

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

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

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

Editorial.

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

Mr. R. Wilson Black, J.P.	Mr. W. R. Russill.
Mr. W. Cunningham, J.P.	Mr. C. W. B. Simmonds
Mr. F. Cursons, J.P.	Rev. R. W. Thomson.

* * * *

BELLE CASTLE CHURCH, JAMAICA.

On the 14th August, 1938, the Baptist Historical Society was linked with the Belle Castle Church, Hector's River, Jamaica, in a ceremony whose message will literally go ringing down the years. When the secretary was in Jamaica twelve months ago, the minister, the Rev. F. Wilson Coore, lamented that the Belle Castle Church, unlike other Baptist churches, lacked a bell. Here, he plaintively remarked, was his church at Hector's River, in a most beautiful situation high on a hill overlooking the sparkling waters of the Caribbean, serving the people of two or three valleys, but possessing no bell with which to call them to worship. Shortly after the secretary's return to England, the minister wrote earnestly reminding him of the need; and, in the spring of this year, he wrote again, and this time suggested that the bell should be given in connection with the Emancipation Centenary Celebrations.

The need was mentioned to a few members of our Society who forthwith subscribed the cost, with the result that the bell was specially cast, transported across the Atlantic, and dedicated at a special service at which our member, the Rev. Henry Cook, M.A., was the preacher, and another member, Mr. C. W. B. Simmonds, among those present. At the close the people gave themselves to the joyful task of ringing the bell one hundred times to welcome the second century of Emancipation, the first "ring" being pulled by Miss Mauvis King, daughter of Dr. Gurnos King, Principal of Calabar College and of Calabar Boys' High School. Very joyously our friends at Belle Castle entered into the spirit of the verse—

Whene'er the sweet church bell
Peals over hill and dell,
 May Jesus Christ be praised;
As joyously it rings,
O haste, to what it sings,
 May Jesus Christ be praised.

Christmas Evans, 1766-1838.

THE preaching of the Gospel has been a primary factor in the development of modern Wales and, despite the changes of the last few decades, it is true to say that instructed people gratefully acknowledge the fact.

There were some eminent preachers in the land during the seventeenth century, and we owe them much, but it was the great Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century which established the preacher in his place of national regard. Wales, for the most part, became decidedly Protestant and Nonconformist, and henceforth, and for long years, the pulpit became the place of power in practically every town, village and district. The preacher's holy office was honoured beyond any other and its occupancy became a coveted privilege, accorded only to those whose gifts and consecration gave ground for believing them to be called of God. Every denomination had its good preachers and an occasional great preacher, whose fame and influence, transcending local and denominational barriers or restrictions, spread throughout the country, discussed and beloved and revered.

A truly great preacher is one of God's choicest gifts to the Christian Church, and perhaps (as someone has suggested) His last resort in His endeavour to save His people from their sins and to establish them in the blessedness of the Faith. Such a preacher was Daniel Rowlands (1730-1790), of Llangeitho, Cardiganshire—in my judgment the greatest of all the great preachers of Wales, a preacher so great that I know of none greater anywhere. But these assessments of "great," "greater," "greatest" must always be made with diffidence rather than with confidence.

Towards the close of the eighteenth and during the early decades of the nineteenth century Wales was blessed with three outstanding preachers—an indissoluble triumvirate: John Elias of Anglesey (1774-1841), a Calvinistic Methodist; Christmas Evans (1766-1838), a Baptist; and William Williams of Wern (1781-1840), an Independent. All three were men of national reputation, honoured throughout religious Wales, and even by the irreligious. Each had his own distinctive gifts and excellence and, in mutual appreciation and friendship, they wrought with all their splendid might for the progress of the Gospel in the land. Of these three it is fair to say that Christmas Evans was the best known, and to that extent the most influential. Perhaps he is the best known, to fame, of all Welsh preachers. He has had English biographers; he published a

number of booklets and many sermons; some of his sermons have been translated into English, one of them (on the text Romans v. 15) being included, with a notice and portrait, in Dr. Henry C. Fish's *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*. His fame has travelled far beyond Wales and the British Isles, and his career is said to have given a powerful stimulus to the American Evangelist, D. L. Moody.

It was at Esgairwen, in the parish of Llandyssul, Cardiganshire, that this celebrated man was born, on Christmas Day, 1766. His parents were respectable (his father being a shoemaker and his mother a farmer's daughter), but too poor to send him to school. He lost his father when nine years of age, after which he was sent to live on a Carmarthenshire farm with an uncle who promised to look after him in return for such "odd jobs" as a boy could do. "Seldom," said Christmas Evans afterwards, "could I find in the whole range of this bad world a more wicked example, and a more ungodly man." Six years later he returned to his native county and found work, here and there, as a farm-hand. He had been an imaginative child, and some early impressions of a serious kind were not wholly obliterated by the harsh experience of subsequent years. Indeed, they were strengthened by some boyish misadventures which might easily have cost him his life. They helped to keep alive a sense of "religion," and they fostered a sort of conviction that he was destined for something worth while.

