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

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

Editorial.

NEW MEMBERS.

The following have joined the Baptist Historical Society during the past quarter:

Beddington Free Grace Library.
Rev. W. Fancutt.
Mr. E. A. Hobbs.
Sir Thomas Hughes, J.P.
Mr. R. E. Pearson, J.P.
Rev. Rhys T. Richards, B.D.
Mr. A. R. Timson.
Mr. E. A. Timson.

* * * *

THOMAS GUY'S INVESTMENTS.

Through the industry of Mr. T. Roy Jones, B.A., we are able to reprint Thomas Guy's private account book, in which he kept particulars of his transactions in South Sea Stock. The reprint occupies thirteen pages, but it was difficult to arrange in any other style, and we felt that historical students would prefer to have a page-by-page reproduction.

Mr. Roy Jones is a student at Rawdon College, which he entered from the St. Mary's Gate Church, Derby, in 1933. Last October the Ward Trustees elected him a Ward Scholar. We congratulate him on his researches, and look forward to further contributions from his pen.

Thomas Guy has long been claimed as a Baptist and one of the denomination's outstanding philanthropists. The evidence in support should be collected and published, that no question may arise in the future. The Secretary has some information, and would be glad of any particulars which members can supply. Which London church, for example, can establish the honour of having had him in membership?

* * * *

REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE.

Baptists of this generation are presented with the opportunity of making an outstanding contribution to the training of the Baptist ministry of the future. Regent's has now been established at Oxford for about a decade, and in the theological school its students have won distinguished successes. The freehold site in St. Giles' is admirably situated, and paid for. The building plans which were prepared two years ago have met with widespread approval. Baptists everywhere should rejoice at the decision of the College Council to proceed with the first portion of the buildings during this year, thus giving them the privilege

of contributing to this far-seeing scheme. It is proposed to lay the foundation stones on Thursday, 21st July. In this issue, the Rev. Percy Austin recounts something of the indebtedness of the denomination to Regent's.

* * * *

BAPTIST UNION ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 25th April, 1938, will long remain memorable, for in the afternoon of that day the Assembly took the unprecedented step of rejecting a major scheme presented to it by the Council, which had approved it by a large majority. The scheme had also received the practically unanimous approval of the general committee of the Baptist Missionary Society. There have been occasions in the past when the Assembly has deferred the Council's proposals for further consideration, or even referred sections to the Associations and Churches (the original Sustentation and Ministerial Recognition schemes come to mind), but never before has the Assembly so emphatically and decisively said to the Council, " we will have nothing to do with your proposals." The repercussions of that afternoon, and the circumstances in which the debate was conducted, will long be felt.

Of the interest of the debate there can be no question. Outstanding speeches were delivered, both for and against the Council's proposals. One speaker, who surely should have known better, appeared unaware of the distinction between capital and income expenditure, with the result that the arithmetic of his lengthy harangue was somewhat extraordinary. He argued that, by the end of two hundred years, the Russell Square site and building would cost £720,000, viz. £120,000 for the building and £600,000 in ground rent. Therefore, a lease for one hundred years would, on this speaker's " argument," but contrary to general financial opinion, have been a better bargain for the Council, the " cost " being lower by £300,000. Again, if the Council had secured a lease for 1,000 years, it would, presumably, have made a terrible bargain, as the " cost " would then have been £3,120,000. Of course, the " argument," as indeed other " arguments " in this particular speech, will not bear examination. Perhaps the quality and effectiveness of the speech are best illustrated by the modern version of a very old yarn. It runs something like this : A prisoner was defended so eloquently and passionately that his acquittal was secured. A month later the erstwhile prisoner was staggered by the bill of costs, and said to the lawyer, " When I heard your speech to the jury I thought it wonderful, and you convinced me that I really didn't do the job; two or three days later I thought about your speech and began

to have doubts and could see a lot of flaws; to-day I know I did the job and there was nothing in your speech." "That may be," replied the canny lawyer, "but the jury only heard the speech once before giving their verdict."

* * * *

MOUNT STREET BURIAL GROUND, NOTTINGHAM.

The earliest known reference to this burial ground is in a deed of Lease and Release dated December 29th and 30th, 1724, where it is stated to have been "for many years last past used as a Burying Place for the People commonly called Baptists *alias* Anabaptists in and about the said Town of Nottingham" . . . It was closed by an Order in Council dated January 30th, 1856, except for burials "in family vaults and walled graves" . . . and the last interment took place in December, 1876.

The disused burial ground itself is now to disappear, as the new street from Park Row to Friar Lane will pass over its site. The remains contained in the graves are to be removed by the Nottingham Corporation to the Nottingham General Cemetery, no "heirs, executors, administrators or relatives of any dead person whose remains are buried there" having taken advantage of the opportunity given them by the Corporation to remove the remains to another burial ground or cemetery. A copy of the Schedule of the tombstones, etc., prepared by the City Engineer, has been supplied by the Town Clerk to the Baptist Historical Society.

A full account of this ancient Baptist burial ground, with quotations from relative deeds and minutes, and copies of the monumental inscriptions, is given in the *History of Friar Lane Baptist Church, Nottingham,* by John T. Godfrey and James Ward (1903).

* * * *

CHRISTMAS EVANS.

The 19th July, 1838, saw the passing of Christmas Evans, the best known of all Welsh preachers, described by Robert Hall as "the tallest, the stoutest and the greatest man he ever saw." A centenary tribute by the Rev. E. W. Price Evans will be printed in our October issue.

The Ministry and the Sacraments.

A FREE CHURCH POINT OF VIEW.[1]

ANY discussion of the Free Church doctrine of the Ministry and the Sacraments must necessarily begin with something even more fundamental, namely our conception of the Church. For this purpose, I cannot do better than quote the definition given in *An Evangelical Free Church Catechism* which was originally published by the National Free Church Council in 1898 and re-issued unchanged in 1927 with an introduction by Dr. Scott Lidgett. The Committee originally responsible for this Catechism included such names as Professor Vernon Bartlet, Dr. Clifford, Professor Peake and Dr. Oswald Dykes.

To the question "What is the Holy Catholic Church?" the Free Church reply is: "It is that Holy Society of believers in Christ Jesus which He founded, of which He is the only Head, and in which He dwells by His Spirit; so that, though made up of many communions, organised in various modes, and scattered throughout the world, it is yet One in Him." The Catechism adds: "The essential mark of a true branch of the Catholic Church is the presence of Christ, through His indwelling Spirit, manifested in holy life and fellowship."

In other words, the Church is a fellowship of believers who are united to Jesus Christ in a personal relationship of trust and obedience, and are by that fact bound one to another by ties of mutual loyalty and love. Those ties sometimes take explicit shape in the fellowship of a particular local Church. At other times the bonds which unite fellow-Christians may remain almost wholly implicit and unexpressed. But the Church consists of all those, and only those, who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, irrespective of any other test whatsoever. And it is to all such, and not merely to a selected few, that the commission is given to go and teach all nations.

Further, every individual Church-member has the same right as any other of direct access to God in Jesus Christ; the same personal assurance of forgiveness and help; the same real, if limited, portion of responsibility for bringing his quota, with others, to the Master's service. And the members of a Church, assembled in a duly summoned Church-meeting, need no further authority than the promised presence of Christ to transact in the name of the Church all relevant business

"We believe"—says the Baptist reply to Lambeth issued

[1] Paper read to the Friends of Reunion Conference, Haywards Heath, May 3rd, 1938.

in May, 1926—"that this Holy Society is truly to be found wherever companies of believers unite as Churches on the ground of a confession of personal faith. Every local community thus constituted is regarded by us as both enabled and responsible for self-government through His indwelling Spirit Who supplies wisdom, love and power and Who, as we believe, leads these communities to associate freely in wider organisations for fellowship and the propagation of the Gospel."

THE MINISTRY.

In our view, therefore, the *Ministry* of the Church is the ministry of the *Church*. That is, it is not in the first instance a body of men set apart—in however solemn a way—for a particular office, but it is the ministerial function (or rather group of functions) which the Church itself is responsible for discharging.

We see no reason to regard one form of Ministry as sacrosanct or indispensable. The Church furnishes itself with Ministers as the Spirit directs and the occasion requires. Permanent needs of Church life call for the appointment by the Church of persons who can give their whole time and attention to them. Other ministries may have a purely temporary character. But the principle remains the same. "God gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ." Within that general condition the Church is free, under the guidance of the Spirit, to modify or develop its ministries without limit. A Church may invite a fully-trained theological student to take the complete oversight of its work in a ministry which may last fifty years. It may equally call upon a wholly untrained layman (or, for that matter, woman) to preach a sermon, to conduct the Lord's Supper or to perform any other service whatsoever. Granted ability, the necessary qualifications are only two: (1) That the individual concerned shall have a sense of divine constraint leading him to the exercise of his gifts, and (2) that after the Church has satisfied itself as to his spiritual fitness, it shall invest him with the requisite authority to act on its behalf.

Herein lies the root, I think, of the Free Church difficulty about Episcopacy. Our objection is not to a supervising Ministry as such, for we already have it; nor is it to the use of due and orderly procedure in conveying to suitable persons the authority needful for their office. We use such procedure ourselves. What we repudiate is the idea that any procedure, however hallowed by tradition or elaborated by experience, should be elevated to a position of first-rate importance in the

life of the Church, and should be regarded as indispensable. Comparison is sometimes drawn between the position of an Anglican Bishop and that of a Congregational Moderator or a Baptist Superintendent on the ground that their functions are somewhat similar. In actual fact no real comparison is possible. Both Moderators and Superintendents have, it is true, gained an honoured—and, in practice, one might almost say an indispensable—place in the life of their respective denominations. Yet, in principle, their position rests wholly upon consent. Any particular church may elect to remain quite independent of them. Their abolition (however regrettable) might conceivably be resolved upon to-morrow without offending the conscience of a single individual in the Churches which they serve. (It is for Anglicans to say whether they could view the disappearance of the Episcopate with the same equanimity.)

Finally, the view of the Ministry which I have outlined carries with it for us this corollary, that no minister has any priestly function apart from that which inheres in the Church as a whole, and which every believer shares by virtue of his membership of the Church.

Holy Communion.

Turning now to the Sacrament of Holy Communion, it is noteworthy that its characteristic name amongst Free Churchmen is "The Lord's Supper." That is to say, both in name and (largely) in the actual form of the Service, we cherish the thought that this is the family meal of the Church, at which Jesus Himself is the Host. As such it is a festal occasion which—on the principle that "He that feasts every day feasts no day"—is the more valued because generally held at relatively rare intervals (once, or at most twice, a month). On these occasions it is customary for us, in addition to partaking of the Bread and the Wine, to engage in other acts which similarly symbolise and cement the fellowship of the Church. Thus, at our Communion Services, we welcome by name, and give the right hand of fellowship to, new Church-members. We announce such bereavements as the Church has suffered. We recall in prayer the absent and the sick. We invariably take up a special offering for the poor of the Church. Even the sitting posture in which we commonly receive Communion, and the position which the presiding Minister and his helpers take up at the Table, have their significance as recalling the scene in the Upper Room at the simple meal which Jesus shared with His disciples. The purpose of all this is to quicken in one another the consciousness of the Body of Christ as a spiritual fellowship at whose centre is the Holy Love which was incarnate in Jesus, and which is

symbolised by the Bread and the Wine which set forth His sacrificial death.

For this reason most Free Churchmen greatly deprecate restricting access to Communion upon grounds of Church order. This is the *Lord's* Supper, to which He invites all who love Him, and we who are Church-members see nothing contrary to His mind in asking any to join us who wish to respond to the Master's invitation. Rather we view it as an offence for which discourtesy is too weak a word, to refuse to any man or woman who sincerely desires it the privilege of coming to the Supper of the Lord.

The meaning given to the Sacrament varies somewhat among our people, but I think that, for the majority, it is chiefly a Service of Remembrance, which brings vividly before their minds the picture of Jesus at the moment when His love for men was most powerfully expressed. This is not to say that our Communion Service lacks mystical significance. Few of our people would attach any intelligible meaning to the idea that Jesus is present *in* the Bread and the Wine. Nor would they connect His presence either with the use of an unvarying order of service, or with the presidency of a full-time Minister. Neverthless they do most firmly and devoutly believe in that Real Presence which is promised to the two or three who are gathered in the name of Christ, and they can testify to the reality of their communion with Him. "I have in my youth," says the writer of a typical Free Church article in the current *Congregational Quarterly*, "been present at a Communion Service conducted by a village blacksmith, a wise, single-minded, and gracious Christian, and felt the sense of the presence of Christ as nearly as when the feast had been spread by any other. There is no such thing as an invalid sacrament when two or three are gathered together in His name."

The essence of the matter is that we administer and participate in the Lord's Supper not as a solitary rite, but—as the name of "Ordinance" implies—as an expression of that worshipful obedience to the Master in all His commands through which alone communion with Him can be ethically and spiritually realised. At its deepest level, the believer's act of obedience becomes an act of self-surrender, in which he makes oblation of himself to God in the Spirit of Sonship and becomes united thereby with his crucified and risen Lord.

BAPTISM.

In the matter of Baptism, I am naturally bound to speak, not for Free Churchmen in general, but as representing the standpoint of the particular denomination to which I belong. Here

I confess I am at once in difficulty, for a very recent and thorough examination of the Baptist position by a Denominational Committee shows that Baptists themselves do not entirely agree as to the relation of baptism to Church order. The situation is too complex to be summarised briefly and I must refer those of you who are interested to the report (published in 1937) of the special Committee appointed by the Baptist Union Council to consider the question of union between Baptists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians. The view I shall try to state here is what I think would be recognised by Baptists as representing a very large body of our people.

