which were under the care of John Donne, William Wheeler, William Dell, and John Gibbs respectively.

These men acted together on May 13th, 1653, when an important document was sent up to Cromwell signed by them and several of their Church members. It was a return of two

men (Nathaniell Taylor and John Croke), to be Members of Parliament for the County of Bedford in Cromwell's "Little," or "Saints'" Parliament. When the Bedfordshire Union of Baptist and Congregational Churches was formed in 1797 it was but a new beginning of an Association which had existed as far back as 1653.

The association of these churches, and especially the link between Newport Pagnell and Bedford, appears to have facilitated the commencement of Bunyan's literary career; for his first book, *Some Gospel Truths Opened,* has it specially stated on the title page that it is to be "sold by Mathias Cowley, Bookseller in Newport Pagnell, 1656"; whilst Bunyan's third book, *A Few Sighs from Hell,* has prefixed to it an address to the reader believed to have been written by John Gibbs, for it is signed with the initials J.G. The writer reveals in it an earnest passion for saving lost souls, and a contempt for the worldly rich who despise the wealth of the other world; but it is perhaps most interesting as showing Gibbs' appreciation of Bunyan. "I verily believe," he writes, "that God hath counted him faithful, and put him into the ministry, and though his outward condition and former employment was mean, and his human learning small, yet is he one that hath acquaintance with God, and taught by His Spirit."

After further praising the soul-winning work of Bunyan, and his industry in the Master's service, he adds, "And I fear that is one reason why the Archers have shot so sorely at him."

This hint of trouble was the first threatening of the coming storm. Both Gibbs and Bunyan were shortly to face severe persecution and imprisonments.

It is apparent from the Bedford Meeting minutes that the fellowship of these men and their churches was mutually helpful. In 1658 we find the Bedford church appointing some of its members (including Burton and Bunyan), to meet Donne, Wheeler, and Gibbs "for the continuing of unity, and preventing of differences among the congregations," and "to consider of some things that may conduce to love and unity amongst us all." Two years later, when Burton was taken ill, the assistance of the same three brethren, together with Bro. Breedon, was sought "in the work of God in preaching and breaking bread once every moneth . . . on the Lord's dayes during the time of his weakness." The latter part of that year (1660) began to bring sorrow to the churches. John Burton died, John Bunyan was thrown into prison, the Bedford Church was robbed of its home, and John Gibbs was ejected from the Church at Newport Pagnell.

How far the ejectment of Gibbs was due to political

influence is not known. It was certainly not the main cause, but it may have played its part, as the following incident will show. In 1659 Sir George Booth headed an insurrection in Cheshire against Parliament. He was defeated by General Lambert, and fled as far as Newport Pagnell; "whither he came, with four servants, and behind one of them himself rode in the habit of a woman, but acting that part not well, he was suspected, and being apprehended and examined, he confessed himself to be Sir George Booth."

Upon Booth's arrest John Gibbs took horse and rode to London, to communicate the earliest intelligence of this event to Parliament; and as the House was then sitting, he was called in, and at the Bar gave an account of the apprehending of Sir George Booth, and "made application to many of the Parliament and Council by his friends for favour." This was on August 24th, 1659. Sir George Booth was sent up to London, and by the Parliament committed to the Tower, and a pecuniary reward was voted to Gibbs and the others concerned. At the Restoration Sir George Booth was created Lord Delamere. He was a man of very bitter spirit, and it is possible that he may have had some part in the ejectment of Gibbs. The last official signature of Gibbs in the Newport Pagnell Parish Register was on August 14th, 1659. His successor, Rev. Robert Marshall, was inducted on March 24th, 1660, so that the ejectment took place some time between these dates. Nominally Gibbs was turned out for refusing to admit the whole parish to the Lord's Table. The truth appears to be that John Gibbs conscientiously refused to give the ordinance to a wealthy and influential parishioner who was a drunkard and a notoriously immoral character. Excluded from his pulpit in the Church, Gibbs commenced preaching in a barn in the High Street of Newport, where he had a numerous following.

The bonds of church fellowship were not broken by these sorrows, but rather the links between Bedford, Newport and the other churches were strengthened. We find Wheeler, Donne, and Gibbs meeting with the Bedford Church in December 1660 to consider the appointment of a successor to John Burton, and William Wheeler was invited to the Pastorate. (It is curious that though Rector of Cranfield, he was regarded as a member of Mr. Gibbs' church.) He did not accept the invitation, for the full fury of the storm of persecution broke upon them in 1662, and it seemed advisable for him to help his own people.

If John Gibbs had not been ejected in 1660, he would have been on August 24th, 1662, for on that day, with the passing of the "Act of Uniformity," the two thousand ministers went out "not knowing whither they went," sacrificing their office and

their livelihood. Amongst them were the associates of John Gibbs:—William Wheeler, John Donne, and William Dell.