When Christmas Evans was about eighteen years of age a religious awakening stirred the youth of the neighbourhood and he was led to attend, and then to join, the historic "Presbyterian" Church of Llwynrhydowen. The minister of this Church was the Rev. David Davies, of Castell Hywel, one of the best classical scholars of contemporary Wales and a distinguished bard, whose Welsh translation of Gray's *Elegy* is said by competent judges to be at least worthy of the stately original. He was also eminent as a schoolmaster, and many of his pupils went straight into the ministry of the Established Church—too many for the liking of Bishop Horsley, who announced that he would ordain no more. Mr. Davies's doctrinal views, however, and those of the Church as a whole, were, or tended towards, what we now call Unitarianism.

Up to this time Christmas Evans was unable to read—it seems incredible—but quickened religious aspirations, in his case as with others in every generation, resulted in a longing for knowledge and education. Few of his associates could read, and a class was formed for their general benefit. There and thus he was initiated into the inexhaustible riches of the Welsh Bible. He seems also to have acquired a little English. Mr. Davies took

a new interest in him and admitted him into his school or "academy," where he "went through the Latin Grammar." This was all the formal schooling that he ever received, and it lasted for only six months. He was too poor to stay longer.

Soon after joining the Church he was invited to take a public part in cottage prayer-meetings, and this led to his being urged to say a few words of exhortation, "to which," he says, "I felt a strong inclination, though I was in utter ignorance of spiritual things." So it was in a country cottage that Christmas Evans preached his first sermon. Eager and earnest as he was, however, his understanding of the Gospel was seriously defective. The Lord Jesus Christ is possessed of a grace and a redemptive power of which he was then unaware. Even so, he was, to the discerning, more than just a young man of promise. There was in him, and in his preaching, the presage of future eminence, perhaps of greatness.

After leaving "school" he went into Herefordshire as a worker in the harvest-fields, presumably in order to earn sufficient money for another term later on. It proved to be an unhappy experience, and it might have been disastrous. If it improved his English it retarded the growth of his spiritual life. He found his field-companions uncongenial and he took no part in behaviour that he considered wrong. This aroused their resentment, and one night five or six of them attacked and beat him unmercifully, leaving him as dead. It was then that he lost his right eye. "He has only one eye," said someone to Robert Hall. "Yes, sir," he replied, "but that's a piercer; an eye, sir, that could light an army through a wilderness on a dark night." On another occasion Hall called it "more properly a brilliant star, it shone like Venus." He counted Christmas Evans "the tallest, the stoutest and the greatest man he ever saw."

He resumed his old life at Llwynrhydowen, working on a farm, but he was restless and frequently depressed, distrustful of his condition in the sight of God. He became unsettled about Baptism and failed to find New Testament precedent or sanction for infant baptism, although he searched diligently. On the other hand, he found plenty of plain evidence for Believers' Baptism by immersion, and conviction at length came to him and held him fast. He was baptised in the river Duar, in 1788, by the Rev. Timothy Thomas, whose Church at Aberduar, in the parish of Llanybyther, Carmarthenshire, he joined. Timothy Thomas was himself a man of considerable eminence, and it meant a great deal to "sit under" his ministry.

The atmosphere at Aberduar was charged with an unwonted warmth and fervour. The services were hearty to the pitch of enthusiasm, and the rather chilled spirit of Christmas Evans

reacted to the glow. The Person of the Lord Jesus Christ became more precious and glorious in his eyes, and he was led into clearer perception of the potent efficacies of His Cross. The evangelical preaching that he heard at Aberduar, and elsewhere, at this time, was blessed of God to his soul; his own preaching acquired a deeper, stronger spirituality.

In 1789 he attended a Baptist Association at Maesyberllan, near Brecon, and there he met some preachers from North Wales who spoke to him of its needs and opportunities. He accepted their invitation to return with them, and so the way opened to his first pastorate—that of the group of little Churches in the Lleyn peninsula, Caernarvonshire. He was ordained at Salem, Tyndonen. In that same year (1789) on October 23rd, he married Miss Catherine Jones, a young and devout member of his Church. She was an admirable woman, and he owed a great deal to her loving care.

His ministry in Lleyn was productive of much that was distinctive of his subsequent career. The living was meagre and his toil was excessive (he often preached five times, and tramped twenty miles on Sundays), but he survived all the strain and grew steadily towards the fullness of his proper stature. He lost much of his old restlessness and depression, and found inward assurance in the Faith that he was preaching with such obvious acceptance to his increasing congregations. His ministry was being abundantly blessed. He changed the style of his preaching, giving it a more distinctive and individual character, mainly through the influence of the Rev. Robert Roberts, of Clynnog, Caernarvonshire, a celebrated and seraphic Calvinistic Methodist preacher. After listening to him—intense, vivid, picturesque, dramatic—he decided that he, too, could preach like that, and he determined henceforth to be himself and to use his imagination and his gift for dramatic portrayal. There is a sense in which we owe the Christmas Evans of history to Robert Roberts, Clynnog.

Nor did he confine his ministry to Lleyn. He undertook a preaching journey as far as Pembrokeshire, travelling down through West Wales and preaching daily, or frequently, on the way. Great crowds attended his ministry, often thronging the chapels, and many people followed him for miles, from one service to another. It was prophetic of still greater things to come.

On Christmas Day, 1792, Christmas Evans left for Anglesey, deeply regretted in Lleyn but convinced of Divine guidance, and there he was to settle for nearly thirty-four laborious but beneficent and fruitful years. It is as "Christmas Evans of Anglesey" that he became known to Wales at large.