First, it is a mistake to suppose that our distinctive convictions are concerned mainly with the amount of water which is used in the act of baptising. We do attach importance to immersion, partly as having been the New Testament mode, and also as symbolising more effectively than any other mode the character of the spiritual transaction involved. Immersion is, as a matter of fact, the mode invariably used among Baptists to-day. But the point we are concerned to stress is that Baptism should be administered only to candidates who are of an age to exercise that personal repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, which are essential to the New Testament meaning of the Sacrament. Our repugnance to Infant Baptism is—needless to say—not based upon any antagonism to children; nor are we blind to the elements of value in a "Christening" Service. Our objection is, that the baptism of infants is an unscriptural practice which veils the essentially personal nature of the issue between the soul and God. Further, its symbolism tends to introduce into the Christian faith a body of ideas and associations which are foreign to the true character of Christianity. In contesting Infant Baptism—says Dr. Wheeler Robinson—"Baptists are testifying against much more than an isolated and relatively unimportant custom; they are testifying against the whole complex of ideas of which it was a symbol, out of which grew the conception of the Church as primarily a great sacramental institution, administered by a body of officials vested with spiritual powers in which ordinary Christians could not share." (*The Life and Faith of the Baptists.*)

The Baptism of Believers which we practise (relying—as we believe—on New Testament authority for so doing) is in fact a different rite from Infant Baptism, and the Baptist interpretation of it is, broadly speaking, as follows:—

(1) Believers' Baptism is the candidate's personal testimony in action to his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It happens that my own practice in administering the rite is to ask the candidate publicly, while standing in the water, whether he accepts Jesus

Christ as Saviour and Lord, and, upon his assent, to immerse him forthwith in the name of the Trinity. But whether this procedure be used or not, the Service itself retains its original New Testament significance as a mode of voluntarily professing the Christian faith. In other words, it is a sign of Conversion, and not a means to it.

(2) The rite expresses for us, also, the moral and spiritual union of the believer with Jesus Christ in his repudiation of sin and his dedication to the service of God. In this connection the symbolism of Immersion has (as St. Paul pointed out in Romans vi.) a peculiar value, inasmuch as the descent of the candidate into the water, and his ascent therefrom, faithfully portray that new orientation of the soul which St. Paul described as dying to sin and rising to Christ.

(3) Experience proves that Believers' Baptism may be a baptism not merely of water but also of the Spirit of God—in other words, a Means of Grace. I say it may be such, for no human power can absolutely guarantee the presence in the candidate of that personal faith through which alone Divine Grace can be appropriated. But that such grace is given in answer to the prayers and faith of the candidate and of the Church is indubitable.

(4) The act of Believers' Baptism is closely linked in our Churches with the entrance of the candidate upon Church membership, although I should add that the connection is not a hard and fast one. For one thing, admission to membership in our Churches does not follow automatically from any rite, but is a privilege which can be accorded only by the decision of the Church itself. Secondly, we not infrequently baptise members of other Christian denominations who have become convinced that Believers' Baptism is the scriptural mode, and who seek it at our hands. Thirdly, an increasing number of our Churches would not reject an application for Church-membership on the sole ground that the applicant had not been baptised, provided that there was good reason to believe him to be a sincere follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. But with these qualifications, it is true to say that Baptism is the normal rite of initiation into the membership of a Baptist Church.

This very inadequate summary of Free Church views upon the Ministry and Sacraments will have completely failed if it has not made at least one thing clear, namely, that these views form a real unity. Free Church thought and practice are, in fact, rooted in one coherent spiritual principle, which is, the undivided sovereignty of the Living Christ over His people, with their consequent freedom and responsibility to interpret and apply His will as He makes it known to them. Freedom for us

is more than freedom from State control, important as that is. It is freedom also from any other kind of constraint, social or ecclesiastical, which would prevent the free response of Christ's people to the immediate direction of His Holy Spirit. "A Free Church"—says a recent writer—"is a Church in which Christ is free to determine the Church's spirit and character: free to express Himself in and through it: free to inspire it in new endeavours and achievements: free to embody Himself in it, that through it He may fulfil His glorious purpose in the soul of the race in His own way." (T. Edmunds, *Christian Freedom and Community.*)

I fear our practice as Free Churches falls lamentably short of our ideal; we never do succeed in living up to it perfectly. But it would be affectation to deny that this is what still gives to Free Church life such meaning and power as it possesses. And we are correspondingly obliged by all that we hold sacred to bear our witness to it.

The question many of us have to answer is whether such a conception of Church life as I have outlined is finally reconcilable with organic Church union as at present conceived. The two types of Church order represented, roughly, by the names "Catholic" and "Free Church" cannot surely, from any final point of view, be absolutely incompatible. They are both —we must believe—genuine, if imperfect, embodiments of the Faith we hold in common. We are learning, indeed, by experience, that at many points they do not so much contradict as supplement one another. Neither can do without the other, and both must learn more and more to co-operate in free and equal fellowship. But that very fact seems to some of us to suggest that the full contribution of these two types to the Church Universal may perhaps only be realised as we recognise that they *are* distinct types, and that their union must—at any rate, for the present—be in the nature of a federation rather than a fusion.

R. L. CHILD.

"Forward Regent's!"

THE old college cry, beloved of many generations of Regent's men, is to-day being filled with a larger significance. It has rallied many a football team fighting against odds, it has made the welkin ring on many occasions in London railway termini just before a boat train has left on which a Regent's man has been going forth to the Mission Field, the song of which it is the refrain is sung at College gatherings, and it is the "passport" whenever old students meet. Now it provides a slogan for the notable "Forward Movement" of the College itself.

Regent's Park College has ever been progressive. It was founded by men of far-sighted vision, and throughout its career its leaders have not only kept abreast of theological learning in a way that has given the College a reputation extending far beyond denominational borders, but they have had the courage to "launch out into the deep" in matters of policy and development. The removal from Stepney to Regent's Park, in 1856, was more than a change of abode; it was a real "forward movement". The affiliation with London University as one of its schools in the Faculty of Theology was another. To-day nearly all our Baptist colleges have such a connection with a university, to their mutual benefit, but Regent's Park was the pioneer. And now once more the College is committed to a courageous policy of advance. The original impetus came partly from circumstances beyond its control. The building in Regent's Park was held on leasehold tenure, and the near approach of the end of the lease, coupled with the impossibility of its renewal on terms that the College could afford, compelled a consideration of future policy. But if this was the occasion it was not entirely the cause of the proposal to move to Oxford. The idea of a Baptist theological college at one of the older universities has long been cherished by many who are concerned about ministerial training. While gladly acknowledging the splendid contribution to higher education that is being made by the newer universities, especially where, as e.g., at London and Manchester, there is a well-organised Theological Faculty, they have recognised that Oxford and Cambridge are still *sui generis*. It is not simply the charm of their ancient buildings or the glamour of their age-long traditions, though these have a definite cultural value. Still less is it a question of the Oxford or Cambridge "manner" or "accent." It is that the two ancient universities are still our greatest national seats of learning, and now that they are truly national, and no longer exclusive Anglican preserves, there is every reason why the Free Churches should avail themselves

fully of the unique privileges and advantages which they offer. The Presbyterians, the Congregationalists and the Methodists have long since done this, so why should Baptists lag behind? And if a Baptist college is to be transferred to Oxford or Cambridge then clearly it should be Regent's Park, both by reason of its present circumstances and even more by its past standing and reputation.

Regent's Park was known for the first period of its history as Stepney College, for it was at Stepney, in East London, that the institution was established in 1810. During the preceding 130 years many attempts had been made by London Baptists to deal with the problem of ministerial training, but with very partial success. Both the West and the North proved more progressive, and the Baptist Academies at Bristol and Horton, Bradford (now Rawdon College) were founded before the Metropolis had a similar institution. When at last the "Baptist Academical Institution at Stepney" came into being its committee invited the famous Joseph Kinghorn, of Norwich, to be the first "President and Resident Tutor". The invitation was not accepted, and Dr. William Newman, who had taken a prominent part in all the preliminary negotiations and plannings, was appointed. The first three students entered into residence on April 8th, 1811, and there is extant a record of the beginning of the college work on the 9th. "The bell rang at 6. Business at 7. Lecture on the article and five declensions. Family worship at 8."

For three years Dr. Newman carried on unaided, although he also had the burden of an important pastorate. Then two assistant tutors were appointed, and with an increasing number of students rapid progress was made. In 1842, the first link with London University was forged, and Stepney became a college eligible to enter its students for the degree examinations. Some notable scholars served on the staff during the Stepney period—F. A. Cox, Solomon Young, Dr. W. H. Murch (President 1827-43), Dr. F. W. Gotch, later Principal of Bristol College, and Dr. Benjamin Davies, one of the most learned Hebraists of his day. From 1838 to 1844 Dr. Joseph Angus held the office of secretary. In 1849 he became President, and occupied that position for forty-four years. The first notable achievement of his long reign was the removal from East London to Holford House, Regent's Park, in 1856. In its new home, "unsurpassed in position and substantialness", as the Committee expressed it, and in close proximity to University College, New College and other educational institutions, the College made marked advance. Dr. Benjamin Davies, who had removed to Canada in 1847, was invited to re-join the staff, on

which he served with great distinction until 1875. When in the seventies the revision of the Bible was undertaken, Regent's Park was the only Free Church college in the country which had members of its staff on both the Old and the New Testament companies of revisers, Dr. Davies and Dr. Angus respectively—a striking tribute.

An increasing number of its students graduated at London University. In 1865 Dr. Angus was able to report that Regent's Park men had secured "The English Scholarship three times out of the five it has been awarded, and the Moral Philosophy Scholarship three times out of five." At that time the College also had a number of lay students, many of whom attained high distinction. Among them were Prof. Sully, the psychologist, Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, the classical scholar, Sir F. Lely, the distinguished Indian civil servant, Sir Stephen Sale, of India, Sir Joseph F. Leese, K.C., M.P., Mr. A. Thomas, K.C., M.P., and Dr. Percy Lush. While the students, both lay and ministerial, were able to make full use of the facilities for graduation in Arts, there were no degrees in Divinity. To make up in a measure for that lack, thirteen Nonconformist colleges associated together to form the Senatus Academicus, which instituted theological examinations for the diplomas of A.T.S. and F.T.S. In the fourteen years of Regent's Park's membership its students headed the Honours List on nine occasions. The Senatus came to an end when London University instituted a Theological Faculty. Regent's became one of its "schools," and its men were able to sit for the Divinity degrees as internal students. The first students to take the new B.D. degree were B. Grey Griffith and J. N. Rawson in 1904. In the next year three more were successful, including Theodore H. Robinson, now Professor of Semitic Languages at Cardiff University, who later became the first R.P.C. man to be awarded the London D.D. Altogether nearly eighty students of the college have taken the B.D. degree, in addition to a far larger number who have graduated in Arts.

This brief survey does not attempt a complete record, but it should include at least a reference to three men to whom the more recent achievements of the College owe much—Samuel W. Green, Professor from 1878 to 1925, Dr. George Pearce Gould, Professor from 1885 to 1896, and President from 1896 to 1920—affectionately known as Sammy and Georgie respectively to all their men—and Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, President since 1920, and one of the most eminent living theologians and Biblical scholars.

Much more of interest might be written about the history of the College, but our main purpose is to say something

about its contribution to the life of our denomination in the service of the men who have been trained within its walls. To tell that story fully would require a volume, hence the present sketch will have many omissions.

Sixteen Regent's men have occupied the presidential chair of the Baptist Union. The first was Dr. J. M. Cramp, in 1838, and the most recent was R. Rowntree Clifford, whose noble life-work at the West Ham Central Mission is one of the greatest achievements in modern Baptist story. Dr. Cramp spent the latter part of his ministry in Canada, where he exercised a great influence. He is best remembered for his *Baptist History*. Others of the sixteen were Charles Stovel, Dr. Angus, Dr. William Brock, C. M. Birrell (father of the Rt. Hon. Augustine Birrell), Dr. S. G. Green, Dr. A. McLaren (twice), J. T. Wigner, George Short, Dr. T. Vincent Tymms, J. R. Wood, Dr. F. B. Meyer, Dr. William Edwards, Dr. J. E. Roberts and Dr. W. E. Blomfield. To these should be added the name of Principal Gould, though he did not receive his training in the college over which he later presided.

The Regent's contribution to denominational leadership has been even more notable in another way. Presidents come and presidents go, but the secretary goes on—if not for ever, at least for a long time. Three Regent's men have held the important position of Secretary of the Baptist Union—J. H. Millard, Dr. S. Harris Booth and Dr. J. H. Shakespeare, the last named perhaps the greatest of all denominational secretaries.

Our Baptist colleges hold a somewhat anomalous position in our denominational life. Unlike the colleges of Methodism or Presbyterianism, which belong to the whole Church and are under its direct authority, our colleges are completely independent institutions. They exist to serve the denomination, but they are subject to no denominational control. They are also independent of each other. Each has its own governing body, and is subject only to its own constituency of subscribers and supporters. The colleges, with one exception, are in membership with the Baptist Union, but they retain their independence, as do the churches which are in such membership.

In spite of the "splendid isolation" in which the colleges carry on their work, however, they are not competing institutions. Their rivalry is of the most friendly kind, and there is a good deal of mutual intercourse and co-operation between them. In this respect Regent's Park has made by far the most notable contribution. The most recent illustration is the arrangement whereby some of the most promising students of other colleges pass on to Regent's Park for the completion of their training. This has been in operation since the beginning of the work in

Oxford, and already students from Bristol, Rawdon and Cardiff have benefited from it. Even more notable, and covering a far longer period, has been the Regent's Park contribution to the professorial staffs of its sister colleges. No college is so parochial and shortsighted as to confine its choice of tutors and professors to its own alumni. It wisely chooses the best available man to fill any tutorial vacancy, and in this respect the colleges are all debtors one to another. But far and away their greatest debt is to Regent's Park. In the case of Rawdon, for example, four of its Principals in succession, from 1863 to 1926, were Regent's Park College men—Dr. S. G. Green, T. G. Rooke, Dr. T. Vincent Tymms and Dr. W. E. Blomfield. Not less memorable was the Regent's contribution to the Rawdon staff in the persons of the beloved William Medley and David Glass, both of whom gave practically their whole life of ministerial service to the Yorkshire college, and whose names are held in reverence by all Rawdonians of the past seventy years. The now defunct Midland College had Regent's Park College Principals in Dr. T. Witton Davies and S. W. Bowser, while Cardiff had Dr. W. Edwards and J. M. Davies. There has been no Regent's Park College Principal of Bristol, but Dr. F. W. Gotch, one of the most distinguished holders of that office, "won his spurs" as a theological tutor on the staff of Regent's Park. Also it should be remembered that Dr. James A Spurgeon, for many years the vice-president of Pastors' College, now Spurgeon's, and after the death of C. H. Spurgeon, its President, was a Regent's man. And the story is well known of the mishap which prevented a meeting between Dr. Angus and the young village preacher in Cambridgeshire which, if it had taken place, would almost certainly have resulted in Charles Haddon Spurgeon himself becoming a Regent's student. Had that eventuated the later Spurgeon story would have lost none of its glory, but modern Baptist history might have been saved some of its less happy controversies and divisions.