Before long Wheeler, Donne, and three-score Dissenters besides, were with Bunyan in Bedford Gaol; whilst at Aylesbury the common gaol was so full that the magistrates were compelled to hire two large houses to receive their prisoners. John Gibbs did not escape, but was subjected to ill-treatment, indignities, hardships, and imprisonments, all of which he faced with a determined and cheerful spirit.

The Conventicle and Five Mile Acts of 1664 and 1665 drove the Dissenting congregations to meet at Olney, Newton Blossomville, and other places. In such preaching services the Olney Baptist cause had its commencement. On the expiration of the Conventicle Act in 1668, meetings were held openly, to the scandal of the bishops. So at the request of Archbishop Sheldon, the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury forwarded to him reports of all "unlawful religious assemblies" in 1669. The name of John Gibbs appears in three of them.

"Newport Pagnell; two meetings; one, Anabaptist; number, uncertain; inferior tradesmen and mechanical people; led by John Child, William Breeden, and John Gibbs ejected hence."

"Olney; two meetings; one, Anabaptist, at the house of Widow Tears; number, about 200, but decrease; meane people; led by Mr. Gibbs, one Breedon, and James Rogers, lace buyers, and one Fenne, a hatter."

"Newton Blossomville; one, in private houses; 50 or 60 meane people, but such as say they value not his Majesty's clemency a pin; led by Gibbs an Anabaptist ejected at Newport Pagnell."

Of those mentioned in these reports it is worth noticing that three (Child, Rogers, and Fenne) probably belonged to Bedford; Breedon was a Newport tradesman.

The Buckinghamshire Quarter Session records do not go back beyond 1678, so that there is very little means of knowing what took place before the first Declaration of Indulgence.

The prison doors were thrown open in 1672, and under the terms of the "Declaration of Indulgence" Bunyan made application for many licences. The list of names includes, besides his own, those of John Donne, John Fenne, James Rogers; and also "John Gibbs, for William Smyth's barn and his own house in Newport Pagnell"; and "William Hensman, for Joseph Kent, his barn in Olney." For three years the churches had liberty. But the licences were recalled and the persecution began again in 1675.

The second period of persecution is better known. At the

Christmas Session of 1682, and at every subsequent Session until that of Christmas 1685, the great majority of summonses were for non-attendance at Church. First of all the nonconformists were summoned for three months' absence from Church; but, later on, three Sundays' absence was the crime that brought them to judgment; and during those years an average of ten or eleven from Newport, and seven or eight from Olney had to appear each quarter. The records have folio after folio of the names of hundreds of persons, chiefly men, from all parts of the county, who for conscience' sake, refused to comply with the law and attend the Established Church of England. John Gibbs' name appears no less than seven times in three years.

The official records naturally make no distinction between Quakers, Baptists, and Independents, but there is a large proportion of the Newport Pagnell and Olney people who are known from other sources to have belonged to John Gibbs' Church. The meeting at Joseph Kent's barn in Olney appears to have been raided in 1684, for at the Midsummer Session, forty people (and Joseph Kent amongst them), were summoned for attending an unlawful assembly at Olney. They were mostly fined 6s. 8d. each, but some were fined 10s., and one as much as £1; which, considering the value of money at that time, was by no means a light sentence.

About this time the Dissenters of the district frequently met at a farmhouse at Northey, about three miles distant from Olney. Whether this place of meeting was chosen as a direct result of the raid on Joseph Kent's barn, or whether they had previously met there, we do not know. The meeting place was only a few yards from "Three Counties' Point," where Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, and Buckinghamshire adjoin. Here Bunyan and Gibbs preached; and here, when they were persecuted in one County, they could flee into the next.

After the persecution ended in 1688, William Smyth's barn in Newport Pagnell and Joseph Kent's barn in Olney became the home of the two congregations, and John Gibbs devoted the remainder of his days to consolidating the work in these places, and on each site new meeting houses took the place of the old barns.

As it has already been pointed out, the views of John Gibbs and John Bunyan on Baptism seem to have been identical; for, whilst they believed in Baptism, they considered Open Membership and Independency as of greater consequence. In the old Church Book at Bedford, Gibbs is called a "Catabaptist"; but as Dr. Whitley points out, the terms "Anabaptist" and "Catabaptist" were used quite indifferently; and therefore give no clue to any particular view of Baptism. It is clear that John

Gibbs did not accept the "Strict Baptist" position, nor the "Paedobaptist" view; for a "Strict Baptist" communion arose in his day in Newport, and a "Paedobaptist" in Olney. His sympathy, however, was always with the Baptists. It is recorded that he encouraged their work in Newport, and that he loved these people and wished to have them settled in Church estate.