The Baptist movement in Anglesey owed much to South Wales enterprise, and for a time it made substantial progress. Then troubles arose within the fellowship, and the result was that Christmas Evans had to face a crop of difficulties which would have deterred a man of less faith and courage. There was one Church, meeting at Llangefni, with a chapel at Capel Newydd and eight preaching stations in different parts of the island. When he left Anglesey these had increased to twenty, and there were twenty-eight preachers, ordained and lay. He was the "Baptist Bishop," with superintendence over all branches, and he lived at Cildwrn, Llangefni. For many years his "salary" was only £17 per annum; never more than £30. But there were, and must have been, some "extras." Out of his poverty he contributed regularly and generously to the B.M.S. and to other "good causes," including Abergavenny Academy.

It is significant that, after his arrival, he arranged for a day of humiliation (with prayer and fasting) before God, at Llanerchymedd. It was a blessed day and it led to further blessings.

In 1793 Christmas Evans made a second preaching tour into South Wales, and a third the following year. It was during this third visit (1794) that he leapt into denominational prominence. He had been invited to preach at an Association in Felinfoel, Llanelly, Caermarthenshire—involving a journey of two hundred miles—and his sermon on that occasion, on the Prodigal Son, created such an impression upon the assembled thousands that his name spread far and wide. He became, almost at once, the leading preacher of his denomination, and thereafter no Welsh Association was considered complete without him. Year after year, to the close of his life, he was an acknowledged "master" in those great assemblies which have been such a notable feature of Welsh religion. Held in the open air, with a platform for the preachers, they were attended by thousands of people gathered from a wide area. They offered a grand opportunity for Gospel preaching and, by the grace of God, those opportunities were often greatly used. Wales owes much to these open-air assemblies. They are still held, and popular, in some parts of the country, but their "glory" is not what it was.

We cannot follow in detail the course of Christmas Evans's life during his Anglesey ministry. He drank deeply of sorrow as well as of joy—"the care of all the Churches" weighed upon mind and heart. His life was exceedingly hard, with little relief from the pressure of grim poverty, taxing faith in the providence of God. There was the bleak period of the Sandemanian (or Glassite) heresy, and then doctrinal controversy upon such matters as Calvinism and the extent of the efficacy of the Atonement.

ment. And always there seemed to be the burden of Chapel-debts (consequent upon necessary Chapel-building), which devolved upon him as upon nobody else, and which he so loyally shouldered and strove to discharge. But he steadfastly pursued his task, and, by the grace of God, the Churches increased and multiplied, and he had many periods of inward peace and blessedness. It was a truly strenuous life of "plain living and high thinking," with his available time methodically planned and conscientiously used in prayer, study, writing, preaching, meetings of all sorts and frequent travelling, mostly on foot. Certainly he had banished idleness from his bones. The marvel is that he did so much so well and for so long.

In 1823 he lost his devout and devoted wife—a disabling loss.

In 1826 he accepted an invitation to the pastorate of Tony-felin, Caerphilly, Glamorgan, and there again, as before in Anglesey, his first call to the Church was a summons to prayer, that they unite in earnest entreaty for the blessing of God. His preaching at Caerphilly attained to a power perhaps unequalled in his past ministry, and he had the joy of baptising and receiving into Church fellowship at least one hundred and forty people during his brief stay. Christmas Evans considered his two years there as among the happiest years of his life. It was his first experience of a single charge with the duty of preaching to the same congregation Sunday after Sunday, and it says much for the vigour and fertility of his mind that, at sixty years of age, he was able to meet the situation so successfully.

During this period, too, he married again. His second wife was his housekeeper, Mary Jones, of the old Anglesey days. She survived him and I understand that, in her old age, and out of regard for the memory of Christmas Evans, C. H. Spurgeon secured for her a small allowance from an English Baptist fund.

In 1828 he removed to the Tabernacle, Cardiff, and in 1832 he returned to North Wales, undertaking the onerous pastorate of Caersalem, Caernarvon. Once more he found himself saddled with a crushing Chapel-debt, and it was in a final effort to clear it that he died. After collecting what he could in North Wales he turned, in the spring of 1838, to the Churches of South Wales, making his last "sacrifice for the cause of the Redeemer." He sent a moving "exhortation" beforehand, explaining the situation at Caernarvon, and soliciting their sympathy and support. His itinerary, with its list of "publications," is on record. It was an arduous and a hazardous undertaking for an old and enfeebled man in precarious health, committing him to "journeyings oft" and long, and to preaching several times a week over the period May 1st to September 30th. His wife and a friend accompanied him, and he was gladdened by the