It is not only the colleges in this country which are thus indebted to Regent's Park. Equally notable has been its contribution to the staffing of Serampore, which is not only our most important Baptist Missionary Society college but also one of the chief schools of theological learning in the whole mission field. Its modern re-organisation, marking a far more important advance than is commonly recognised among our people, was under the principalship of Dr. George Howells, who was succeeded by the present Principal, G. H. C. Angus. Both are Regent's men, and at more than one period of its history the whole of the European teaching staff have been of the same ilk. Next to Serampore the most famous of our Baptist Missionary

Society colleges is Calabar, Jamaica. Two of its most successful principals, David Jonathan East and Arthur James, were Regent's men, and the college is now entering upon a new era of prosperity under another, Dr. Gurnos King. In Australia the Queensland Baptist College has for many years been under the principalship of William Bell, now one of the Regent's veterans, while among others who have won distinction in tutorial work may be mentioned Dr. T. Harwood Pattison, for many years professor at Rochester Theological Seminary, U.S.A.

The scholastic eminence of a theological college is best demonstrated by the number of its students who themselves attain eminence in theological learning, and if this be accepted as the test, then it is beyond any question that Regent's Park stands first among our Baptist colleges. Even so, however, the chief purpose of a theological college is to train men for the ministry. It may justly be proud of its scholars, but if it does not produce preachers and pastors of whom it can be equally proud, it is failing of its main purpose. How does Regent's Park stand in this respect? A perusal of its list of alumni makes clear that if it cannot claim to excel its sister institutions it is certainly in no whit inferior to them. The once popular saying in many Baptist circles that "Regent's produces scholars and ———— produces preachers" was never more than a half truth. Regent's has produced scholars *and* preachers, to a very notable degree.

It would be generally agreed that the greatest, certainly the most famous, preacher among Regent's men was Alexander McLaren, one of the pulpit giants of the nineteenth century. He was only sixteen years of age when he applied for admission to the old college at Stepney, and the Committee were struck with his very youthful appearance. But they were struck even more by the excellence of his examination papers, and they had no hesitancy about accepting him. He left the college in 1846, and for the next twelve years ministered at Southampton. In July, 1858, he entered upon the pastorate at Manchester that was to continue for nearly half a century and to become of world-wide fame and influence. We recall Sir W. Robertson Nicoll's tribute: "McLaren's natural gifts were extraordinary. He was out of sight the most brilliant man all round I ever knew. . . . Will there ever again be such a combination of spiritual insight, of scholarship, of passion, of style, of keen intellectual power? He was clearly a man of genius, and men of genius are very rare. So long as preachers care to teach from the Scriptures they will find their best help and guide in him. We shall not see his like again."

Dr. McLaren's fame is secure, and none would dare to

pluck the laurels from his brow. But *was* he the greatest preacher among Regent's men? The claim has at least been challenged. Twenty-five years ago the closing address of the College session was given by Thomas Phillips, of Bloomsbury, himself a notable preacher and a keen student of preaching. He took for his subject "The sermons of Edmund Luscombe Hull." We quote his opening paragraph. "I wish this evening to take as my subject the sermons of Edmund Luscombe Hull —Regent's Park's greatest gift to myself, and to countless other ministers. Your college has produced at least three immortal preachers: John Pulsford, who left in 1840; Alexander McLaren, who left in 1846; and Edmund Luscombe Hull, who left ten years later. The first two lived to a ripe and fruitful age, but the last faded away in the maytime of his years, and died at the early age of thirty. Pulsford was a mystic. McLaren was an expositor. Hull was a spiritual psychologist. Pulsford explored the spiritual frontiers. McLaren explored the word of God. Hull explored the human soul. Pulsford grasped big chunks of truth from the unseen, and often served them upside down. McLaren coaxed secret meanings out of shy verses and intractable Hebrew roots. Hull minted his own rich, deep melancholy for the benefit of his fellow-men. Pulsford sat at the feet of Jacob Boehme, McLaren at the feet of Benjamin Davies, and Hull at the feet of Sir William Hamilton and the great poets. It was Pulsford who saw the farthest, it was McLaren who saw the clearest, it was Hull who saw the deepest. Since your last annual meeting the jubilee of his death has passed. It is therefore fitting that I should call attention to him as Regent's Park's greatest preacher."

Many will read that passage with surprise, for "a generation has arisen that knew not Joseph", and to most Baptists, and—be it said to their shame—to many Baptist ministers, Hull's is an unknown or forgotten name. He left college in 1855, and it was at Kings Lynn that the sermons were preached which, after his premature death in 1862, were edited by his brother and published in three volumes. They ran through many editions, and although long since out of print may sometimes be found in secondhand bookshops. When any Baptist eye alights upon them in such a place they should be recognised as bargains to be snapped up at once, no matter what the price. We have quoted Robertson Nicoll's testimony to McLaren: here is what that eminent critic once wrote about Hull (*British Monthly*, January, 1901). "Edmund Luscombe Hull would, had he lived, have been the first of British preachers. Indeed, I am by no means sure that he did not occupy this position at the time of his early death. The one man to be named with Hull was Frederick

Robertson, of Brighton, but there was about Hull a quiet strength and patience which Robertson never possessed, and a still greater mastery of the last secrets of English prose."

Pulsford, McLaren, Hull—the great triumvirate! In popular esteem, however, at least two of them were far outdistanced by another Regent's man, Dr. F. B. Meyer. He was a man of great gifts and tireless energy. In his pastorates in Leicester and London he did a noble work, both in the realms of evangelism and of social service, while as a Convention speaker he was honoured and beloved throughout the English-speaking world. He also wielded a facile pen, and he published some scores of books and booklets, chiefly of devotional exposition. Perhaps he would have accomplished more, at least of permanent value, had he attempted less, but it has been given to few men to exercise so wide an influence, or to touch so many lives for good. F. B. Meyer's name will ever stand high on the Regent's "Honours' List."

And what shall we more say? For the time would fail to tell of all those who have gone forth from the College to serve their day and generation, and who, seeking not fame for themselves, have won a good report—of men like Silas Mead, who did such fine work for many years in Australia, Dr. Samuel Cox, the first editor of *The Expositor,* J. Hunt Cooke, editor of *The Freeman,* later the *Baptist Times,* W. J. Mathams, author of "Christ of the upward way", "God is with us, God is with us", "Jesus, Friend of little children", and other hymns, W. S. E. Hay, one of the Baptist pioneers in South Africa, and pastors and preachers like Alfred Tilly, of Cardiff, Charles Vince, of Birmingham, George Short, of Salisbury, Robert Caven, of Leicester, J. R. Wood, of Upper Holloway, T. H. Martin, of Glasgow, J. E. Roberts and Arnold Streuli, both of Manchester, G. Howard James, of Nottingham and Derby, and a National President of the Christian Endeavour Movement, E. C. Pike, Edward Medley, W. V. Robinson, W. W. Sidey, C. M. Hardy, W. Bampton Taylor and many another, both among those who are still in active service in this and other lands, and those who have passed to their eternal reward.

Last, but not least, we think of the Regent's missionary record. It is one of which the College has reason to be proud. At one time Bristol was recognised as the leading missionary college, but for many years now it has had to yield pride of place to Regent's Park College. An analysis of the college trained men on the Baptist Missionary Society staff, at home and abroad, in the College centenary year, 1910, shows that the largest number were Regent's men, with Bristol and Spurgeon's next in order. In the years since then Spurgeon's has made a

notable advance and now occupies second place, but Regent's is still in the lead, though only very slightly.

To give a full list of Regent's Park College missionaries is not possible in our limited space, but it includes the immortal name of Tom Comber, and others less famous but not less worthy of fame—such as Herbert Dixon and Sydney Ennals, the Boxer martyrs, Dr. J. P. Bruce, later the Professor of Chinese at London University, Arthur Sowerby, A. G. Shorrock, Dr. Cecil Robertson and Dr. John Lewis, all of China; Dr. G. H. Rouse, J. Drew Bate, Arthur Jewson, A. Teichmann, R. H. Tregillus, T. W. Norledge, T. O. Ransford and W. Sutton Page, of India; F. D. Waldock and Bruce Etherington, of Ceylon; Leonard Tucker of India and Jamaica; Percy Comber, Harry White, F. R. Oram, W. L. Forfeitt, W. H. Doke, W. P. Balfern and H. Sutton Smith, of the Congo; W. Kemme Landels and J. Campbell Wall, of Italy; A. Llewellyn Jenkins, of Brittany, and a fine body of men who are still in active service and nobly maintaining the great college tradition.

Equally notable has been the Regent's share in Baptist Missionary Society headquarter's leadership and administration. Before he became Principal of the college, Dr. Angus was for some years the Secretary of the Missionary Society. In later years another Regent's Park College man, Clement Bailhache, held that office, while to-day all the four ministerial members of the staff at Furnival Street—C. E. Wilson, the foreign secretary, B. Grey Griffith, the home secretary, E. A. Payne, the editorial secretary and W. W. Bottoms, the Young People's Secretary—own the same college allegiance, though in the case of the last named it is shared with Bristol, Mr. Bottoms being one of those students who under the new scheme have passed on to Regent's Park for the completion of their training.

During the century and a quarter of its history Regent's Park College has trained nearly 650 men for ministerial or missionary service. Those men have made a great contribution to our denominational life, and the denomination should be proud of the college which prepared them for their life work, and which has such a notable record of honourable achievement. That pride should find practical expression in generous and enthusiastic support of the move to Oxford. The establishment of the College in that ancient university marks the beginning of a new chapter in its history that holds promise of even more notable achievement than the past has known. It is also an event of outstanding denominational significance. The College in Oxford will do honour not only to itself but to the whole Baptist Church. Hence all Baptists may well echo the old College cry, " Forward Regent's! "

PERCY AUSTIN.

"Religion and Science."

THE situation that confronts us to-day as religious leaders is one of extraordinary difficulty. The factors in the case are many and varied and complex. But one of these factors is undoubtedly the influence of Natural Science. Religion and Science are the two greatest forces in the life of mankind. Religion is very, very old. Science—in the modern sense of the term—is comparatively new, for, according to Sir James Jeans, it may be said to date from "January 7, 1610, when Galileo Galilei, Professor of Mathematics in the University of Padua, sat in front of a telescope which he had made with his own hands." For some three hundred years now the attention of man has been directed—in the main—outwards, to the understanding and exploitation of the laws and forces of the physical world, and the consequent neglect of the inner life has led to the temporary overshadowing of Religion by Science. Thus our modern age is not very religious, but it is proud of its Science, and its devotion to Science is partly responsible for the decline of Religion. *On the practical side,* Science has so multiplied the conveniences and comforts and amenities of existence that it is naturally hailed as a great Benefactor, whose benefits are of the concrete kind that man is prone to appreciate most. Then, too, Science has supplied the ordinary man with many new interests, with the result that just as Wilberforce could fairly plead that William Pitt was so absorbed in politics that he never gave himself time for due reflection on Religion, so we can plead, just as fairly, that the average man of to-day is so absorbed in the new toys which Science has placed at his disposal—motor-cars, aeroplanes, the cinema and radio and what not—that he does not give himself time for due reflection on spiritual things. *On the theoretical side,* the teaching of Science has undermined not a few traditional religious ideas, with the result that, as Radhakrishnan says, "To those whose minds are dazed by the new knowledge of Science, the orthodox theologians seem to be like men talking in their sleep." *More subtly disintegrating still*—from the religious point of view—is the influence of scientific method on the Spirit of the Age, for it has so disposed the minds of many that they are disinclined to believe anything that cannot be proved in what they call "a scientific way." There are young people amongst us who have given up the practice of religious worship partly because the scientific truths they have learned in the laboratory seem so clear, so definite, so absolutely assured, while the religious truths they hear about in Church seem in comparison to be painfully vague,

indefinite, and problematic. They suppose that in the religious realm " we have but faith and cannot know," and they prefer to commit themselves only to what they know, in the false confidence that knowledge is solely of things they see. It is, therefore, hardly an exaggeration to say, as A. N. Whitehead does, " that the future course of history depends upon the decision of this generation as to the relations between Science and Religion."

Happily—though many are unaware of the fact—the relations between Religion and Science to-day are more cordial than they have ever been before. A few decades ago it was assumed by many intellectuals that Religion would before long be finally and for ever expelled from the world by the rational researches of Natural Science. Such a point of view is now almost as dead as Dickens' door nail. The new element in the situation is not merely the recognition that Science leaves room for Religion, but the realisation that when Science has done all it can for mankind, Religion is still the prime necessity of man.

I.

The relations between Religion and Science are such that neither should be pitted against the other—for both have their rights, each in its own domain.

Whenever we are inclined to resent the attacks that have been made on Religion in the name of Science, it is well to recall the melancholy fact that the attacks made on Science in the name of Religion have been more frequent and more virulent. The Roman Catholic Church still proscribes what she calls " false science." As Loisy says: " The great scandal in our day is the permanent rooted and irreconcilable opposition, often cruel and disloyal, which the Roman Catholic Church has made and continues to make to the whole intellectual and scientific movement." The attitude of Protestant Fundamentalists is practically the same. This unhappy opposition to scientific research disfigures the history of the Church all the way through. The earliest form it assumed was that of amused contempt. We find, e.g., that in the second century, Tatian, of " Diatessaron " fame, made fun of the studies of the Greeks, including grammar, geography and astronomy; " How can I believe him," he exclaimed, " who says that the sun is a red-hot mass and the moon an earth? " That was the attitude of several of the Fathers. They regarded scientific enquiry as a waste of precious time that should be devoted to spiritual concerns. Though they were right enough in the insistence on the pre-eminence of Religion, they were wrong in the disparagement of scientific knowledge. The Church's methods soon became more violent. Late in the fourth

century—in the supposed interests of Religion—Bishop Theophilus destroyed one of the libraries of Alexandria; early in the fifth, Hypatia, an astronomer's daughter and herself a teacher of mathematics, was brutally murdered in the same city by a mob of Christian fanatics; while early in the sixth century the Emperor Justinian closed all schools of philosophy. So it was in the middle ages. In the thirteenth century, Roger Bacon, whose greatest achievement was the invention of the magnifying glass, endured fourteen years' imprisonment as an ecclesiastical penalty for his scientific researches, at the instance of the General of the Franciscan Order to which he belonged. When Copernicus introduced the most revolutionary change in the history of human thought, there was a terrible fluttering in the theological dovecotes. The Reformers were as bitter in their opposition as Rome. Luther referred to Copernicus as a fool; Melanchthon deplored his lack of decency; while Calvin imagined he had disposed of Copernicus for ever by the simple query, "Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?" But we must be fair to these theologians. It was naturally a terrible shock to be told that the earth, so far from being the hub of the universe, was only one of the smaller planets. The new cosmology upset all current notions about heaven and hell, and worst of all it seemed to rob man of all significance in the cosmic scheme. Even to-day there are people who find it difficult to lay the astronomical ghost, and who react to the starry heavens, not as Immanuel Kant did—with a feeling of reverence, but as Thomas Carlyle did—with a feeling of horror at the immensity of it all and at man's apparent insignificance. In the nineteenth century the findings of Geology and Biology were met with a veritable tornado of ecclesiastical abuse. Even scientific inventions of great practical utility have been resisted on supposedly religious grounds. The use of telescopes, microscopes and spectacles was condemned as immoral and sinful, because, it was alleged, the use of such instruments made things appear in an unnatural and therefore false light, and gave one man an unfair advantage over another. Inoculation and the use of anaesthetics were denounced as unwarrantable interferences with the ways of Providence, while devout Boer farmers some years ago refused to join in an anti-locust campaign because they regarded it as an attempt to stay the hand of God. By these attacks on Science the Church has lost prestige, for she was proved each time to be in the wrong. To fight against truth is to fight against God. The nature of the physical world is primarily a scientific and not a religious issue, and in that department the man of science must be left absolutely free to find out all he can.