On the other hand it is plain from the Rothwell Church Minutes that there was very little sympathy between the two causes in Olney; and the attitude of John Gibbs, in accepting Open Membership whilst not accepting Infant Baptism, is the only one that reconciles statements in the Olney Trust Deed of 1694, and the division that occurred in the Church some years after the death of Gibbs. The Trust Deed speaks of the congregation as "Independent or Protestant Dissenters"; and according to its terms no one can preach, pray, or perform any religious worship or service, in the assemblies, or on the premises, unless they agree with John Gibbs. Matthias Maurice, a Welshman, later succeeded to the pastorate, and as he was a Paedobaptist, and evidently could not accept the teaching of John Gibbs, he left the Church with a large number of his supporters, and went to the Paedobaptist Meeting House, where Richard Davis of Rothwell had begun preaching services in 1691, and which had since that year existed as a branch of the Wellingborough, Sheep Street, Independent Church. The Baptists, apparently knowing that their view coincided with that of John Gibbs, retained the older Meeting House, and though much reduced in number, bravely determined to carry on the work.

Toward the end of his life, John Gibbs seems to have become increasingly impressed with the great mysteries of life, death, and eternity; and between 1697 and 1699 published several short treatises on these subjects, as well as two funeral sermons. The treatises are entitled:—"An Exhortation Against the Fears of Death," and "A Brief Declaration of the Resurrection of the Dead." Bound up with these is "A Discourse on the Four Last Things:—On Death, which is most certain; on Judgment, which is most strict; on Hell, which is most dismal; and on Heaven, which is most delightful." The two funeral sermons have also been preserved. One was for William Maxwell, who died in 1697 when a student at Harvard College, Cambridge, New England; and who was possibly his grandson; the other was for William Hartley, an Apothecary, who died in 1698, and who also was his kinsman.

John Gibbs died on June 16th, 1699, being then in his seventy-second year, and was buried in the parish Church at

Newport Pagnell. His will reveals the fact that he had been married, and that his wife and four daughters survived him.

On the death of Gibbs a quaint elegy was published, and also an acrostick on his name. Both of these show how highly his life and ministry were valued by his own people. The inscription on his tomb, whilst it gave him highest praise, does not seem to have been an extravagant summary of his character. It declared him to be :—" A man of well cultivated mind, wonderful memory, acute judgment, and great learning, as well as of eminent piety and great integrity; a fervent preacher to saints and sinners." In the Newport Pagnell Congregational Church and in the Olney Baptist Church, the work which he began still continues and flourishes.

MAURICE F. HEWETT.

JOHN GIBBS, 33-697. A funeral sermon preached at Newport Pagnell, April 11th, 1697. On the occasion of the sudden death of William Maxwell, a pious and hopeful young scholar, belonging to Harvard College, in Cambridge, New England. This was published in Cornhill, London. The preface shows that Maxwell was a relation of Gibbs. As Oxford and Cambridge were closed to dissenters, the choice for a higher education lay between the Academies run by university graduates, without the university tone, and foreign universities, such as St. Andrew's and Leyden. Hollis, the Baptist Mæcenas in London, saw the possibilities that attached to Harvard's college in New England, and endowed it for two professors; with scholarships, also, preferentially for Baptists. Young Maxwell seems to have been one of the earliest to go from England—or Scotland?—across the Atlantic for his training. It was a fine idea to link together the two hemispheres, as Rhodes has seen for an even wider constituency.

FROME had Baptists as early as 1669, but till 1692 they were on the roll of Southwick. Forty then organized and called John Sharp of Northampton. A group separated about 1700, the main body built in 1711 on Badcox lane. Sharp was sent by the Western Association to stand for orthodoxy in 1719 at Salters' Hall. Five years later his son helped him, till he died 1724. The father saw two secessions, but when Thomas Hurne from Crockerton succeeded in 1740, he gathered back the earlier group. Abraham Larwill followed, 1749-1760. John Kingdon followed, saw the second secession disband, had 160 members in 1775. Eleven years later, in a period of revival, he won a Calvinistic Methodist minister and all his congregation.

Broadmead's Call to Robert Hall.

FOUR LETTERS FROM THE ARCHIVES.

The Church of Christ of the Baptist Denomination meeting in Broadmead in the City of Bristol to the Rev. Robert Hall, A.M. sends Christian salutations.

REVD. AND DEAR SIR.—We are called together by that dispension of Divine Providence which has removed our late dear and venerated pastor, Dr. Ryland. We review with gratitude to God the distinguished care and goodness with which He has watched over our Church from the time of its formation—amidst persecution, when a few servants of the Lord received the word with much affliction and joy in the Holy Ghost, throughout a long series of years, which have all been marked by the conversion of some to God and by the entrance of others into the everlasting rest.

Our Church has long had reason to bless God for a succession of pastors, pure in their doctrine, holy in conduct, and faithful in exertions; and more especially do we, who have personally known and loved our late Pastor, remember with thanksgiving his exemplary purity of life, his instructions and his most earnest prayers. We are met to consider our state and the supply of our need. It has been intimated to us that the Committee of the Baptist Academy consider it not desirable that the office of the President of that Institution should be united with the pastoral office in our church, and they have resolved to recommend to the Annual Meeting our dear and very highly respected minister, Mr. Crisp as the President, and we understand that he is writing to accede to the proposal. We have now to present to you our most sincere and earnest request that you will consent to take the pastoral office over us. We feel particularly urged to this measure by the recollection of our early union, by attachments both ministerial and personal which have been formed during your visits to us, by the intimacy and endeared Christian friendship which many of us have long enjoyed with you, by the affection which always subsisted between our late pastor and yourself and your honoured father, especially by a conviction that in giving this invitation we are seeking a Union which under the Divine blessing may greatly conduce to the spiritual prosperity of our own society and the cause of religion in our city.