warmth of his welcome. Arriving in Monmouthshire, he proceeded to the Association meetings at Argoed, and there he preached his last Association sermon, from the text Ephesians ii. 8. Illness detained him at Tredegar for a week, after which he revisited his old Churches at Caerphilly and Cardiff. He was in Swansea by July 14th (a Saturday), and on the Sunday he preached in Bethesda Welsh Baptist Chapel, both morning and evening. The following evening (Monday) he was at Mount Pleasant, Swansea, where he preached an English sermon from the text: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name" (St. Luke xxiv. 47). It is said that he preached "very happily" but, when he was descending from the pulpit, he was heard to declare: "This is my last sermon." So it proved, whatever he may have meant by the words. That night he was taken ill, and at 4 o'clock on Thursday morning, July 19th, 1838, he passed hence to his adored Saviour. Shortly before he died he thanked his host, the Rev. Daniel Davies, of Bethesda, Swansea, for his kindness, and then he said to him and to his fellow-traveller from North Wales (Mr. John Hughes, Ruthin): "I am leaving you; for fifty-three years have I laboured in the sanctuary and my comfort and confidence on this solemn occasion are that I never laboured without blood in the vessel. Preach Christ to the people, dear brethren. If you look upon me as I appear in my preaching, I am lost for ever; but if you look at me in Christ, I am in heaven and am saved." He spoke, of course, in Welsh, and then he triumphantly recited a verse from a grand Welsh hymn, after which, as if stepping into some heavenly chariot, he waved his hand and called out: "Good-bye, drive on." So died Christmas Evans.

The funeral, on the following Monday, July 23rd, was attended by a vast concourse of people, and his body was reverently laid to rest in the burial-ground attached to Bethesda Chapel. The news of his passing plunged the whole of religious Wales into sorrow, and crowded memorial services throughout the length and breadth of the land bore testimony to the honour in which he was held. Men knew that Wales had lost one of the noblest and most gifted of her sons.

It seems safe to prophesy that his fame is undying; it is quite certain that "he, being dead, yet speaketh." The Welsh Baptist Union has recently celebrated, in a worthy way, the centenary of his death, and it is fitting that the celebrations should have been held when the Union met, for this year's Assembly, at Caernarvon.

The foregoing narrative of the course of his life may serve to show, at least in some measure, the kind of man Christmas Evans was, but something should be attempted in the nature of

a survey, or perhaps an estimate, with an extract from one of his sermons by way of illustration.

His portrait was painted at least twice (one of them used to hang in Bristol Baptist College; I hope it is there still) and prints have been numerous. In his prime he was a big and robust man, of an impressive appearance, five feet eleven inches in height. His face (of a ruddy complexion) was open and friendly, with a suggestion of humour, and domed with a fine forehead, high and full. His one eye was large and lustrous, and prominently set in its socket. His voice, we are told, was strong rather than rich and melodious, but when his feelings were deeply stirred (and he was truly a man of warm and generous heart) it acquired a tone of sweet and moving pathos. Dramatic though he was in his preaching, there seems to have been little or no action or bodily movement, hardly more than a simple stretching forth of the hand, now and then. He had no "hwyl," as that term is generally understood, but at the height of inspiration his speech had a certain rhythmical intonation, quite individual and characteristic. On such occasions he would speak very fast and with an apparently irresistible momentum.

Christmas Evans's early disadvantages were too many and too prolonged, and his later opportunities were too few and limited, to allow of his becoming a "scholar" in the more technical sense, but it would be a mistake to suppose him an ill-educated man. On the contrary, we must call him an educated man. The historian Gibbon said that he had received two educations: one which others had given to him, and one which he had given to himself, and that of these two, the latter was by far the more important. Christmas Evans's formal education—his "schooling"—lasted for only six months, but thereafter (more especially after his settlement in Lleyn in 1789), to the end of his life, he was assiduous in self-culture. As Matthew Arnold reminded his generation, the instruments of culture are three: reading, observation and reflection (though not necessarily in that order). Christmas Evans never possessed a large library, and never had easy access to one, but he hungered for knowledge and we may say of him, as Alexander Whyte said of himself, that he read "like a famished wolf." He read constantly, at home and away from home, and although his circumstances restricted the range of his reading they strengthened its intensity. It *may* be better to make the most of a few good books than to read a larger number in a less thorough fashion. The staple of his reading was the Welsh Bible, and such "divinity" as John Owen, and he went to John Gill and others for his Biblical exposition. He rated Robert Haldane's *Romans* among the very best commentaries that he knew, earnestly recommending it to all

ministers, and he liked the commentaries of the American scholar, Moses Stuart. The writings of Andrew Fuller modified the rigidity of his earlier Calvinism, and he was very appreciative of the *Essays* of John Foster. In old age, when health was poor and his sight seriously affected, he read James Beattie's once-celebrated *Essay on Truth* and followed with eager attention the course of his argument against the scepticism of David Hume. As we should expect, he was a great lover, and a diligent student of John Bunyan; and he was familiar with the poetry of Milton and Young, and still more familiar with the Welsh hymns and songs of William Williams of Pantycelyn. He was very much interested in men and in great events, and he read as widely as he could in History and Biography. He knew a good deal of the literature of Wales (mostly, I suppose, its religious literature) and the style of his later writings is that of the cultivated and sensitive student. Nor must we forget that he achieved a working knowledge of Latin, Greek and Hebrew. For his Hebrew and his New Testament Greek he seems to have depended upon the now-forgotten but once-excellent *Lexicons* of John Parkhurst.

He lived in a country of magnificent beauty, romantic history and long cultural traditions, whose people had recently passed through a transforming religious experience. This country he knew thoroughly, and its people (with their wide variety of types) he knew intimately. He had been everywhere, north, south, east and west, on foot, on horseback and in a "gig," and as he travelled he had all sorts of experiences. He had an alert and sensitive mind and there was little that escaped his open and observant eye.