But if Science has often been wrongfully attacked by the representatives of Religion, it is no less true that Religion has often been wrongfully attacked by the representatives of Science. In the name of astronomy, man has been dismissed as a mere parasite infesting the epidermis of one of the meanest of the planets. In the name of Geology the life of man has been derided as a mere tick of the clock. In the name of Biology, man has been declared to be nothing more than a remarkably intelligent ape. In the name of Chemistry he has been spoken of as a mere chemical compound—a few shillingsworth of fat, phosphorus, potassium, magnesium and sulphur. Science has thus sometimes been used to destroy human value, and to suggest that man has no more significance in the scheme of things than the fly of a summer's day, that human beings are mere bubbles—soon burst.

"Let science prove we are, and then
What matters science unto men?"

"O star-eyed Science, hast thou wandered there,
To waft us home the message of despair?"

We naturally react against such ideas, as Wordsworth reacted against the scientific ideas of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. What moved him, we are told, was not intellectual antagonism, but moral revulsion, the feeling that something had been left out, and that what had been left out comprised everything that was most important. True, we must not reject such ideas just because we dislike them, or we expose ourselves to the charge that our religion is a mere pleasing, comforting phantasy in which we take refuge from the bleak facts about the world and the grim truth about human life. The point to note is that such ideas are fatal not only to Religion and to all cherished human institutions, but even to Science itself. If man is a mere parasite, a sort of louse, what value can be attached to his astronomy? If he is a mere ape, what reliance can be placed on his simian biology? If he is himself a mere chemical compound, his chemical theories are suspect. The plain truth is that Science, of necessity, exalts man—it is man who has measured the vast distances between the stars, ascertained their size, their weight, their temperature, their chemical composition, and resolved the complexity of their movements. It is man who has deciphered the history of the earth's crust, written the story of the forward march of life, and discovered the few elements of which all the myriad things about us are made. Science is one of the greatest achievements of the human mind, and if Science is great and significant, man, its author, must be greater and more significant still. The disparaging ideas about man some-

times put forward in the name of Science are not really scientific, for they do not take into account all the facts, and the facts left out are precisely those that are most important. Science does not deal and cannot deal with the whole of reality, and when she has explored all the territory she can, a vast realm still remains to be explored by other than scientific methods.

There are two ways of approaching reality—the way of Science and the way of Religion, and there is no necessary opposition between the two. It is one of the first duties of the religious man to be a lover of truth, with mind open to all the facts about the physical world which Science lays bare; and it is one of the first duties of the man of science to cultivate reverence for those sacred moral and spiritual interests and values upon which the worth of human life depends, which are a matter of life and death for civilisation itself, and which it is the office of Religion to foster and cherish.

II.

The relation between Religion and Science is such that Science needs to be supplemented by Religion. It is important in this connection to note first of all that Science is by no means omniscient, even in her own domain. Take, for example, such an apparently simple problem as the greenness of grass. Why is grass green? Science replies that it is green because it contains minute grains of chlorophyl, which is a green substance. So then we ask: Why is chlorophyl green? Science replies that it is green because it is made of a substance whose characteristic it is to give off a green ray. At this point, one might ask several questions, but let one suffice: What is a green ray? Science replies that a green ray is a movement in the ether (granted, of course, that there is such a thing as ether) vibrating at the rate of 660 billion times a minute. But when we ask what causes the ether so to vibrate and why that particular vibration affects our eyes as a green ray, Science shrugs her shoulders and replies that she does not know and cannot tell. Every scientific explanation leads to an impasse of that kind—a clear proof that there is a realm of reality which Science cannot explore, and at least a hint that there is another world than the physical. Science can tell us how things work, but why they work as they do or why there are any things to work at all, she does not know. As Sir Frederick Hopkins said two or three years ago, speaking about the origin of life: "All that we yet know about it is that we know nothing." "What we are surest of," said the late Professor Arthur Thomson, "is the fundamental mysteriousness of the world." "The ultimate realities of the Universe," says

Jeans, "are at present quite beyond the reach of Science." So Science does not know all, even about her own domain.

What is far more important is that that domain, large as it is, is comparatively small, for Science can deal only with phenomena, appearances, with the witness of the physical senses. If a thing can't be seen with the naked eye or with the telescope or microscope, or heard with the naked ear or with any instrument for the detection of sound, or tasted or smelt or grasped or measured with a rule or weighed in the balances, Science cannot deal with it at all. That means that all the things which mean most to us lie outside her domain. She can deal with the chemistry and physics of the artist's pigments, but with the appeal of great art she is not concerned. She can deal with the laws of sound, but with the appeal of great music she has nothing to do. She can show us how to set up a printer's press, but the appeal of great literature is beyond her ken. She can tell us much about the human body, but human personality, and the ethical and religious experiences of men, lie outside her domain. So then, art, music, literature, culture, all that is summed up for us in the word "personality," ethics, religion—in short, all the things that make life worth living—are realities with which she cannot deal. But the passion for truth, the appreciation of beauty, admiration for nobility of soul, the hunger and thirst for goodness, the sense of duty, of moral obligation, of an imperious "ought," the feeling of dissatisfaction with the mere things of time and sense, the consciousness of a Power not ourselves making for righteousness, are as much facts of experience as our awareness of stars and rocks and trees and birds and flowers, and any knowledge we may glean of the laws which govern them; and further, they are the most significant facts in the entire range of our experience. Yet with all these facts Science cannot deal—and, as Mr. C. E. M. Joad points out—"In regard to many things the information which Science has to offer is not the kind of information that matters." In this department, then, of life's most significant facts, the methods and instruments of Science are of no avail. Aesthetic, moral and religious truth cannot be "proved" in a "scientific way." There is no proof possible that Beethoven's music is superior to that produced by the beating of tom-toms by a savage—yet it is none the less a fact that it is superior. But a man realises the fact—if he does realise it at all—not by any scientific demonstration, but by intuition. There is no proof possible that a man ought to be pure and not licentious, true and not false, courageous and not a coward. Yet we can be quite certain about these matters. It is characteristic of all moral truth that it can be neither proven nor disproven, but it needs no proof, for it proves itself and

imposes itself upon the conscience. So it is with religious experience—we cannot prove to all the world that there is an unseen Power making for righteousness, but we can be as sure of the fact as of anything. We are in touch with two worlds—a material world from which our sensuous experience is derived, and which Science can interpret to us, and a spiritual world from which arise our duties and responsibilities, and to attempt to apply "scientific method" to this realm would be as absurd as trying to "extract the square root of a sonnet." In dealing with this spiritual world, knowledge comes by way of intuition. If "certainty" is not possible, "certitude" is. Just as there is a Science which knows the physical world, so there is a Religion which knows God. As Eddington said a year or two ago: "Are we, in pursuing the mystical outlook, facing the hard facts of experience? Surely we are. I think that those who would wish to take cognisance of nothing but the measurements of the scientific world made by our sense organs are shirking one of the most immediate facts of experience, viz., that consciousness is not wholly or even primarily a device for receiving sense-impressions."

The main issue for every man is, after all, this: What is life for? Now Science cannot tell us what anything is for. She can only tell us how things are made. If, e.g., we ask Science what an organ is for, she will take the instrument to pieces and explain the structure and function of every part, and when she has laid the last piece on the floor, she will triumphantly exclaim: "Such is an organ." But if we ask Art what an organ is for, she will place a John Sebastian Bach upon an organ stool and bid him play one of his Preludes; and as our souls are ravished by sublime music she exclaims triumphantly: "That reveals what an organ is." Which answer, then, is correct? Both are correct. But which answer is more significant and gets to the root of the matter? Obviously the answer of Art. So it is in regard to life. Science can supply us with much information about the material side of life, but it cannot tell us what life is for—the thing we most need to know—and it leaves us free to choose between Secularism and Religion, which are the only alternatives, there is no middle course. According to Secularism, life is "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." According to Religion, life is a high and noble calling. According to Secularism, the spirit of man is a mere epiphenomenon, an accidental concomitant of a soulless, purposeless, mechanical, cosmic process. According to Religion, the spirit of man is allied to ultimate reality, the realest of real things. According to Secularism, the sense of moral obligation is the mere hobgoblin of the nursery, something to be contemp-

tuously brushed aside as a thing of no consequence. According to Religion, it is the master light of all our seeing, the witness within us to a higher world. The plain fact is that life won't work in the secular way, but it will work in the religious way. As Whitehead says, in a very penetrating word: "The fact of religious vision and its history of persistent expansion is our one ground for optimism. Apart from it, human life is a flash of occasional enjoyment, lighting up a mass of pain and misery, a bagatelle of transient experience." That is simply another way of saying that science needs to be supplemented by Religion.

III.

The relations of Religion and Science are such that each can be of great service to the other. It is sometimes maintained that Religion and Science have nothing to do with each other. There are men of Science who have insisted that science proceeds on its path without any contact with Religion; and there are theologians, like the late Wilhelm Hermann, of Marburg, who have maintained that Religion stands completely apart from Natural Science. But that cannot be. They need each other and can serve each other. As Dr. Lyman has suggested: "The hormones of Science make for the health of religion and the hormones of religion make for the vigour of science." Or as Clerk Maxwell said: "I think men of science as well as other men need to learn from Christianity, and I think that Christians whose minds are scientific are bound to study science, that their view of the glory of God may be as extensive as their being is capable of."

The services that science can render to religion are obvious enough. Science has again and again proved a disinfectant, a bath of purification, that sets religion free from superstition, and there is nothing which discredits Religion more than the superstition so often associated with it, for superstition, though it poses as Religion's friend, is really its deadly enemy, and secretly devours its substance. Science saves religion from degenerating into magic. The distinction between the two is broadly this—if our religion is magical we suppose that we can somehow get God into our power and use Him for our own ends; if our Religion is pure we seek rather to put ourselves at God's disposal that He may use us for His ends. There are magical views of the sacraments and magical views of prayer which wither and die away at the touch of science. Science helps to keep religion to its proper domain. Religion is all too apt to get mixed up with ideas which have really nothing to do with it. Such beliefs as that the world was created out of nothing in six days, and that the world is about four thousand years

old, have often been foolishly declared to be Christian fundamentals—from such extraneous elements, science purifies religion. Under the beneficial influence of Science, theology has grown increasingly disposed to start, not from the clouds of speculation, but from the *terra firma* of the facts of experience and the facts of history, and to express the eternal truth of the gospel in forms that are intellectually sound. Can science do any more for religion? Has it got a religious message itself? Hardly—but very nearly, for its message to-day is in many respects favourable to Religion. Its emphasis on the wonder and order and intelligibility of the world has at least a religious value. It is perhaps not too optimistic to-day to declare that the new physics of the atom has destroyed the materialism that nineteenth-century physics encouraged by declaring that visible, tangible matter alone was real, and by implying that all concern with values and with religious experience was a mere wandering away from reality into a world of shadows and illusion. Now an atom is declared to be a field of force and is defined as an electrical rhythm—though we are to understand that the term rhythm is symbolical and electricity a name for something whose real nature is unknown. We are assured that the electrons behave as if they possessed spontaneity or free will, so that along with the old materialism the old determinism is also gone. While the old physics declared that matter alone was real, and mind a mere emanation from matter, the new physics faces the possibility that mind alone is real and matter is its creature. According to the new biology, it is becoming increasingly impossible to explain living things in terms of mechanism and chemistry and physics. "The maintenance and reproduction of a living organism," says J. B. S. Haldane, "is nothing less than a standing miracle." As for astronomy, let two astronomers speak: "The Universe begins to look like a great thought. We hail Mind as the Creator and Governor of matter. We discover that the Universe shows evidence of a designing and controlling power which has something in common with our individual minds." Professor Henderson, of Harvard, declares that as an astronomer he finds strong reasons for the acceptance of the general conclusion "that we may now rightly regard the Universe in its very essence as biocentric," and he finds that the organic world is uniquely fitted to be the cradle of life. Sir Arthur Thomson's "Epilogue," the last chapter of his last book (*Scientific Riddles*), contains many remarkable passages, amongst them this: "We cannot philosophically get away from Aristotle's conviction that there is nothing in the ending that was not also in kind in the beginning. We know that there is Reason in the ending, if ending we can speak of. So there must have been

the analogue of Reason in the beginning. Thus at the limit of our intellectual tether again, we feel compelled, and it is a glad compulsion, to say with the most philosophical of the disciples, 'In the beginning was Mind, and the Mind was with God and the Mind was God'." So far as Science teaches such things as these, it is at least an aid to Religion.

Finally, what about the services of Religion to Science? There is a profound sense in which Science is the daughter of Religion, or at least the granddaughter. The modern scientific movement was born of the conviction that the world is rational, and the belief in the rationality of the world was born of religion and fostered by it. "Faith in the possibility of Science is an unconscious derivative from mediaeval theology," says Whitehead. I suppose Einstein means something like that when he says: "Our religious insight is the source and guide of our scientific insight." Then, too, just as Science saves Religion from superstition, so Religion saves Science from materialism. Religion bears ceaseless witness to the fact that man cannot degenerate in soul and at the same time advance in true knowledge. Further, as an American philosopher (G. H. Palmer) has pointed out: "Without the presupposition of God, Science is fragmentary and baseless."