We do not, nor probably do you, approve of inviting a

settled pastor to leave his station for another, if there be no other motive than inclination. But we think we can give this call and not violate the principle (we have heard that there have been some particulars which have rendered your connection with the Church at Leicester not so indissoluble as it might have been at some distance of time, and in addition to this) we could, as one consideration, suggest that Bristol may be regarded as a more enlarged field of usefulness than your present situation.

If the connection we now propose should be effected, we trust you will find in us every disposition to accommodate your convenience and comfort, and we shall wait with an anxious hope of your assent, for which we shall return our thanks to Him whose assistance and direction we have sought and have, we trust, received.

We remain, Rev. and dear Sir, yours very affectionately,

(Signed by 183 members, another 84 adherents).

3rd October, 1825.

My Very Dear Friend.—I am as much ashamed as any of my friends can be, to keep them so long in suspense respecting my determination in regard to removing to Bristol. I feel it to be of so much importance to my own happiness, and in the relation it bears to the spiritual interests of a large body of people, both here and at Bristol, that I tremble at the thought of coming to a final decision. My inclination, I confess, stands towards Bristol, the reasons are obvious; two sisters justly dear to me residing there; a place dear to me from ancient recollections [and from the most entrancing scenery;] access to books, a want of which I most grievously feel here; many old friends or the families of old friends, who I much love and esteem; [a superior description of society,] and I may add, equal if not superior prospects of usefulness. These, it must be acknowledged, are weighty considerations, and I feel them in their full force, insomuch that I feel myself incapable of relinquishing the thought of Bristol without a pang.

On the other hand, I most sensibly feel the difficulty of leaving a people who are most affectionately attached, and a congregation which I have, through mercy, been the instrument of raising from a very low to a very flourishing state. The certainty of giving great uneasiness to many excellent and worthy friends, and of being accessory to the injury of an interest which ought ever to be dear to me, presses much upon my mind; it is indeed the grand difficulty I feel in the way of leaving Leicester. I tremble at the thought of destroying what I have been the means of building up. I tremble at the thought of rushing into a sphere of action to which I am not called, and, it may be, of

offending God, by deserting my proper post. As it is the *last* remove, in all probability I shall ever be tempted to make before I am conveyed to the "house appointed for all the living," I feel extremely anxious that it may be made with the Divine Approbation. Conscious that my times are in the Lord's Hands I desire most sincerely to acknowledge Him in all my ways. Oh, that I might hear a voice behind me saying, "This is the way, walk *thou* in it." My mind is much perplexed, my resolution not decided. I feel a conflict between opposite motives and am drawn by contrary attractions: though, were I to consult my inclinations alone, I should certainly decide for Bristol. My advanced period of life, and the apprehension of its possible, if not probable effects on the interest of religion, form the grand objections.

[One thing I must beg leave to mention, that were I to settle with you, I should decline taking any share in the monthly lectures. In the prayer-meeting (the united) I should engage with pleasure. I have but little opinion of the utility of the first of these meetings.]

On the whole, I must request one month more, and at the end of that time (if my life is spared) you may reckon upon my giving you a decisive answer. During that interval I will again seek the Divine Guidance, and I humbly hope I shall receive it. At all events, I will not keep you longer in suspense, and am truly concerned at having exercised your patience so long. [I beg to be most affectionately remembered to Mr. Holden, and thank him sincerely for his kind letter. My best regards await all enquiring friends. My love to my dear Mr. Thos. James and my sister.]

I remain, my dear sir,

Your affectionate friend and brother,

To Mr. A. Tozer. R. HALL.
Bristol.

Postmark, Worcester, Dec. 7, 1825.

WORCESTER, WEDNESDAY,
One o'clock.

DEAR SIR.—I hasten to inform you that Mr. Hall has accepted the invitation. I am the bearer of a letter to Mr. Tozer announcing it, which letter he read to me. I felt a great preference to this mode of communication for many evident reasons, especially as it is something to read to the Church, till his formal answer to their invitation comes, which he promises in a few days. I shall feel great pleasure in communicating to my brethren the particulars when I return.

I hope the impressions in my mind occasioned by the visit will never be forgotten by me. In spite of all that slanderous

tongues may say, we have him *in the right way*, and I hope and believe it will be with the divine approbation and blessing.

Such a day I never spent before, from the Monday morning, 9 o'clock to past 9 in the evening, I did not leave his house. We began smoking our pipes immediately after breakfast and did not put them down till dinner was on the table, when they were resumed and so on to the end of the chapter. I made 2 or 3 attempts to leave and call again, but he would not let me go. Please to say I shall come home Thursday evening (to-morrow).