Reading and observation, together with experience, combined to provide him with abundant material for reflection, to which he gave long periods of time, not least when quietly travelling, often alone, through the spacious solitudes of the country. So he grew, and steadily matured, into his splendid stature of a man—not indeed a finished and accurate scholar, not perhaps even a learned man, but certainly a well-informed man, whose mind had been cultivated to become the capable instrument of his genius.

His brightest talent was his *imagination*, and this he possessed to a degree truly amounting to genius. Herein he has been compared with Milton, Bunyan and Jean Paul Richter. Each of these comparisons has a measure of aptness, but his closest affinities are with Bunyan. He had a copious vocabulary, readily subservient to his will and purpose. He was a master of picturesque description and of dramatic representation, and his allegories and parables were of an intense human interest. His

hearers were made to realise that his figures and personifications had a direct relation to themselves. If it is objected that his fancies are sometimes extravagant and "riotous," it may be urged in reply that he was a great popular preacher and that they occasioned no difficulty to the common people. His burning earnestness and their own absorbing interest won and held an exclusive attention to the truth alone.

But the essential elements of his power as a preacher have still to be mentioned—his unshakable conviction of the truth and urgency of the Christian Gospel, and the reality and depth of his personal piety. He was very sure about man's desperate need of a Saviour, and he was equally sure of the power of Jesus Christ to "save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him." He delighted to proclaim and propound this best of all "good news." His personal piety was evidenced everywhere and in all company, but without parade, and he was pre-eminently a man of prayer, strict, methodical and eager—for himself, for others, for his Churches, and for the progress of the Gospel. The following prayer was found in the book of his last preaching engagements: "O Lord, give me Thy desire on this journey, for Thy Name's sake. 1. Peace in Christ. 2. The comfort of love. 3. To feel the bowels of compassion towards my brethren in the denomination to which I belong. 4. The fellowship of the Spirit. Amen. I desire also that my sermons while I preach them increase as the five loaves and two fishes. Amen—C.E." No one can read the accounts of his Covenants with God without being himself searched in heart. Truly this man was a *good* minister of Jesus Christ.

In the course of his strenuous life, Christmas Evans found (or made) time to write, and the output of his pen was considerable, varied, and valuable—letters, articles, expositions and sermons. Mostly sermons. He is the most literary of all the great preachers of Wales. His *Works* were gathered together and edited by the late Dr. Owen Davies, Caernarvon, and published in three substantial volumes (over 2,000 pages) in 1898. They are indispensable to the student of Christmas Evans.

Some of his sermons have been translated into English, but they are not now easily accessible. The following extract from a famous sermon (belonging, apparently, to the period of his ministry at Caerphilly), based on the text, 1 Timothy iii. 16, is perhaps fairly representative. The preacher is considering the evidences for our Lord's resurrection, among which he includes the witness of the soldiers when they had returned to the high priests and rulers after watching the grave:—

"Behold, while we were on the watch, and about the dawn of the day, a great earthquake, like unto the one that took place

on Friday afternoon, *when He* died! and we all fell powerless to the ground. Looking up, we saw an angel in a white robe, his eyes like the lightning, so vivid and piercing that the mightiest armies of Caesar would fain have escaped from them. We, not able to bear this sight, were obliged to look down at once. We endeavoured again to raise our eyes, and we beheld One coming out of the grave, passing by the angel, who now sat upon the removed stone, arrayed in such triumphant majesty that the earth never witnessed such a sight before—yes, HE WAS LIKE UNTO THE SON OF GOD!’ ‘What became of the angel?’ ‘Oh, a legion of them came down; and one of them, very fair, like a young man, entered the grave, and sat where the head of Jesus had lain; and immediately another also, looking fair and beautiful, sat where His feet had rested.’ ‘And did the angels say nothing to you?’ ‘No, but they looked with eyes of lightning.’ ‘Saw you not (His friends) the women?’ ‘Oh, yes, they came there; but He had left the tomb before their arrival.’ ‘Talked the angels to them?’ ‘Yes; they seemed to be of one family, and most intimately acquainted with each other.’ ‘Do you remember anything of the conversation?’ ‘Yes. “Fear you not. Let the Pharisees and Darkness fear to-day. You seek Jesus? He is not here; for He is risen indeed. He is alive and lives for ever; He is gone before you into Galilee.” We heard one angel say, “Come, see the place where the Lord lay.” Another angel addressed a woman called Mary, and said, “Woman, why weepest thou, while thy Lord has risen indeed, and is (alive) so near unto thee? *Let His enemies weep to-day!*” ‘What! How say you—*close that door*. You tall soldier approach: *Was it not you that pierced His side?*’ ‘Yes, it was I; and this relation is all true. I pray that I may never witness such a scene again. Oh! alas, it is all true! He must have been the Son of God!’ The Pharisees lost their case on *the day of appeal*; they gave the soldiers money to say that His disciples had stolen the body while they slept. *If they were asleep, how did they know in what manner He had left the grave?* They, however, suffered themselves to be suborned, and for money lied; and, to this hour, the kingdom of Satan hangs upon that lie.” Such was the preaching of Christmas Evans.

E. W. PRICE EVANS.

The Fruit of Freedom.