And since Science supplies power, but not the control and direction of power, Science needs the help and inspiration of Religion. What a terrible creature a physician or surgeon would be if he were pure scientist and nothing more, and regarded every patient just as a "case," without the kindliness and the sympathy and the sense of human value which Religion alone can inspire. Who of us would care to entrust his children to a teacher who merely knows his subject and teaches it on sound pedagogic principles, but without a warm human regard for the pupils committed to his trust—a quality which—at its highest—Religion only can supply? What a soulless, heartless thing industry becomes when it is simply organised scientifically, without reference to human needs, human feelings, human rights, human values, and in complete independence of all moral and spiritual considerations. It is a mere commonplace, too, that the greatest peril that threatens mankind to-day is the one that arises from Science, the peril lest man's mastery of the forces of Nature should so outstrip his moral and spiritual development as to lead to the destruction of our civilisation in warfare more devilish than our rude barbarian ancestors ever knew. The dark shadow of that menace hangs like a black pall over the whole of Europe. Men of science may reply that that state of affairs is not an indictment of Science but an idictment of mankind. True, perhaps—but it does reveal that man is unfit to be entrusted

with the terrible powers which Science is placing at his disposal unless his moral and spiritual advance proceeds *pari passu* with his advance in scientific knowledge. That means that the world's need of Religion is deeper and more urgent than its need of Science, and the Religion that it needs is the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

L. H. MARSHALL.

The Baptistry of St. John at Poictiers.

"THE Church of St. John Lateran is a Baptist Church, and I hope to preach there before I die." So said the late Dr. Fasulo of Rome about the famous basilica known to Roman Catholics as the "Mother and head of all Churches in the World". The ancient baptistry at the Lateran, possibly the oldest ecclesiastical building still in use by any Christian communion, is well known as a monument of the primitive mode of baptism. The splendid baptistries at Florence, where it is said that Dante once saved a child from drowning, at Pisa, and elsewhere in Italy, are even more famous, but it may not be so well known that the earliest Christian monument in France is also a "Baptist Church".

The Baptistry of St. John at Poictiers as an architectural monument cannot be compared with the great baptistries of Italy but in historical interest and significance it is their fellow. The building has an appearance of great antiquity. The central part, which is the original baptismal chamber, is a rectangular building of flat Roman bricks with low-pitched gables and roof covered with semi-cylindrical tiles. This building now forms the transept of a cruciform church, the chancel and nave being of later date. In the centre of the floor is the deep stepped octagonal basin of the baptistry, which is about eight feet wide at floor level. Typewritten notes for the use of visitors explain that this basin was used for baptism by immersion, as Christ was baptised in Jordan, and that this mode obtained till about 680 A.D.

About fifty years ago this whole site was excavated with a view to discovering the plan of the original buildings. The

excavations shewed that there had been a large porch to the west of the baptismal chamber, opening into it by two doors, and on the north, south and east sides, a series of six rooms. Of these it is thought that three were changing rooms for the candidates, one a vestry for the Bishop who administered the ordinance and the other two vestries for the elders and deacons and for the deaconesses attendant on the candidates.

The building of the baptistry is assigned to the fourth century and local tradition associates it with St. Hilary, who was Bishop of Poictiers from 353 till 368. Hilary was a convert from paganism and, at the time of his ordination to this important bishopric, he was a married man and a layman. He soon became renowned as a preacher and under his leadership Poictiers became a centre of orthodoxy. In 356 he was banished at the instance of the Arians but he was allowed to return four years later. During his exile he had written "On the Trinity" and "Against the Arians".

The first important alterations to Hilary's baptistry were made about the end of the seventh century, at the time when affusion took the place of immersion as the recognised mode of baptism. The reasons put forward for this change are that new converts were now rare and infant baptism was becoming general, and that bodily nudity was increasingly repugnant to new generations of Christians. At this time Bishop Ansoald built the pentagonal chancel on the east side of the baptismal chamber, and had the ancient baptistry filled in and an up-to-date font erected on its site. All the baptisms of the district were performed at this font by the Bishops of Poictiers down to the eleventh century. Then it became customary for priests to baptise in their own churches. The nave of the present church was built to replace the porch of the baptistry which was damaged by a fire in the year 1018. The structure is practically unaltered since that date.

The building has gone through many vicissitudes. For centuries it served as parish church for a very small parish, and was little used and on the verge of ruin. After the French Revolution it was put to secular uses and for a time was turned into a bell foundry. About one hundred years ago it was bought by the state, put in order, and placed in the hands of the Societé des Antiquaires de l'Ouest as a museum to house their collection of ancient stone monuments. This Society still cares for the Baptistry of St. John, and has issued an admirable booklet about it, to which the writer is indebted for much of this information.

C. B. Jewson.

Calvin's Doctrine of Baptism.

CALVIN'S doctrine of Baptism is probably the best defence of infant baptism from the Protestant point of view. For that reason it is worth examining. If we Baptists can see the best that can be said for a position which we oppose, it may help us to a better understanding of our own, and since in certain quarters we are being asked to show cause etc., a study of Calvin may not be irrelevant.

All the reformers had to elaborate their teaching of the Sacraments over against Roman Catholic theory. They all rejected transubstantiation. Equally they all rejected baptismal regeneration. Yet curiously enough both Luther, Zwingli and Calvin retained infant baptism. It is not easy for a modern Baptist to see the logic of that view, nor do the arguments of Calvin at this point impress one by their logical consistency, in spite of his reputation as a logician. Why the reformers, when going so far in a radical direction, should have stopped short here, is not easy to say, though it is a fact that probably we ought to consider. Was it that the Anabaptists had already drawn their conclusion, and their teaching on Baptism was rejected out of prejudice against their views on other matters? Anyway Calvin completely fails to appreciate the Anabaptist point of view on Baptism. He knew that infant baptism needed defending and he fashions a long chapter to the purpose, but apparently he did not know against what exactly he had to defend it. He argues against the wrong point, and only very cursorily dismisses the real point. In fact as he nears the real point he becomes merely vituperative [1]

By way of preliminary let us endeavour to see what the real point is.

In olden times religion was a national affair, and those born in the nation were by that very fact members in the faith, children of the Covenant, to use the Jewish phrase. They could say "we have Abraham to our father" and that was sufficient. The mark of that in the Jewish race was circumcision. To be circumcised was to inherit the promises—or to put it in another way, circumcision was the symbol (or sacrament) to which the promises of the Covenant were attached. But the qualification was birth—over which the individual had no control.

Then in time the Roman Catholic Church took over this very idea, only instead of the nation as the unit, it regarded itself, the one church, as such. This one church was international. Actually physical birth therefore was no good as a

[1] *Institutes*, Book IV., Chapter xvi., Section 19.

qualification for membership in it. Consequently the new birth, regeneration, was substituted for physical birth. This new birth was by Baptism so that, in any country, by Baptism any child could be grafted into the religious unit, be born into the Kingdom, made a child of God. This is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Salvation is linked to the union of the individual with the organised body, and that union is effected simply by a ceremony even when the subject is unconscious of it.

Now the Reformers one and all broke with this fundamental position. Salvation, they maintained in effect, is not by union with the organised body but by union of the individual with Christ, and this through faith. Such a position, in reality, marks the end of all *nominal* Christianity. A person cannot be a Christian by the privilege of birth, but neither can he become a Christian by being engrafted willy-nilly by a ceremony of the Church. Calvin may not have stated the matter thus, but this is the assumption on which his whole doctrine in the *Institutes* is based. Consequently the real point is—what significance is there in infant baptism when both baptismal regeneration and the idea on which it rests are whole-heartedly rejected? How can it have any meaning at all if salvation is by Faith, and by Faith alone?

In working out his doctrine of the Sacraments Calvin obviously has in mind the adult believer. This is so even when he is discussing Baptism until he turns to the particular topic of infant baptism. A sacrament is defined as " an external sign, by which the Lord seals on our consciences His promise of good will towards us, in order to sustain the weakness of our faith, and we in turn testify our piety towards Him, both before Himself, and before angels as well as men ". [2] Thus there are two things (1) God's seal and (2) our testimony. Both obviously presuppose the conscious mind. The seal is the seal of a promise. This promise Calvin insists must be proclaimed and understood in order that the rite may be a Sacrament. Thus the Sacraments stand on a level with the word, and are " not accepted save by those who receive the word and the sacraments with a firm faith ". [3] Calvin quotes Augustine to the effect that " the efficacy of the word is produced in the Sacraments not because it is spoken but because it is believed ". The reformer here is talking of Sacraments in general without thinking specially of Baptism, and he is insistent on this need for belief as the condition of the Sacraments' efficacy. Most theologians draw up their definition of Sacrament with the Lord's Supper specially in mind. And Calvin is not the first to forget his own

[2] *Ibid.*, Chapter xiv., Section 1.
[3] *Ibid.*, Section 7.

definition when he comes to discuss Baptism. How the above definition can find any room for infant baptism it is difficult to see. The reformer himself sensed the difficulty. He stands by his definition when dealing with those of an adult age who hitherto have been aliens from the covenant, i.e. the heathen, but makes a distinction between them and the children of Christian parents. The former are not to receive the sign of baptism without previous faith and repentance; the latter are "immediately on their birth received by God as heirs of the Covenant".[4]

Calvin justifies the inclusion of infants by arguments that have often been repeated. His main idea is that Baptism takes the place of Circumcision. This is buttressed with the fact that Christ called the children to Him and said, "of such is the Kingdom of God", and also by statements in scripture concerning the baptism of families. Since no mention is made of the exclusion of children in these instances, therefore no man of sense will argue that they were not baptised! It is not necessary for us here to do more than mention these familiar arguments. More to our purpose is the answer Calvin gives to the question of how the baptism benefits infants. First, it has a benefit on the parents as they realise that God extends His mercy not only to them but to their offspring; it animates them to surer confidence on seeing with the bodily eye the covenant of the Lord engraved on the bodies of their children.[5] Then, secondly, the benefit to the infants is that first they are made an object of greater interest to the other members of the Church.

Both these points, it will be noted, do violence not only to Calvin's definition of a Sacrament but to every other. The idea that God works on one individual (an infant) to stimulate faith in another (the parent) is something entirely new in the discussion and would require a recasting of the whole section on Sacraments. Also the idea that Sacrament is a ceremony for the good of the church is not ordinary Christian doctrine. Even on Roman theory the blessing is to the subject of the rite and not just to those who witness it. So we are still left with the question—what good accrues to the infant?

Calvin makes two other attempts. When they grow up he says they are thereby strongly urged to an earnest desire of serving God, Who has received them as sons by the formal symbol of adoption, before from nonage they were able to recognise Him as Father. That is to say the Sacrament of Baptism is a sort of post-dated cheque: it will operate when the time comes. But again is this a Christian sacrament?

[4] *Ibid.*, Section 24.
[5] *Ibid.*, Section 9.

In his next answer the reformer sails near the wind. Infants cannot be saved it is argued without regeneration. Calvin agrees. "We confess, indeed, that the word of the Lord is the only seed of spiritual regeneration: but we deny the inference that, therefore, the power of God cannot regenerate infants". That is as possible and easy for him as it is wondrous and incomprehensible for us. It were dangerous to deny that the Lord is able to furnish them with the knowledge of Himself in any way He pleases.[6] So also he argues they are baptised for future repentance and faith, "the seed of both lies hid in them by the secret operation of the Spirit".

Here he is obviously trying hard to fit infant baptism into his fundamental outlook of salvation as the result of a response of man to God. But we can hardly say that he succeeds. He hovers precariously between the magical baptismal regeneration on the one hand and the true idea that Baptism presupposes repentance and Faith on the other. He rides off on the suggestion that the power of God is marvellous and our comprehension limited!

As to his positive teaching on Baptism that is well worth consideration. He defines it as the initiatory rite by which we are admitted to the fellowship of the Church, that being engrafted into Christ, we may be accounted children of God. It contributes to our Faith three things:

(1) It is a sign or evidence of our purification, a kind of sealed instrument whereby God assures us that all our sins are done away and will no longer be imputed to us. The knowledge and certainty of such gifts from God are perceived in the sacrament.

(2) It shows us our mortification in Christ and the new life in Him. Here Calvin quotes Romans vi. 3-4. This exhorts us to the imitation of Christ. Also it symbolises that Christ has made us partakers of His death, so that the efficacy of both His death and resurrection are made sure to us—the one to mortification of the flesh, the other to the quickening of the Spirit. Thus we are promised, first, the free pardon of sins and the imputation of righteousness; and, secondly, the grace of the Holy Spirit to form us again to newness of life. These promises of God the Sacrament seals to us.

(3) Baptism assures us that we are so united with Christ as to be partakers of all His blessings. For He sanctified Baptism in His own body that He might have it in common with us as the firmest bond of union and fellowship which He deigned to form with us.

Comparing these three points with the usual teaching on

[6] *Ibid.*, Chapter xvi., Section 18.

Baptism in our Baptist Churches and creeds we note that, while Calvin allows that Baptism is our witness of our faith, his emphasis is not on that as ours tends to be. For him the Sacrament is a sign of what God has done and is doing. There can be no doubt that in this the Reformer is right, and it might be well if we Baptists of the modern world gave more attention to the positive content of the doctrine. If we ask the paedo-baptist what Baptism does for the infant and look for an answer, we ought to be able clearly to state what, on our theory, it does for the believer. It is not enough to say that it gives him an opportunity to witness. It is a ceremony which has to do with the believer's appropriation of the grace of God given in Christ. There is a real ministry of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of the believer in Baptism. What that ministry is needs careful definition.

In conclusion we may note with gratitude that Calvin broke away from the mediaeval doctrine of baptismal regeneration. He denied that the Sacraments are essential to salvation (though he insists that all Christians require them) and also that unbaptised infants of necessity are doomed to eternal damnation. As to the Form he was indifferent save that he preferred primitive simplicity to the elaborations which characterised the Roman ceremony.

ARTHUR DAKIN.

Devizes in 1699.

A PHOTOGRAPH of the following document hangs in the vestry of the Old Baptist Church at Devizes; and a second photograph has been given by Mr. Henry Tull to the writer.