Your sincere brother,

JOHN DANIELL.

Andrew Levett, Esq., Solicitor, Bristol.

December 21st, 1825.

To the Church of Christ assembling in Broadmead, Bristol.

MY DEAR BRETHREN.—After long and mature deliberation and earnest prayer I write these lines to inform you that I accept the invitation you have been pleased to give me to the pastoral office. That it may become a mutual blessing, and that you and myself may reap the fruit of it, in the glory of God, the spiritual improvement of each other, and the conversion of sinners from the error of their ways will I trust, continue to be as it

[four illegible lines]

inability for the adequate discharge of the weighty duties which will devolve upon me, and particularly my unfitness to walk in the steps of your late venerable pastor. My only hope, amidst the discouragement arising from this quarter is placed "in your prayers and the supply of the spirit of Christ Jesus." Conscious as I am of innumerable imperfections I must rely on your candour for a favourable construction of my conduct and reception of my labours. Permit me, my dear brethren, to conclude by "recommending you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

I remain, dear brethren,

Your friend and brother,

ROBERT HALL.

Burnham's Group of Churches.

THE planting of new churches is to-day quite rare, a phenomenon which should claim serious study. But 150 years ago England was awakened by the great Evangelical Revival, so that groups of believers gathered, multiplied, sent out evangelists to plant fresh churches. Around the metropolis this was the more marked, owing to the constant inflow of people to what was already well populated. A picture of a group of churches may illustrate what was possible for one man of great, if singular, abilities.

Richard Burnham came from High Wycombe, where Calvinistic Baptists had settled into premises built by the General Baptists a century earlier. At Reading he came under the influence of Thomas Davis, son of a Welshman and a Huguenot, converted at Woolwich by Robert McGregor. Burnham was one of seven of the disciples of Davis who were called to the ministry, and he illustrates well three characteristics of that age's piety—the most extreme Calvinism in doctrine, the modicum of respect for the moral law, the utmost fluency in preaching and in the writing of hymns. He is considered here only as a founder of churches.

On 21st April, 1778, fifteen members of Reading were organised by Davis into a new church at Staines, in the presence of ten other Baptist pastors; and Burnham was ordained their minister. The cause flourished, so that his reputation soon reached London, and he quitted this church. It had a check in 1823, but was revived by Pritchard of Keppel street. Under the care of Gregory Hawson from Portsea, it grew, entered new premises, and evangelized at Chertsey and Addlestone; within living memory it opened also at Egham.

Burnham, however, went on to an eventful career in London. An American evangelist had hired a small Calvinistic Methodist chapel, and gathered a congregation, but had departed to succour the Seventh-day congregation at Cripplegate. The deserted flock appealed to Burnham, and they found a home just across Blackfriars Bridge, where they organised in 1780. In his life-time, this church divided into three; his death gave rise to a fourth church and a fifth.

The first change was in 1782, when Burnham and one party hired a tennis court in Gate street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, whence they passed to Edward street in Soho, and after the departure of

yet another party, they apparently found peace, as they named the cause Salem. When John Martin's church was presented in 1795 with new premises on Keppel street, Burnham's people took a lease of the old premises on Grafton street in Westminster. Here he finished his course in October 1810; one epitaph was placed on his tomb at Whitefield's Tabernacle; a very different estimate was published by Walter Wilson within four years. The church divided afresh, and the principal group, under the care of John Stevens from Boston, rented quarters in the highly aristocratic neighbourhood of York street off Jermyn street. But in 1823 there was some internal revolution, which for a wonder does not seem to have led to any secession. The church chose to re-date itself, as though to cut loose from its troubled history, and built itself new premises up Meard's Court, off Wardour street in Soho. Stevens continued till 1847: J. E. Bloomfield followed after five years, and with the pastorate of J. T. Briscoe which began 1870 we reach comparatively modern times.

The second section of this church did not move on to Edward street, but continued to worship at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1790, and at Chapel street in 1794. Meantime a church had been formed by William Garnish, which had had trouble in 1793. Five years later he had apparently gathered in this section, and they were worshipping in Great Castle street. But by 1811 they were in the Edward street premises, vacated by their sister-church, with T. Simmonds as their pastor. Seven years later they set the example of discarding their complex past, and calling themselves a new church of 1818, as they entered Soho Chapel at 406, Oxford street. Only after the pastorate of Herbert, Comb, Wyard, and Pells, did J. Wilkins persuade them to take the date 1791. Under J. Box they moved to Shaftesbury Avenue, and the fine new premises became the headquarters of the Metropolitan Strict Association. But in 1916 the church sold these premises to "Gower Street," of which much is to be said. It erected in 1918 and 1925 new premises on the High Road in Finchley, and named them Soho Memorial.

The third section of Burnham's church was reinforced by a group from Mitchell street, St. Luke's, which itself had had a most variegated story. James Upton from Waltham Abbey organized them in 1785, at the old premises in Green Walk; when rebuilt in 1801 the cause was termed Church street. To tell of the work done by his sons would open up vistas down which we must not travel. When the London, Chatham and Dover Railway wanted the space, his name was commemorated in the Upton chapel of 1864 in Barkham terrace, Lambeth road. Meantime the church had given rise to others, in Kingston and Lambeth.