BERDYAEV, in an illuminating phrase, calls our age "the end of the Renaissance." We, in the western world, are looking back over a few centuries during which a certain very definite process has been going on, the results of which are only becoming clear as the process works itself out to its fulfilment in our own time. What, then, was the Renaissance? What has been the guiding principle of our civilisation throughout the last five hundred years? In general terms we might answer these questions by saying that the Renaissance was the attempt to set man free from all the limitations imposed upon him by the idea of supernatural religion or supernatural moral law. The final value was seen not in God, but in man, and the broad tendency of these centuries has been to exalt human values and to seek for an ever-increasing measure of human freedom. You might sum up the spirit of the process in two lines from Swinburne:

"Glory to man in the highest,
For man is the master of things."

Set free from the crushing weight of supernatural authority, it was believed that man would reach his full stature and build the perfect kingdom.

We stand now, if Berdyaev be right, at the end of that extraordinary historical experiment. The twentieth century has seen the final shackles fall. It has heard the final and absolute assertion of human freedom. And our modern bewilderment arises from this—that the end of the process has turned out in fact to be utterly different from all men's hopes and dreams throughout the centuries of the experiment.

It would seem worth while to look at the various departments of life in some detail, to see how all of them have met with the same fate and how all of them are contributing to-day to our disillusionment. Everywhere in life, men appear to exalt the human values and to assert man's absolute freedom; and everywhere, like an ironic echo of Rousseau's famous sentence, men find themselves in chains.

1. Let us think first of the struggle for scientific freedom, a struggle which has been central in the period under our review, and which in itself is typical of all that has happened to the human spirit in the Renaissance period. At the beginning of that period, scientific men found their freedom of speculation constantly being curbed by the Church, which spoke in the name

of supernatural revelation. Throughout the period, in every century, there has been a constant state of warfare between those, on the one hand, who have insisted upon the necessity for free speculation, and those, on the other hand, who have insisted with more heat than success that a place must be left in life for the supernatural.

There is, of course, the treatment of Galileo with which we are all familiar, and in which the Church appears as the tyrannical suppressor of man's right to think and to investigate his universe. Unfortunately, Galileo's case is all too typical. Even when scientific men have been seeking to apply their discoveries in beneficent ways, there have not been wanting religious men who have opposed their acts. Mr. C. E. M. Joad quotes an amusing passage from the writings of an American preacher in the nineteenth century who saw a close relationship between the invention of steam engines and the activities of the devil. He said: "If God had designed that His intelligent creatures should travel at the frightful speed of 15 m.p.h. by steam, He would have foretold it through His holy prophets. It is a device of Satan to lead immortal souls down to hell." In the same century, some Scottish divines were extremely doubtful about Sir James Simpson's use of chloroform as an anaesthetic, particularly for women in childbirth. They argued that pain was a divine institution and that the pains of childbirth for women were a part of the primeval curse laid on humanity at the "fall." To seek to avoid this by the use of chloroform was obviously a form of revolt against the divine will. Simpson cleverly evaded their strictures by replying that before God removed Adam's rib, He caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam. Thus it seemed that surgery could claim to be following the divine method. With examples of this sort before us, is it any wonder that scientists should have felt religion to be an intolerable burden? Surely men were justified in feeling that if they could sweep away the authority of the Church and the authority of the Bible, they could build a world in which truth and humanity would work their beneficent results for all men. Is it any wonder that men gradually came to feel that if only they could achieve speculative and practical freedom, all would be well with humanity?

In a sense they were right. The results of our scientific freedom have been extraordinary. In all the centuries during which men have inhabited this planet, no more wonderful civilisation than our own has been built. We know more about the universe than ever before. We have achieved a miraculous control over matter and over the natural forces. We have become at last something like the real masters of the material world. We have driven back, if not destroyed, the dark tides

of pain and disease and death. Surely in claiming his speculative freedom, man was on the right road?

But now, at the end of that process, we look with strained and doubting eyes at the world which we have built. Even as I write, I have before me pictures of Barcelona during and after an air raid. In this morning's paper I read that one thousand people were killed yesterday in Canton. All over the world the cold mist of fear is settling on the minds of men. In some strange and devilish way, the science which made us is devouring us. The ideal human kingdom towards which we blithely journey recedes further and further from us. The word "humanity" has become an empty symbol, a mockery, and our freedom has been turned into paralysing fear.

By a strange irony, the science which built our civilisation is being robbed by its own child of the freedom which is the breath of its life, so that in one State after another, science is being dictated to by powers which science itself has armed and made invulnerable.

2. Or consider how the process has revealed itself in the world of economics. Mr. R. H. Tawney, in his monumental book *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, has drawn for us a picture of the economic forces at work in the world from the fourteenth century to the eighteenth. We find that just as scientific men were fighting for their freedom against the Church, so in the economic sphere, bankers, merchants, industrialists and land-owners were struggling to cast off the yoke which mediaeval religion had bound upon them. Nor was the struggle a short one. The Church, both Catholic and Reformed, strove for more than two centuries to keep a grip upon the economic life of man and to insist that man's dealings in the market-place must be subject to the eternal laws of God. It is only in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and particularly in the latter, that we find the full economic freedom of man achieved and the doctrine of *laissez faire* accepted without question as economic orthodoxy.