Of the people concerned. It was not known how John Rede the donor was related to Colonel John Rede, who in 1659 had been chief of a garrison in Scotland, in 1672 had a licence refused to conduct worship at his house in Porton, but obtained one for his house in Idmiston, twenty miles south-east of Devizes. The donor, who was a principal burgess of the town, died 1701. The man who attended the important meeting of the Western Association in 1723 was probably his son. Daniel Webb and John Coleman were deacons of the Devizes church. James Webb appeared in London at the 1689 assembly as pastor of this church; his name appears last in 1701. John Filks is first mentioned in 1704, acting as pastor till 1723, with the help of Thomas Lucas of Trowbridge. Richard Anstie was a grocer

in Devizes; the family has a long record of Baptist service, Joseph becoming assistant at Bristol Pithay before 1753. This Andrew Gifford was the cooper of Bristol, baptized in 1659 at the age of 18, whose licence in 1672 is one of the treasures in the Gifford museum, pastor of Pithay, lived till 1721. Sir John Eyles in 1673 gave the lease of numbers 22, 23, The Brittox to this church; he and Richard Webb who died 1680 had been the most conspicuous early members. The Webbs and Filks were cousins; both families gave many ministers to the churches.

W. T. WHITLEY.

To all whom it may concerne. Whereas I John Rede of ye Devizes in ye County of Wilts Esqe by a certaine writting vnder my hand & seal ye fourteenth day of Septr. 1699. Did make over a Bond of ye penalty of two hundred pounds for ye payment of one hundred pounds yt I had on Daniell Webb of ye Devizes aforesd: clothier vnto James Webb, John ffilks Richard Anstie & Andrew Gifford, & their assigns; reseruing ye interest of ye sd hundred pounds to my self dureing my naturall life, And after my Decease ye sd hundred pounds & interest thereof to ye sd James Webb John ffilks Richard Anstie & Andrew Gifford & their assigns in trust to such vse & vses as they shall think fitt &c—NOW these are to declare that notwithstanding it is said to such vse, & vses as they shall think fitt, yet I haue assigned it to them with this intention yt they shall think no vse or vses fitt for ye dispose of ye said hundred pounds and interest But what I do her by direct (viz) That ye interest of ye sd hundred pounds shall be yearly distributed amongst such poor ministers of ye Churches called Baptists as are not able to provide for them, & that as ye sd trustees shall from yeare after yeare think meet according to each poor ministers necessity, also I do Direct that when two of ye sd trustees shall die, the Survivors of ym shall assign over ye sd hundred pounds & interest to fower other of Baptist congregation, yt ye trust may be continued for ever, ALL which Direction I desire ye sd trustees & their assigns will always keep to, & ffaithfully observue, as they wil answere it in ye day of Judgment, before ye allknowing & Righteous Judg. In testimony hereof I haue herevnto set my hand this present nineteenth day of Septembr. 1699.

witnessed by

John Eyles Jon: Webb ye mark of J: REDE
John Coleman Dll Webb John Rid X

Baptist Historical Society.

1. THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING.

TWICE at least in recent years our Society's Annual Meeting has been felicitously preluded by a tour of visits to the sites of historic Baptist churches in London. But the shift of population has led to the extinction of some churches, and the transference of others to more outlying neighbourhoods; and even apart from this, it is obvious that the material for such an excursion must soon be exhausted. Yet it seemed a pity to have nothing in its place, for the tours have certainly brought more people to the Annual Meeting. In this connection the happy idea of holding the meeting of 1938 at "Upton" Chapel, Lambeth, and prefacing it with an inspection of Lambeth Palace, occurred to the resourceful brain of—was it our energetic Secretary, or the Secretary *emeritus?* No matter which: for if one had not thought of it, we may be sure the other would!

Accordingly, necessary permission having been sought and graciously accorded, we assembled at the main gateway at 2.30 on Thursday, April 28th. We were conducted first to the Library, where we were received by the Archbishop's Librarian, Dr. Irene Churchill, and later by the Archbishop's Chaplain, Dr. Alan C. Don. Dr. Churchill had put out in the showcases some of the treasures of the Library which she thought would be of special interest to us, notably many early editions of the English Bible or New Testament, and after a rapid outline of the history of the various Palace buildings, she gave us an interesting and instructive account of these. On the centre table she had set out nine volumes which had a more direct bearing on the history of English Dissent, and respecting these she gracefully handed over the task of exposition to Dr. Whitley, who was able to show that they provided a series of landmarks reaching from the rise of Separatism under Elizabeth to its substantial emancipation under William the Third.

Our thanks to Dr. Churchill were suitably expressed by our President, who asked her acceptance of the Society's facsimile reprint of Helwys' *Mistery of Iniquity.*

We were next taken in hand by the genial porter who, as he showed us over the state apartments, chapel and garden, proved himself a well-informed and enthusiastic conductor. We saw, among other things, the long series of portraits of Archbishops of Canterbury, down to the very beautiful painting of the present Archbishop by the President of the Royal Academy. But the building which would probably have been of the greatest interest to most of us—the Lollard's Tower—could

unfortunately not be shown, owing to the obstacles presented by steep stairs and very confined chambers.

In the garden the flower beds (the soil for which, we were told, had been brought from Edenbridge) were gay with wall flowers and tulips. We were shown a postern gate into it which is sacred to the use of the nurses from St. Thomas's Hospital hard by, so that they can enjoy its beauty and quiet whenever they are free and so disposed: and also a plot of ground which was once a paddock for cows, but is now fenced off as a play-ground for local school children. But we scarcely needed this evidence to convince us of the public spirit of Dr. Lang.

Thence we adjourned to "Upton" Chapel for the Annual Meeting. The rapidity with which the necessary business could be transacted is an index of the prosperous state of the Society. The Treasurer was indeed able to report that it had doubled its membership in the last four years, and that a reserve fund was being built up.

Finally we were entertained to a most liberal tea by the "Upton" Church, to whom our thanks were warmly paid by the President.

A. J. D. FARRER.

II. REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1937.

Thirty years ago, on the 30th April, 1908, at the fourth session of its Annual Assembly in Bloomsbury, the Baptist Union resolved unanimously:

> "That the members of the Assembly of the Baptist Union cordially approve of the proposal to form a Baptist Historical Society, and trust that this important denominational work will receive practical and general support."

At the close of the session circulars signed by the Secretary of the Union were issued to the ministers and delegates inviting them to attend the inaugural meeting of the Society that afternoon.

The first resolution was proposed by Dr. J. H. Shakespeare, who remained a warm friend of the Society throughout his secretariat of the Union. The need for the Society had long been obvious. Many of our records were in danger of being lost: the absence of modern historical works created difficulties when legal issues were involved: there was need to appreciate afresh the heritage into which Baptists had entered. 65 ministers and delegates joined at this inaugural meeting, and of those foundation members Drs. J. C. Carlile, J. W. Ewing, J. H. Rushbrooke and W. T. Whitley, the Rev. A. S. Langley and

Mr. H. Ernest Wood have continued their membership throughout the thirty years.

The Society's aims were stated to be:

1. To gather all Records of British and Irish Baptists.
2. To hold Meetings to Discuss Obscure Points.
3. To publish "Transactions" read at these Meetings, and other papers.
4. To promote County and Other Histories.
5. To provide Safe Custody for Ancient Minutes, &c.
6. To encourage Young Students of History.

Now, at the end of three decades, the Society has a record of which it may be proud. It has published seven volumes of *Transactions* and eight of the *Baptist Quarterly,* into which the *Transactions* were merged in 1922, reprinted several historical volumes, and inspired and subsidised others. Many inquiries, world-wide in their origin, have been answered, and valued guidance has been given to research students.

The Society has also furnished the Baptist Union and individual Churches with historical material which has aided the settlement of legal questions, and Churches have been encouraged to preserve their ancient records and publish centenary and other volumes.

No one can review these 30 years without reference to the outstanding service rendered from the outset by Dr. Whitley, who, for so many years, was the Society's Secretary and Editor.

Twelve months ago our Annual Meeting was held at the historic church at Cloughfold, which has the distinction of being the first church to enter into permanent membership of our Society. The welcome was typically warm-hearted, and the hospitality bounteous. Deeds and other historic records of the church were on exhibition, and the Secretary, Mr. J. S. Hardman, who had generously provided charabancs from Manchester, delivered an instructive and entertaining address on the past of the church.

At that meeting it was reported that the *Baptist Quarterly* would be enlarged to fifty-six pages, and we are glad to report that as a result of the continued increase in our membership it has been possible to enlarge it further as from January to sixty-four pages. The four issues of 1937 included articles of interest and permanent value, and re-prints of various original letters and records. We are indebted to an increasing band of contributors who gladly and gratuitously help the Society.

Our Library has been enriched by various gifts, including the Minute Book of the London Strict Baptist Association, 1846-1853, by Mr. A. R. Woollacot, and the Treasurer's book of

the Melbourne Church with photographs and letters, by Mr. B. B. Granger. Various churches which have published centenary or other records have presented copies, and we invite all such churches, and all Baptist authors, to present copies of their works to the Society for incorporation into its permanent library.

Looking to the future, we are privileged to state that Dr. Whitley is engaged on the preparation of a third volume of his *Bibliography*, which will probably cover the fifty years 1837-1887. The earlier volumes have been invaluable, and students for all time will be debtors to Dr. Whitley's industry and research.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE, *Secretary.*

III. FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(For the year ended 31st December, 1937.)

INCOME

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Balance from 1936	... ...	13 4
Subscriptions—		
Annual for 1937	124 16 2	
Annual for 1938	8 6 0	
Two Life Members	21 0 0	
		154 2 2
Sale of Publications	... ...	11 1 3
		£165 16 9

EXPENDITURE

		£165 16 9
		12 4 6
Subscriptions paid in advance ...	8 6 0	
Balance in hand	3 18 6	
Transfer to Reserve	... ...	44 5 0
Stationery, postages, insurance etc.	... ...	13 9 0
Baptist Quarterly, four issues ...	... ...	95 18 3

RESERVE FUND

	£60 0 0
Balance	10 0 0
Deposit Account for Life Subscriptions	50 0 0

A. H. CALDER, *Treasurer.*

The Holdings of Thomas Guy in the South Sea Company.

IN the article on Guy in the *Dictionary of National Biography* we find the statement, "In 1720 Guy is said to have possessed 45,500£ of the original South Sea Company Stock. The 100£ shares gradually rose. Guy began to sell out at 300£ and sold the last of his shares at 600£." A similar statement is also found in Wilks and Bettany's *Biographical History of Guy's Hospital*, page 59.

Recently I visited Guy's and obtained access to a photographic copy of the book in which Guy kept an account of his South Sea Company holdings. An examination of this book—a copy of which is produced below—has revealed several errors in the statements of Bettany. Guy held £54,040 of stock and not £45,500 as Bettany states. When he began to sell on April 22nd, 1720, he realised 340%, and his last sale, that of June 14th, realised 525% and not 600%; though it must be admitted that he had previously sold £4,000 stock at 600%.

One cannot help admiring the way in which Guy managed his sales. Practically every sale shows an increase in price but the last one realised only 525%. Guy was wise enough to sell out early and not chance a fall. The shares continued to rise—from the debit side of the account we learn that the £100 share reached £770. Actually the peak was reached on June 26th—twelve days after Guy had sold the last of his shares. A £100 share was then worth £1,060. Once the fall began it was very rapid, and by September 21st a £100 share could be bought for £150.

We may well feel grateful to Guy for his wisdom and foresight. If he had delayed selling for only a few weeks he would have lost heavily. As it was he realised £232,591 12s. 0d. This money he re-invested in safer shares—Annuities and India Stock. Thus he increased the fortune which was to be so largely devoted to the founding of one of England's greatest hospitals.

T. Roy Jones.

Account of Disposall of £54040 So. Sea Stock
for £234,428 2.— and
of the purchasing of

£179,566. 11. 4. & of 4% Annuities &

£8,000. —. —. & of 5p. cent do. &

£1,500. —. —. India Stock.

[Folio 1]

SOUTH SEA STOCK) DR. £ s. d.
CAPITAL 54,040£)
1720/

		£	£	s.	d.
April					
22d	1000 Sold at 340 p.cent.	—	3400		———
27th	1000 Sold at 340 p.cent.	—	3400		———
27	1000 Sold at 351 p.cent.	—	3510		———
27	1000 Sold at 351 p.cent.	—	3510		———
29	1000 Sold at 352 p.cent.	—	3520		———
29	1000 Sold at 353 p.cent.	—	3530		———
			20,870		———
	£				
	To 2000 advanced out of Yoe. private Cash.	—	2,000		———
May 9	1000 Sold at 341 p.cent.	—	3,410		———
9	1000 Sold at 349 p.cent.	—	3,490		———
11	1000 Sold at 342 p.cent.	—	3,420		———
11	2000 Sold at 342 p.cent.	—	6840		———
11	1000 Sold at 353½ p.cent.	—	3,535		———
11	1000 Sold at 353½ p.cent.	—	3,535		———
	13,000.	Carried Over	47,100		———

1720.		CONTRA. CREDITOR.	£ s. d.
April	£	910,000	
27th	2000	Bank Annuities Bot. at 99 p.cent	1980. ——
27	3500	Annuities at 4 p.cent D. Bot. at 96¾ p.cent	3386. 5. ——
29	2000	ditto. D. at 98 p.cent	1960 ——
29	500	ditto. 3dG. at 97½ p.cent	487. 10. ——
30	500	ditto. D. at 98 p.cent	490 ——
29	100	ditto. 3dG. at 97½ p.cent	97. 10. ——
			8,401. 5. ——
29	500	ditto. D. at 98 p.cent	490 ——
May 3	500	India Stock at 239 p.cent.	1,195 ——
6	1000	ditto. at 239½ p.cent.	2,395 ——
3	215 :19 :4	Ann : at 4 p.cent D. at 98 p.cent	211. 13. 4
3	278 :16 :8	do. D at 98 p.cent	278. 6. 8
3	200	do. D at 98 p.cent	196 ——
3	1400	do. D at 97¾ p.cent	1,368. 10 ——
3	2000	do. D at 97¾ p.cent	1,955 ——
4	2500	do. D at 98 p.cent	2,450 ——
5	4000	do. D at 98 p.cent	3,920 ——
10	1000	do. D at 98 p.cent	980 ——
10	3000	do. 3dG at 98 p.cent	2,940 ——
11	500	do. 3dG at 98 p.cent	490 ——
11	2000	do. D at 98 p.cent	1,960 ——
12	1000	do. D at 97¾ p.cent	977. 10. —
12	4000	do. 3dG at 97⅞ p.cent	3,915 ——
12	4000	do. 3dG at 98 p.cent	3,920 ——
		Carried Over	38,043. 5. —

[Folio 2]