Kingston had seen Josiah Thompson, senior, in his retirement, but it does not seem that he did any work there. Thomas Mabbott, of Lincoln, Spalding, Birmingham, Dudley, and Red Cross street, was the first Baptist evangelist here, and in 1790 organized in the Lambeth meeting-house the church of Kingston, confiding them next year to the care of Isaac Phillimore, who in 1794 became their first pastor.

A building on the Waterloo road being vacated by adherents of the New Jerusalem church, was opened in 1836 by members of Upton's church, and a daughter church was formed; but it did not live to come of age.

The fissiparous church of Burnham gave rise in 1805 to a group which occupied the old premises at Edward street, first under J. P. Bateman, then under W. Willmott. Andrew Smith took them to Brewer street, and soon after he went to Rye in 1821 the church ceased independent existence. It is conceivable that in 1823 it re-united with the parent church, and thus gave an excuse for the assumption of that date.

At the death of Burnham, there was no agreement as to a successor. Forty-five people left and established themselves in 1811 on Coventry street. Their fortunes are obscure, but eight years later William Williams was admitted to the Board as pastor of a church at Grafton street. This may imply that he took this group back to their old home when Stevens vacated it. It does not seem to have survived 1847.

Even in Burnham's life, several had seceded and gathered at Lewisham street near Westminster Abbey. They were joined by seceders from Stevens at York street, and in 1814 they called from Liverpool Henry Paice. But he had not the Burnham tradition, and wanted to sing from Watts as well; this led to his speedy retirement. His friends, however, bought out the others and recalled him next year. When he went to Wycombe, Christopher Woollacott came, and in 1828 opened the present home on Romney street. The Burnham influence ended in 1865, but Spurgeon re-opened the premises in the same year. This church is practically the only one in the whole City of Westminster.

Gower Street Chapel.

A BOOKWORM on his way down Shaftesbury Avenue to Charing Cross Road, may have his topographical sense bewildered as he passes a building labelled Gower Street Memorial; for Gower Street still runs its straight and unblemished course. The name, however, refers to a building near the north of Gower Street, which has housed three churches, whose vicissitudes exemplify some of the difficulties besetting churches of a highly Calvinistic type.

William Huntingdon, S.S., died in 1813, and some of his followers gathered for worship in Conway street. In 1819 they were attracted by a pedobaptist, Henry Fowler of Birmingham, and next year they built this chapel, which was opened by Gadsby of Manchester. They had only a ninety-nine-year lease of the ground, had not paid for the chapel, so borrowed on mortgage. Fowler settled as their pastor in 1821, the bond being not believers' baptism, but hyper-Calvinism. The church lost its pastor in 1838, and approached Edward Blackstock.

He belonged originally to the Strict Baptist church at Wolverhampton, but at Lakenheath had persuaded the church to Open Communion, though it has since reverted to the Strict position. So when in 1818 Blackstock desired to become pastor of one of Burnham's group of churches, he was rejected. As a hyper-Calvinist, indifferent on the question of baptism, he was exactly of the Gower street type, and he settled. But William Gadsby of Manchester, then at the height of his influence, disapproved, and in 1842 the Baptists were invited to quit the church. The weakened community could not pay the interest, the mortgagee foreclosed, and the church was ejected. This did not improve its cohesion, but part of it under Arthur Triggs from Zion in Waterloo road bought the remainder of the lease from the mortgagee and re-entered. In 1854, however, he sold the lease, and his section seems to have disbanded.

The section that held with Blackstock made a new start in 1843, and found a home in Little Portland street. A further disruption sent one party to Hertford street, another round Castle street, George street, Great Portland street, Lawson's Rooms on Gower street, till John Wigmore found room at Rehoboth on Ridinghouse lane and united the fragments in 1854 as a Strict Baptist church. A sketch of its later career appeared in II., 169.

In October 1842 seven Baptists from the original 1813

church met in an upper room in Gadsby's Yard off Tottenham Court Road. They decided to aim at forming a Strict Baptist church, and obtained the countenance of John Kershaw of Rochdale. They bought the lease of a chapel in Eden street, off the Hampstead road, hitherto used by the New Connexion; and it was opened under these new auspices by John Warburton of Trowbridge. They then felt strong enough to form a church, and five men on 25th May, 1843, gave one another the right hand of fellowship. Gadsby came next month to recognize the church, which had grown to number twenty. For eleven years there was steady progress, with supplies, and in 1854 the church bought from Arthur Triggs the diminished lease of the Gower street premises, and Kershaw re-opened it for them next year. Within five years they enlarged it, and the building then bore the two dates 1820, 1860. Some of the members had belonged to the original non-Baptist church of 1813, and by degrees this 1843 Baptist church came to consider itself a Baptist church of 1820. The lease was due to expire on 24th March, 1919, and so the provident church looked ahead and bought from another Strict Baptist church the freehold chapel on Shaftesbury Avenue, which it re-named Gower Street Memorial, and occupied in April 1917.