In this sphere, too, we must admit that men justified the freedom they claimed. Our abhorrence of the social conditions in which we find ourselves must not blind us to the fact that the industrialisation of the western world brought an infinitely fuller and richer life to men. Commerce brought to the cities of the West the strange and exotic products of the East. There was an unprecedented increase in the human population of the globe. The ancient spectre of famine was laid in its grave, as men thought, for ever.

Now, again, we stand at the end of the process and find that here, too, man's apparent freedom and advance has been his betrayal. He would be a courageous man who, looking at all

the facts to-day, would defend the economic doctrine of *laissez faire*. For we have in all industrialised countries a hungry army of unemployed men; boys and girls leaving school whom industry cannot absorb. We have all the uncertainty and misery of a poverty set off against a background of great wealth, and always underlying these, the ugly fear of a war between the classes. At the Renaissance men said in effect, "Strike off our economic shackles. Let us trade and compete freely, and the world will be wealthy." At the end of the Renaissance we have South Wales.

Strangely enough, the cry of the masses to-day is simply a repetition of the old cry. They say, "Give us real economic freedom and all will be well." The suggestion is that in the dictatorship of the proletariat we shall find our heaven on earth. Yet it should be obvious from a moment's reflection that the proletariat cannot dictate, and that if the world revolution of the Marxists' dream were to come, we should simply plunge deeper into slavery. Reinhold Niebuhr, in his book *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, sums up our bitter predicament thus: "There is as yet no clear proof that the power of economic over-lords can be destroyed by means less rigorous than communism has employed; but there is also no proof that communistic oligarchs, once the idealistic passion of a revolutionary period is spent, will be very preferable to the capitalistic oligarchs whom they are to displace." However we take it, economic freedom seems to lead to social slavery.

3. We see the same process repeat itself in the world of art. Before the Renaissance all art was religious. Painting and music and the drama all grew and flourished in the walled garden of the Church. With the Renaissance, art, too, cried out to be free. Why should painting be restricted to religious subjects? To the Madonna, to the Saints? Why should painting not express all the world of humanity with its teeming life and passion? Browning catches the spirit of the Renaissance when his painter complains:

"This world's no blot for us,
Nor blank; it means intensely and means good.
To find its meaning is my meat and drink."

Or why should music only express men's religious emotions? Why should it not seek to express the whole world of human feeling and thought?

Why should the drama present over and over to men only the Bible stories? What of all the human tragedy and comedy around us? And so men broke away from the Church and

claimed for their art the same freedom as they were claiming for science and for business.

Nor dare we suggest that this assumption of freedom was not productive of great good for the human spirit. It is only necessary to mention the names of Shakespeare and Beethoven to feel that the great emancipating impulse in art was justified. It would be idle to assert that either of these could have produced what he did produce, had he stayed within the safe but narrow confines of the Church. Art would be free, and art vindicated its freedom.

Yet the process must be judged by its ends. What are they? Where does the modern man go to seek his aesthetic satisfaction? It is true that he no longer seeks it in the Church, but neither does he seek it from the great spiritual rebels. When the modern man wishes to satisfy his artistic desires, he goes in company with thousands and thousands of his fellows to the nearest picture house and there finds an art divorced from religion, but divorced, too, from all human reality; an art which is as far removed from the Renaissance as it is from the Church. Man demanded his artistic freedom and he has it, but what is the result? That upon our generation there is poured, in the name of art, an endless torrent of trivial nonsense.

Nor, if we look a little behind the scenes, is the position less disquieting. In Cedric Belfrage's *Promised Land*, we have an unofficial history of Hollywood which seems to suggest that art has freed itself from the tyranny of the monk only to become the slave of the millionaire, without genius, without talent, without even taste, determined to give to men only "what they want." Once more man's claim of absolute freedom has resulted in a grotesque and hideous form of slavery.

4. Lastly and briefly, we think of education. The revolt here has never been so powerful as in other spheres of life. In many lands the Church still has some power over the education of the young. But nevertheless here, too, the struggle has gone on and there has been a steady increase in the ranks of those who believe that education should be wholly secular, a function of the State with which the Church has no right whatever to interfere. All sorts of private experiments have already been made, and in general it is true that education is wider and more intelligent than ever it has been before. There are many reasons for believing, for example, that if the Churches in England were forcibly dispossessed of their educational powers, the results from the point of view of the general education of the children would be nothing but beneficent. Here, too, we who belong to this Renaissance period, instinctively feel that freedom from supernatural interference would solve many of our problems.

Nevertheless, one cannot but notice that the secular education which men receive, if not at school at any rate in the universities, has not quite had the results which were hoped. Modern people know more than their forefathers did. In fact, what we know is quite extraordinary. We know the number of light years to the spiral nebulae. We know the number of eggs laid by that most prolific of fish, the cod (or is it the herring?). Yet there is a strange blank in the very centre of the modern man's mind. Where once our more ignorant forefathers set their picture of God, we can only set a question mark. Our systems of education send men out into the world with extraordinary stores of knowledge about the circumference of life, and with a strange agnosticism about its heart and centre. We have succeeded in producing a generation which has no philosophy, to whom all fundamental questions are meaningless. This might not be so bad if man could permanently hold on to his question mark, that is to say, if he could permanently be an agnostic. But as Somerset Maugham has said, "The practical outcome of agnosticism is that you act as though God did not exist." And W. E. Hocking, the psychologist, says, "The pre-war experience of France in secularised education has furnished a striking instance of the principle that in education a vacuum is equivalent to a negation." The net result of modern agnosticism is that modern men have ceased to believe at all in the supernatural.