SOUTH SEA STOCK)
CAPITAL 54,040£) Dr.
1720

May	Brought Over	13,000	47,100
13	Sold at 350	1,000	3,500
	Sold at 350½	1,000	3,505
	Sold at 350½	1,000	3,505
17	Sold at 353½	1,000	3,535
	Sold at 354	1,500	5,310
	Sold at 354½	500	1,772. 10 —
	Sold at 354	1,000	3,540
	Sold at 355	1,000	3,550
23	Sold at 360	1,000	3,600
	Sold at 375	1,000	3,750
	Sold at 377	1,000	3,770
	Sold at 381	1,000	3,810
	Sold at 382	1,000	3,820
	Sold at 398	1,000	3,980
	Sold at 410	1,000	4,100
	Sold at 410	1,000	4,100
	Sold at 412	1,000	4,120
		30,000	110,367. 10 —

CONTRA CRED^{r}

1720

May		Brought Over	38,043. 5 —
	10	3000 Bank Annuities 910,000 at 99¾ p.cent	2,992. 10 —
	12	1000 —— do. —— at par —	1,000 —
		2000 —— do. —— at par —	2,000 —
	13	1000 Annuit. at 4 p.cent D — at 98 p.cent	980 —
		1,000 — do. —) 3^{d}G —— (at 98 p.cent	980 —
		1,000 — do. —) (at 98 p.cent	980 —
	17	1,500 — do. — 4 p.cent D — at 97¾ p.cent	1,466. 5 —
		5,000 — do. —— D — at 97¾ p.cent	4,887. 10 —
		700 — do. —— D — at 98 p.cent	686 —
		6,000 — do. —— D — at 97¾ p.cent	5,865 —
	19	500 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.cent	488. 15 —
		750 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.cent	733. 2. 6
		850 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.cent	830. 17. 6
		800 — do. —— D — at 97¾ p.cent	782 —
		500 — do. —— D — at 97¾ p.cent	488. 15 —
		3,000 — do. —— D — at 97¾ p.C	2,932. 10 —
	20	900 — do. —— D — at 97¾ p.C	879. 15 —
		100 — do. —— D — at 97½ p.cent	97. 10 —
		4,000 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.cent	3,910 —
		1,000 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.C	977. 10 —
		116 . 14 . — do. — 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.C	114. 1 —
		120 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97¾ p.C	117. 6 —
		300 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97½ p.C	292. 10 —
		100 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97½ p.C	97. 10 —
		400 — do. —— 3^{d}G — at 97½ p.C	390 —
			73,012. 12 —

[Folio 3]

1720 SOUTH SEA STOCK) Dr
CAPITAL 54,040£)

May	Brought Over 30,000		110,367. 10 —
25	Sold at 361	1,000	3,610 —
	Sold at 415	1,000	4,150 —
	Sold at 450	1,000	4,500 —
	Sold at 415	2,500	10,375 —
		35,500	133,002. 10 —
	To Premiums and Continuation of S°S. Stock		3,524. 2 —
	To —do.— for Continuation		430 —
			136,956. 12 —

1720 CONTRA CRED[r]

May		Brought Over		73,012. 12. 0
	24	700£ Annuities at 4 p.C.	3[d]G — at 97¾ p.C	684. 5 —
		1500 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 98 p.C	1,470 ———
		100 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 98 p.C	98 ———
		1900 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 98 p.C	1,862 ———
		500 ——— do. ———	D — at 98 p.C	490 ———
		5000 ——— do. ———	D — at 98 p.C	4,900 ———
		5000 ——— do. ———	D — at 97¾ p.C	4,887. 10 —
		200 ——— do. ———	D — at 97½ p.C	195 ———
		300 ——— do. ———	D — at 97½ p.C	292. 10 —
	25	200 ——— do. ———	D — at 97⅝ p.C	195. 15 —
		500 ——— do. ———	D — at 97⅝ p.C	489. 7. 6
		500 ——— do. ———	D — at 97⅝ p.C	489. 7. 6
		400 ——— do. ———	D — at 97⅝ p.C	391. 10 —
		400 ——— do. ———	D — at 97⅝ p.C	391. 10 —
		3500 ——— do. ———	D — at 98 p.C	3,430 ———
		1000 ——— do. ———	D — at 98 p.C	980 ———
		1000 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 98 p.C	980 ———
		200 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 97½ p.C	195 ———
		500 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 97½ p.C	487. 10 —
		700 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 97½ p.C	682. 10 —
	26	200 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 97½ p.C	195 ———
		50 ——— do. ———	3[d]G — at 97½ p.C	48. 15 —
				96,848. 2 —

[Folio 4]

SOUTH SEA STOCK Dr
CAPITAL 54,040£

June	Brought Over —— 35,500£ —— Stock etc.		136,956. 12 —
1	Sold at 415 p.cent	2,500 ——	10,375 ——
	Sold at 410 p.cent	1,000 ——	4,100 ——
	Sold at 455 p.cent	1,000 ——	4,550 ——
	Sold at 450 p.cent	1,000 ——	4,500 ——
		41,000	160,481. 12 —

CONTRA CRED[r]

May		Brought Over				96,848. 2. 0
	24	300	Annuities at 4 p.cent	D at 97	p.cent	292. 10 —
	27	10000	do.	D at 98	p.cent	9,800 ———
		4700	do.	D at 98	p.cent	4,606 ———
		700	do.	D at 98	p.C	686 ———
		42 . 4 . 2 —	do.	D at 97¾	p.C	41. 5. 6
		1000	do.	D at 97¾	p.C	977. 10 —
		6200	do.	D at 98	p.C	6,076 ———
		55000	do.	D at 98	p.C	5,390 ———
		1000	do.	3[d]G at 98	p.C	980 ———
		100	do.	3[d]G at 98	p.C	98 ———
		200	do.	3[d]G at 98	p.C	196 ———
		500	do.	3[d]G at 98	p.C	490 ———
	31	5000	do.	D at 98	p.C	4,900 ———
		100	do.	D at 97½	p.C	97. 10 —
		3000	do.	D at 98	p.C	2,940 ———
		160	do.	3[d]G at 97½	p.C	156 ———
		300	do.	3[d]G at 97½	p.C	292. 10 —
		700	do.	3[d]G at 97⅞	p.C	685. 2. 6
June		500	do.	3[d]G at 97½	p.C	487. 10 —
	1	600	do.	D at 97½	p.C	585 ———
		500	do.	D at 97¾	p.C	488. 15 —
	2	1000	do.	D at 98	p.C	980 ———
		1500	do.	D at 97½	p.C	1,462. 10 —
		6000	do.	D at 97¾	p.C	5,865 ———
		632 . 15 . 4	do.	D at 97¾	p.C	618. 10. 4
		300	do.	D at 97¾	p.C	293. 5 —
		700	do.	3[d]G at 97¾	p.C	684. 5 —
						147,017. 5. 4

[Folio 5]

SOUTH SEA STOCK)
CAPITAL 54,040£) Dr

June		Brought Over	41,000	Stock at	160,481. 12 —
	3	Sold at 522 p.C	1,000	———	5,220 ———
		Sold at 522 p.C	1,000	———	5,220 ———
		Sold at 525 p.C	1,000	———	5,250 ———
	5	Sold at 528 p.C	2,000	———	10,560 ———
		Sold at 527 p.C	1,000	———	5,270 ———
		Sold at 545 p.C	1,000	———	5,450 ———
		Sold at 545 p.C	1,000	———	5,450 ———
		Sold at 548 p.C	1,000	———	5,480 ———
			50,000		208,381. 12 —

CONTRA CRED^{r}

		£	s.	d.
June	Brought Over	147,017.	5.	4
2	400 Annuit. 4 p.Cent D 98 p.Cent	392	——	
	100 —— do. —— D 98 p.C	98	——	
	500 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 98 p.C	490	——	
	1,350 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 98 p.C	1,323	——	
	1,000 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 98 p.C	980	——	
	1,000 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97$\frac{3}{4}$ p.C	977.	10	—
	700 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	682.	10	—
	2,500 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	2,437.	10	—
	1,000 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	975	——	
	100 —— do. —— D 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	97.	10	—
	400 —— do. —— D 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	390	——	
3	500 —— do. —— D 98 p.C	490	——	
	4,000 —— do. —— D 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	3,900	——	
	1,000 —— do. —— D 97$\frac{1}{4}$ p.C	972.	10	—
	300 —— do. —— D 97 p.C	291	——	
	200 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97 p.C	194	——	
	500 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97 p.C	485	——	
	100 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97 p.C	97	——	
9	1,000 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 98 p.C	980	——	
	3,500 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97$\frac{1}{4}$ p.C	3,403.	15	—
	300 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	292.	10	—
	700 —— do. —— D 97$\frac{1}{2}$ p.C	682.	10	—
	600 —— do. —— D 97$\frac{1}{4}$ p.C	583.	10	—
10	100 —— do. —— D 97 p.C	97	——	
	600 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97 p.C	582	——	
	200 —— do. —— 3^{d}G 97 p.C	194	——	
	500 —— do. —— D 97 p.C	485	——	
		169,590.	0.	4

[Folio 6]

SOUTH SEA STOCK)
CAPITAL 54,040£) Dr

June	Brought Over	50,000£ Stock, at	208,381. 12 —
10	Sold at 600 p.Cent	2,000 ———	12,000 ———
	Sold at 600 p.C	2,000 ———	12,000 ———
14	Sold at 525 p.C	40 ———	210 ———
		54,040£ Stock	232,591. 12 —
	Sold out 1,000 Annuities at 4 p.C at 96¾ p.C		967. 10 —
	To Continuations on S°Sea Stock) including 100£ from Mr. Pringle)		869 ———
			234,428. 2 —

CONTRA CRED^{r}

June	Brought Over		169,590. 0. 4
14	1,300 Annuit. at 4 p.C	3^{d}G at 97½ p.C	1,264. 5 —
	200 ——— do. ———	3^{d}G at 96¾ p.C	193. 10 —
	300 ——— do. ———	D at 96¾ p.C	290. 5 —
	3,000 ——— do. ———	D at 96¾ p.C	2,902. 10 —
	500 ——— do. ———	D at 96¾ p.C	483. 15 —
*15	1,000 ——— do. ———	3^{d}G at 96¾ p.C	967. 10 —
	1,500 ——— do. ———	3^{d}G at 96⅞ p.C	1,453. 2. 6
	3,000 ——— do. ———	D at 96¾ p.C	2,902. 10 —
	2,000 Lottery Annuities at 5 p.C at		97¼ 1,945 ———
16	1,000 Annuit. at 4 p.C	3^{d}G at 97¼	972. 10 —
17	3,200 ——— do. ———	3^{d}G at 96 p.C	3,072 ———
	1,200 ——— do. ———	3^{d}G at 95 p.C	1,140 ———
	800 ——— do. ———	D at 96 p.C	768 ———
21	1,000 ——— do. ———	D at 95 p.C	950 ———
			188,894. 17. 10
	By 2,000 S^{o}Sea Stock taken in for Wm Lock and of interest included at 550 p.C.		11,000 ———
	By 2,000 do. for Wm Bell at 750 p.Cent		15,000 ———
	By 1,000 do. for do. at 770 p.Cent		7,700 ———
	By 1,000 do. for Tho. Page at 760 p.C		7,600 ———
	The Int. on Mr. Bates' and Mr. Page's is 46 p.C and not included in the price above		
			230,194. 17. 10
	Due to Ballance		4,233. 4. 2
	Total of 4 p.Cents 179,566,11,4		
	Total of 5 p.Cents 8,000,		234,428. 2 —

Reviews.

The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World, by H. Kraemer (Edinburgh House Press, 8s. 6d.)

In preparation for the World Missionary Conference to be held at Madras this year, the International Missionary Council invited Dr. Hendrik Kraemer to write this book dealing with the theme of "The Witness of the Church". The author is very conscious of his limitations for such a task, since no one man can be fully acquainted with the problems of all Mission Fields, but the reader is only conscious of the vast range and depth of the author's knowledge, and of his magnificent justification of the Council's choice. That a Professor of the History of Religions should display a profound knowledge of the non-Christian religions, and should give us a penetrating review of the spirit and genius of these faiths that would of itself make this a valuable work, is not surprising, but to this Dr. Kraemer adds the qualities of a philosopher, a theologian, and a statesman. Yet none of these terms, nor all of them together, can adequately describe the great book he has produced, for it is pervaded by a spirit which far surpasses the learning and wisdom it displays. The vision of the Kingdom of God is before the author's eyes, and in his heart burns the desire to see the vision realised. Yet never does he allow his zeal to blind him to facts, and the balanced judgment displayed throughout the work is beyond praise.

A generation ago missionary leaders talked of "the evangelisation of the world in this generation." No longer does Dr. Kraemer hold such an exuberant hope before us, for he has a juster appreciation of the forces ranged against us. He analyses faithfully all the causes of the disillusionment of the hour, whether found in the many troublous currents in our western world, or in the political and intellectual ferment in the lands where Missions are at work. He exposes the strength of the various non-Christian religions, and the weakness often manifest in our witness. Yet if any reader of these lines should suppose that this is a book of despair, and that he will rise from reading it with a sense of the hopelessness of the Christian task, he will be completely mistaken. For while the vastness and difficulty of our task are set forth with the utmost plainness, Dr. Kraemer has given us a book which inspires hope and confidence, a book which reminds us of the greatness of our resources in the Gospel, and of the complete relevance of the Gospel to the needs of men everywhere in this bewildered age.

To traverse all the ground covered in this book would be

far beyond the scope of this review, and the reviewer may be pardoned for singling out those things which seem to him of special significance. That there have been divisions of opinion within missionary circles on larger matters of policy in recent years is well known. Dr. Kraemer does not burk the issues they have raised, but seeks to clarify the confusions out of which they have sprung. He exposes the fundamental error of those who have urged that in Mission lands the Scriptures of the non-Christian faiths should replace the Old Testament as the preparation for the Gospel, and equally the folly of those who have held that by the pooling of faith and experience Christian and non-Christian should co-operate to achieve some new and richer thing. He expresses his firm rejection of the view that proselytism is something of which the Church should be ashamed, and that social and philanthropic service is an end in itself. Of all these rejected attitudes the reviewer has had personal experience, and he is well aware that the author's views will not command unqualified approval in all quarters. But of their essential soundness he is fully assured. Deep and sympathetic study of the culture, faith and outlook of the non-Christian world, the glad recognition that "God hath not left Himself without witness" amongst men, eager participation in educational social, or philanthropic work, are all fully consistent with a deep and firm grasp on what Dr. Kraemer repeatedly calls Biblical realism. The Church is charged with the message that God "so passionately wants contact with man" that He "goes to the length of the Incarnation," and sends His Church forth to testify of "the creative and redemptive Will of the living, holy, righteous God of Love."