The Gower street premises, still bearing the outward semblance of a chapel, are now used as a furniture-warehouse. In this they are rather like the chapel at Nottingham, where Carey preached his famous sermon; but that is now doomed to be taken down to improve the lane on which it stands.

The General Baptist Academy of the Old Connexion.

THE first organized attempt to train men for the Baptist ministry in London was made by the General Baptist Assembly. The impetus was given by the church of Saffron Walden and Melbourn in 1790, and within two years Stephen Freeman agreed to take pupils at his house in Ponder's End, under the auspices of the "General Baptist Society for the Education of Young Men for the Ministry." His only student was Benjamin Austen, who ministered at Smarden, and died 1859. Obituary, *B.B. Quarterly* 1861

The second tutor was John Evans, the versatile author, pastor, school-master, LL.D., and his work lasted 1795-1818. He equipped Thomas Pine of Maidstone, who does not seem to have held any pastorate. Thomas Sadler, minister at Horsham 1801-1839. William Moon, Deptford, 1803-1823. W. Thomas died soon, and David Thomas by 1819. John Baker, Chatham, 1816. John Cundill. George Smallfield was not only minister, but printer of the Monthly Repository. George Culmer Pound was at Dover 1809-41, dying 1866. J. W. Morris worked at York, Lewes and Dean Row till death in 1843. W. R. Jones at Chichester and Trowbridge. John Philpot and W. Dobel held no pastorates recorded. Joseph Bane was at Aylsham 1817-1848, one of the few who served Calvinist churches. W. H. Creaton to Leicestershire. T. L. Taylor, Billingshurst 1818-20. John Thomas died soon. W. Kite at Ditchling, Hurst Green, Rolvenden, Dover. C. P. Valentine returned to farm life. W. Brown left no mark. Edwin Chapman at Billingshurst, Chatham, Deptford, Stamford street.

James Gilchrist was the third tutor, 1818-1827, and trained six men, besides one who did not finish his course. James Taplin never served a Baptist church, but many Unitarian churches. J. O. Squier went to Edinburgh, Saffron Walden, Deptford, Headcorn, and Unitarian churches. T. F. Thomas to Chatham, Ipswich, &c. W. Chinnock, after five years at Billingshurst, became a schoolmaster. John Marten to Canterbury, Dover, Saffron Walden, Peckham. Jerom Murch to Diss and Bath, then turned to municipal life.

Benjamin Mardon was fourth tutor, 1828-55. J. C. Means served the original White's Alley church, then in Southwark, Chatham, and the church now at Winchmore Hill. James Cook to Long Sutton and Cranbrook. J. A. Briggs to Dover, Rolvenden, Bessels Green, Headcorn, and Unitarian churches. Thomas Sadler, Unitarian churches only. J. L. Short to Dover, then Unitarian. John Hill to Cranbrook and Chichester. Edward Hall to Battle, Cranbrook, Billingshurst, then Leeds town missionary. W. Matthews to Huddersfield, Horsham, Hull, Yeovil, and Lincoln. Hill died at the age of 83 in 1876, apparently the last of these students. It is not clear that any fifth tutor was appointed.

Some Recent Baptist Books.

THE Life and Faith of the Baptists. By H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D., 184 pages and index, 5*s.* Methuen.

Dr. Jacks is editing a series in which the varieties of Christian expression among men of differing communions are being set forth, so that sane and trustworthy accounts may be had with a minimum of controversy. Principal Robinson has well earned his right to be our spokesman. And he has well chosen an unusual form of description.

This age demands facts before theories; and Englishmen especially do things first, then afterwards (if ever) try to understand their relation and meaning. So eight pictures of Baptist life are here drawn first. They are very various; a boy, his soldier-uncle, a social reformer, a teacher, a woman author, a school-master, a preacher, and the inner life of a church as shown in its minutes dealing with discipline and hymn-singing. Of the people, only three were ministers, and two of these are better known in other capacities; this choice shows what we mean by the priesthood of All believers. What other communion would have selected a group with no theologian, no ecclesiastical statesman? An Anglo-Catholic from these sixty pages will get many glimpses into the real character of Baptist life, and may marvel at the difference in tone from his own circle.

Then come four chapters to emphasize four characteristics. The first is the importance we attach to conversion, personal direct response to God's call; and the way we impress this at the psychological moment, by baptism. Then our doctrine of the Church is unfolded. Next the object of the Church, to win more adherents for Christ. And our intense love of liberty. Other people believe in these things, and even combine one or two; to us they are the cornerstones of our faith.

We may for our own profit study half the final chapter, which deals with the strength and weakness of the Baptists. Friendly observers tell us that our very emphasis on these points, especially the first, bars re-union and keeps us isolated: that we under-estimate the divine impartation of grace; that our organisation is too crude for us to utilise our latent powers; that we do not train and use our young people; that we tend to undue literalism of interpretation. We cannot but recognise the truths in these kindly warnings, and Dr. Robinson suggests how we may be able to profit by them, and enrich our life. It is one of the

great merits of this volume that there is no assumption of our superiority at every point; and thus while we may amend our ways by attention to this half of the chapter, others may gather hints from the other half, won by its truly Christian tone.

W. T. W.

The Permanent Value of the Ten Commandments. By H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D. *7s. 6d.* Allen and Unwin.

A book of this kind is much needed. Although the Ten Commandments are prefaced with a clear statement that they were for a people brought out of Egypt, they are often painted on the walls of churches in England, bearing no relation to Egypt. Although our Lord expressly criticised some of them as inadequate, and although He offered Two Commandments as fundamental and all-sufficient, yet Christian catechisms try to teach duty under these ten heads. Frank dealing is decidedly in place: and the title of this book promises it.

The author has shown to our readers how he is at home in Pauline thought, and his competent handling of Paul's Greek. Here he reveals himself as equipped in Hebrew, and in Hebrew thought. He is truly Pauline in using plainness of speech, so that there is no vague ambiguity in his exposition. If there be a very clear statement of views that will surprise some old-fashioned stalwarts, in language that is not highly theological or conventional, yet there is no reticence as to the seat and source of authority to-day. "All authority is given to Me," was the explicit claim of the risen Christ: and this is stated in other Biblical terms here, as that He is our Lord and King.

The Master and His Men. Studies in Christian Enterprise. By F. Townley Lord, D.D. (Carey Press, *3s. 6d.*)

One of the dominant arguments for Christianity, if not the supreme argument, is found in the appeal to the Church's history and the witness of the Christian experience. In this stimulating book, Dr. Lord shows us the Church starting out on her adventurous voyage, "not heavily loaded with formal enactments, detailed schemes, and credal statements," and yet, as the years rolled by, expressing Christian enthusiasm in a hundred ways. With keen insight, he discusses the men and women who, in different ages, "have caught a vision of the splendour of Christ and set out to reflect that splendour to their own world and in their own way." We realise afresh our immense debt to that first strange group who companioned with the Master and gave us those literary records without which we cannot conceive Christian history.

The chapter on the conflict with imperial power is arresting and inspiring. To-day, the Christian belief in immortality is possibly not stressed as it should be, but it was this strong conviction which helped the men who would not bow the knee to Caesar "all along the tortured way and through the arena or the flames to the Other Side." With sustained interest, we follow Dr. Lord as he writes of the men who forsook the world—impelled thereto by a yearning for simplicity of life, an illustration of the continual action and reaction between the life of the spirit and the life of organisation; of the Friars who, on the open road, found "a Nature and a Humanity responsive to their call"; of the men who sailed to heathen lands and of the men who carried the gospel to the slums. These men followed great ideals. But ideals are not enough; there must be the dynamic to urge to their pursuit. And the dynamic which inspired these men was their divine constraint. They knew Christ as Saviour and Teacher and could not "refrain from an attempt to make that experience known to others." In his final chapter, Dr. Lord reminds us that "the youth of our Christian Churches to-day enter into a heritage which cannot be excelled in any other society in the world" and he discusses four prominent features of our religious life: (1) The atmosphere of religious freedom; (2) The new intellectual standards; (3) The restless spirit of present day life; (4) The new unity of the world.

Scholarship breathes on every page, but it is scholarship that does not terrify. For Dr. Lord knows the youth and the thinking man of to-day, and to them his musical style, with its vivid poetry in words fitly joined, will make a particular appeal. The book is well produced by the Carey Press and deserves wide circulation.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

Christ and Money. By Hugh Martin, M.A. (Student Christian Movement, 3*s.*)

It is remarkable that comparatively little attention has been given to this important and most practical problem in traditional Christian teaching. Mr. Hugh Martin is a wholehearted believer in the practicability of the Christian Gospel: he is anxious that the Christianity of our time should leave its ennobling influence in the sphere of economics, and although he has not written this book in the interests of any particular theory, it is clear that he is very dissatisfied with the existing order of things. He believes that already the Spirit of Christ has found an entrance into our commercial and industrial life, and to read this book is to realise that he has made a contribution to the subject which

is far greater than his own modest claims. From a consideration of the value of money he proceeds to a brief but clear treatment of the Teaching of Jesus, and then has some straight things to say about property. "The tradition of the Church from the days of the Apostles till now is that all property is held in trust. The owners have to answer to God for its use. There is no moral standing in bare possession." Particularly valuable is his chapter on personal expenditure. He will not lay down rules—"It is a matter of the spirit"—but he stresses the idea of stewardship, condemns luxurious expenditure, advises the Christian duty of saving and provision for age, and has some fine things to say about systematic giving to the work of the Church both at home and abroad. Altogether this is a healthy book which may be specially recommended to the young people of our churches. Its clear style and virile treatment should commend it to a wide circle of readers.