Admirably is the many-sidedness of the task of the Church brought out. It has to make individual disciples, gladly and unashamedly; but it has also to establish Churches, and to transform cultures, to touch life at every point, and to refashion all it touches. Before such a task the Church might well quail, until it remembers that it is not self-assigned. Never must we lose a theocentric attitude, or forget the Lord Who sends His people forth to their vast enterprise. Such an attitude alone can save us from the superiority complex which some have shown, and from the false humility of a common seeker with the non-Christian after Truth to which others have turned. "The real Christian contention is not: 'We have the revelation and not you,' but pointing gratefully and humbly to Christ: 'It has pleased God to reveal Himself fully and decisively in Christ; repent, believe and adore'." The very sense of humble wonder that God has committed to him this amazing message will keep the messenger from compromising its grandeur, or forgetting

its uniqueness, for he will realise that to depreciate his message or his Master is not humility, but disloyalty.

For this great book a wide circulation is assured, and it is earnestly to be hoped that it will everywhere exercise its ministry to clarify thought, to quicken faith, to awaken zeal, and that its wisdom, sobriety and confidence will direct the witness of the Church into fruitful channels during the coming years.

H. H. Rowley.

The History of Israel: its Facts and Factors, by H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D. (Duckworth, 5s.)

In no field of theological learning are the Baptists better represented than in that of the Old Testament, and of their scholars in this field none enjoys greater repute than Principal Wheeler Robinson. Hitherto his chief contributions have been concerned with the psychology of the Hebrews and the theology of the Old Testament, where he is without rival amongst British scholars. He has now given us a short *History of Israel* as a worthy companion to his *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.* Of the need for such a work every teacher is aware. For the advanced student we have the large-scale work of Oesterley and Robinson, whose volume on the pre-exilic period issued from the pen of another Baptist, Professor Theodore Robinson, but we have lacked a short work, abreast of modern scholarship, to serve for less specialised readers. That need is now admirably supplied in this work. Terse and judicious, accurate and informed, it will provide for all who study it reliable guidance through the many problems that surround Israelite history.

Curiously enough, but a few weeks before Dr. Robinson's book appeared, yet another Baptist work on the same subject was published, in Mr. J. N. Schofield's *Historical Background of the Bible.* These two almost simultaneously issued works are so different in design and interest, however, that they will supplement, rather than rival, one another. Mr. Schofield's is more concerned with archaeological material than Dr. Robinson's, which seeks rather to find the spirit of Israel in her history, and which culminates in a chapter on the philosophy of history. Interest in this subject peeps out at several points, as on p. 199, where he says: "The dependence of the future history of the world on the relations of this absolutely unprincipled pair (Herod and Cleopatra) is suggestive, and raises interesting questions for a philosophy of history."

On the vexed question of the date of the Exodus, Dr. Robinson presents a brief but balanced summary of the evidence, and decides in favour of the view that Ramses II. is the Pharaoh of the Oppression. In recent years a number of British writers have favoured an earlier date, and have sought to save the chronology of 1 Kings vi. 1 at the expense of much else in the Old Testament. I am persuaded that Dr. Robinson is right in holding to the later date, and I am glad to find that Mr. Schofield agrees with him in this.

In general, Dr. Robinson's work rests on a critically orthodox view of the Old Testament. Thus he accepts the account of Josiah's reform, and holds the Law-book on which it rested to be the book of Deuteronomy. Here Mr. Schofield differs from him, and dismisses the story of the reform as the propaganda of the historian, while relegating the book of Deuteronomy to a later age.

It is now nearly fifty years since Van Hoonacker argued that the traditional order of Ezra and Nehemiah should be reversed, and that in reality Nehemiah preceded Ezra by about half a century. For many years he secured little following, but recently this view has become almost general, and it is a satisfaction to find that Dr. Robinson attaches himself to it.

Less satisfying is his view that the more likely of the two accounts of Sennacherib's campaign against Jerusalem attributes the deliverance to the approach of the Ethiopians, while the less likely ascribes it to a supernatural visitation of the Assyrian camp. On this view Isaiah's word was completely falsified by events. For Dr. Robinson points out that the prophet in his confidence in Yahweh dismissed with courteous detachment the Ethiopian envoys, and spoke with scorn of the Egyptian aid that was promised. I find it hard to doubt that Isaiah was vindicated, and that the Egyptian aid proved vain, while effective deliverance came through the outbreak of plague in the Assyrian camp. It was the way of Yahweh to use such agencies, and as our fathers found the hand of God in the storm which discomfited the Spanish Armada, so the Hebrews saw in the plague the evidence of the divine intervention in history.

A query may be raised on another point, this time a very trifling point of chronology. On p. 51 it is said that the Ark remained at Kirjath-jearim for twenty years, and it would seem to be implied that this was the total time it was there. The figure, of course, is taken from 1 Samuel vii. 2, where it is given as the time between the placing of the Ark there and the renewal of religious loyalty, leading to the deliverance under Samuel. The figure belongs, therefore, to the same pragmatic chronology as that of the book of Judges, and shares in its artificiality. And

if it provides no authoritative estimate of the period it professes to define, it can scarcely be used as authoritative for a wholly different period, to which it makes no reference. For when the Ark was captured by the Philistines, but a few months before it was placed in Kirjath-jearim, Samuel was still quite young, whereas he had already died as an old man before the Ark was taken away from Kirjath-jearim. In the tradition itself, therefore, much more than twenty years is implied. Radical criticism of the infancy narratives of Samuel might turn the edge of this argument, but it would not at the same time establish the reliability of the "twenty years" of 1 Samuel vii. 2.

Only those who have worked at the problems of the Old Testament know how intricate they are, and the fact that it is only at so few points that I want to question Dr. Robinson's judgment is the strongest evidence of the satisfaction I have found in his work.

On the post-exilic period, with its growing exclusiveness, he remarks with fine penetration, "Within the hard shell of the exclusive community, the kernel of prophetic aims to some extent found protection," while a sound estimate of the importance of Pharisaism dictates the observation that the Samaritan community "shows us what the post-exilic Judaism might have become without the larger outlook and enthusiasm of the Pharisees." In both cases a popular misconception is quietly corrected in a truer appreciation of the spirit of Judaism.

It should be added that the sobriety of Dr. Robinson's judgment is matched by the lucidity of his style. Especially happy is he in some of his epigrammatic summaries, of which a single example must suffice: "The Exodus from Egypt gave Israel a religion; the settlement in Canaan gave them a land; the pressure of the Philistines gave them a king."

The study of this little book will do much more than acquaint the reader with the outline of Israel's story from the beginning to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. It will enable him to see the significance of the history, and especially its religious significance. In his final chapter, Dr. Robinson claims to have reconstructed the argument from prophecy in a new way. The older search for verbal resemblances and all its misplaced ingenuity has been, as he says, discredited, but instead of leaving its place vacant, Dr. Robinson points us to the broader evidence of the inner dynamic of the history as the revelation of the power and presence of God. In this he is but doing what the prophets themselves did. For to history they constantly appealed as the demonstration of the being and character of God, and in history they believed the sphere of His activity still lay.

H. H. Rowley.

The Historical Background of the Bible, by J. N. Schofield, M.A., B.D. (Thomas Nelson & Sons, 7s. 6d.)

This volume is the work of an able Baptist scholar who has had the advantage of some years' residence in Palestine and Egypt as an Army chaplain and is now the Lecturer in Old Testament Studies and Hebrew in Leeds University. It is written therefore by a specialist who has first-hand knowledge of the Near East. Clearly and skilfully the author discharges his task of providing a popular account of the history that lies behind the Bible record as this is reconstructed by modern scholarship. With due emphasis on significant events, the long story is unfolded from the earliest times to the revolt of Bar Koziba in A.D. 135. The narrative is introduced by a vivid chapter on the geographical background and is rounded off with a brief concluding section dealing with Palestine in the twentieth century. The latter is of special interest for those who wish for competent guidance on the history which is being made at the present time in the Holy Land. The book is well furnished with maps and photographs, which add considerably to its interest and usefulness. A select bibliography of recent literature is provided for those who wish to explore the subject further.

In view of the extensive archaeological researches which have been carried out in the Near East in recent years, it is not the least valuable feature of this book that it makes full use of them and estimates fairly their bearing on the historical study of the Bible. Most of the photographs reproduced in it are designed to illustrate this side of the subject.

No one who studies this book with due care can do otherwise than go back to the Bible with fresh insight into its meaning and message. This is just the volume to put into the hands of those who realise that the Biblical revelation is rooted and grounded in history, and desire to grasp clearly the course and main features of the history that underlies it. But the general reader should be warned that a popular book which renounces technical discussion is bound to appear more dogmatic than it really is. Many of the conclusions given here cannot be taken as final nor do they always represent the majority opinion of the experts. Readers may be assured, however, that this review of the Bible history is in the main that which is generally accepted by modern scholars. Mr. Schofield has shown himself an admirable workman in his chosen field and his book deserves a cordial reception. This is his first book and it warrants the hope that other works from his pen will be forthcoming.

W. E. Hough.

The Church through the Centuries, by Cyril Charles Richardson. 255pp. (Charles Scribner's Sons, Ltd., New York and London, 8s. 6d.)

Dr. C. C. Richardson, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, who is Assistant Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, New York, has taken as his subject one that is bound to receive increasing attention. He sets himself the task of tracing the history of the concept "Church" from the first century A.D. through the changes brought by the Middle Ages and by way of the teaching of the Reformers to modern times. He has produced a readable and graphic narrative, saved from being too general and vague in its statements by useful examples of different types of Christian life and worship through the centuries. Throughout Dr. Richardson has in mind the problems and issues of our own day. He regards as "the really vital problem for Christians to-day: What can and ought the Church to mean for our generation?", and the fact that his own answer to the question is not very clear and satisfying does not mean that he has not succeeded in producing a very serviceable book.

Such a study is important for at least three reasons. In many different parts of the world to-day the question of the right relation of the Church to the Community and to the State is of growing urgency. Secondly, the development of recent years of the "Oecumenical Movement" among Christians has brought into prominence the very diverse conceptions of the Church which are to be found in Christian tradition and still powerful in different ecclesiastical groupings. Dr. Richardson devotes the last fifteen pages of his book to a sympathetic but probably over-optimistic account of recent "Reunion" movements. It is a little too early to assess their historical significance, though very valuable to set them against the long background of Christian history. Thirdly, and of greatest importance, varying conceptions of the Church involve varying interpretations of the Gospel. Not a great deal of attention is given to this aspect of the matter in this book and this is one of its weaknesses. It has been prepared mainly for American readers, but the section on American Protestantism will be found useful by those in this country also, while Nonconformists will welcome the amount of space given to the Reformation sects and to Free Church life generally. There might well have been more extended reference to the expansion of Christianity in Asia and Africa during the last hundred years. The list of books for further reading has some curious inclusions and omissions. For example, the recent Anglican Report on Doctrine is included, but not the series of volumes issued in connection with the Oxford Conference. In spite of these points,

however, Dr. Richardson has produced a useful and stimulating volume, covering a wide field with care and discrimination.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Paul of Tarsus, by T. Reaveley Glover, M.A., D.D. (Student Christian Movement Press. Torch Library, 3s. 6d.)

The Cross of Job, by H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D. (Student Christian Movement Press. Religion and Life Books, 1s.)

The Student Christian Movement is doing an excellent service by its cheap reprints of former publications, a service especially valuable in cases where the original edition is unobtainable. Dr. Robinson's brief study of Job, marked by his penetrating and always human scholarship, lights up the contribution of the book to the problem of suffering, emphasising the note of the prologue that such suffering fulfils a purpose that exists in the mind and will of God. Dr. Glover's book on Paul is a delight to re-read, full of suggestion both for the student and the preacher, throwing into relief both the greatness of Paul's creative genius and the enormously interesting personality of this man who was "apprehended of Christ Jesus."

W. TAYLOR BOWIE.

A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships, by Allan Barr, M.A. (T. & T. Clark, 4s.)

This unique four-colour diagram is based upon a minute study of the Greek text, and it has been designed to assist the reader of the Synoptic Gospels by giving an accurate presentation of their relationships in a single conspectus, and by line and colour to contribute to the student's understanding of Synoptic questions. The value of the diagram is enhanced by explicit directions for its use and by a brief survey of the Synoptic Problem.

Peace and the Churches, by Irene Marinoff, Ph.D. (Independent Press, 1s.)

This booklet is the first-fruits of the Jessie Stewart Spicer Peace Fellowship, which was founded by the eleven children of the late Sir Albert and Lady Spicer in memory of their mother. Dr. Marinoff was the first holder of the Fellowship, and she sets out and discusses the main factors of the greatest problem of the day. Peace, she suggests, is something far greater than the absence of war, and dynamic peace can only be realised by the

creation of an international order which will guarantee a peaceful revision of treaties and the settlement of just claims without resorting to arms. She recognises that at least three standpoints are sincerely and conscientiously held by Christians: (1) that war is always sin; (2) that there are "just" wars; (3) that the State is a Divine Order and therefore unconditional support of one's country is a Christian duty. Amid the many booklets and pamphlets on this question, this is one of the most useful.

Thirty-five to Fifty, by Albert Peel, M.A., D.Litt. (Independent Press, 5s.)

One reading does not exhaust this book, it will take its place among those to which a return can be made. "Contrasts make up life," says Dr. Peel, and his life has been enriched by many varied interests. Most of the essays have appeared in the *Congregational Quarterly*, and the sectional headings indicate something of their wide range—Statesmen and Scholars, Pastor and People, Men and Books, Work and Play, and others. We should like to quote many of Dr. Peel's quotations and observations, but must forbear.

Somehow, amid all his historical research, and book reviewing, and literary work, and cricket, Dr. Peel found time to maintain an active ministry in one of the most crowded districts of London, and his pastoral experiences are never far from him. "The minister who goes from a wedding to a funeral, or from a home where a life has just ended to another where a baby has just received a joyous welcome, knows well life's light and shade, the black and white squares which make its chequer board."

The cricket chapters are delightful. But Dr. Peel is a Yorkshireman, and to him Yorkshire cricket *is* cricket. Well, is it? Cricket is a game, not a business of dour efficiency. Owning as loyal an allegiance to another county, I suggest that, for playing cricket as it should be played over a long period of years, Gloucestershire would be first, Middlesex second, and Yorkshire among the also rans! And, of course, the West Country trio, "W.G.," "The Croucher," and Wally Hammond, stand supreme.

EDITOR.