If you are a bold spirit, you will probably feel that this is a good thing, but consider what is happening. We are turning out from our schools and universities masses of men and women who are virtually atheists. We are letting these men and women loose in a world where the newspapers and the wireless are able to exert a propaganda influence of unbelievable power. The secularly educated modern man, without any religion, is powerless to resist these forces, and into the central blank of his life there comes the State or the Empire, or the Cause or the Leader. We say, "let children be freely educated and let them choose if they wish to worship in later life." The result is that our children do worship in later life. They worship the Mikado of Japan, or Kemal Attaturk, or Benito Mussolini, or Adolf Hitler, or Stalin, or even General Franco. In our attempts to set men free we have compelled them to be slaves.

So through all this Renaissance period, we see the same forces at work. In every department of life man cries out for freedom. For a time his freedom seems to work for good, and then at the last he finds himself back in a new and more hideous form of slavery. Can we interpret to our age the historical tragedy in which we all find ourselves actors? I feel that we can.

In St. John's version of the trial of Christ, the Jews shouted

to Pilate, "We have no King but Caesar." Now what these men wanted to shout was only the first part of that sentence, namely, "We have no King." They hated Caesar. In part they were destroying Christ because Christ had refused to draw the sword against Caesar. But the practical exigency of the occasion compelled them, if they would have Christ destroyed, to affirm Caesar. No doubt they did it with a mental reservation, but they did it. It is the strange destiny of man that if he will not affirm the highest, he appears to be inevitably condemned to affirm the lowest. For him there is no halfway house. At the Renaissance man attempted to cry, "We have no King." They stood midway between God and the Devil, and, repudiating both, they set up man in their place. But now history is compelling us against our own will to complete the text. We can no longer in these days say, "We have no King," but with whatever bitterness of spirit we are compelled to add, "but Caesar." Caesar has turned science into a curse. Caesar has turned economics into a blight. Caesar has enslaved art and uses education for his own purposes. Bitter and bewildered, men see all for which they had hoped, destroyed and repudiated, so that the youth of Italy can rejoice that they "are trampling on the stinking corpse of freedom." We have gone the full circle. Setting out to be free we trample on freedom itself. Setting out to have no King we have the lowest.

What the Renaissance man did not realise, and what we have not yet in the modern world realised, is that man is not absolute. Therefore human freedom can never be absolute freedom. Science was right in claiming freedom, but wrong when it set itself up as the absolute. Business men were right in claiming greater freedom, but wrong when they demanded absolute freedom. Art was justified in demanding a wider world, but wrong when she insisted that no bounds whatever could be set to her world. Educationalists who cry out for the best possible secular education are right, but wrong when they go on to assert that that can only be achieved by the repudiation of any form of religious education. Man's freedom is a relative freedom which he enjoys under the will of God. The curse of our day is that he has turned that relative into an absolute. There is deep truth in Tennyson's linking together knowledge and reverence, and in his further assertion:

"Our wills are ours, we know not how,
Our wills are ours to make them Thine."

DOUGLAS STEWART.

The Means of Grace.

A Personal Confession.

I AM very dubious about possessing the proper qualifications for writing this paper. I am not well versed in the art of ecclesiastical conciliation. I have no genius for finding some *rapprochement* between conflicting and opposing views. Therefore I shall probably be dogmatic and controversial, and ought to leave the subject entirely alone. Yet I can never resist the lure of a theme that is perplexing.

PSYCHOLOGY AND DENOMINATIONALISM.

I find myself in a somewhat uncomfortable position to-day. After a few years of practical experiment in the direction of Church Union, I am being forced to the conclusion that denominationalism in some form or other is inevitable. It has its roots in Psychology. Here are some sentences from a fine little book on *Psychology's Defence of the Faith*, by Dr. Yellowlees, which express my point of view.

"The mental make-up of a High Church Anglican is quite different from that of a Baptist or a Quaker. The one must have certain elements in the expression of his religion which are necessary for his psychological satisfaction, though to a person of a different type these things are not only unnecessary, but may be a positive hindrance to his religious expression. It is thus a psychological impossibility for them ever to achieve any durable sort of uniformity in religious belief or practice, however much they may love each other, and however willing they may be to co-operate in practical affairs."

It is that "mental make-up" which begins to record its verdict as soon as you start to discuss the means of Grace. An honest attempt at self-analysis has left me rather bewildered about my own "mental make-up."

I find myself favourably predisposed to the Quaker view of Sacramentalism; that is, to recognise no special Sacraments, or rather to say that all life is sacramental. Yet I am strangely dissatisfied with that position.

I find myself intellectually unfriendly to the conceptions of the Roman and Greek Churches about Sacraments, with their list of the perfect seven: Baptism, Confirmation, The Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Marriage.

I find myself critical of the Reformers' point of view, with its insistence upon the two Sacraments of Baptism and The Lord's Supper, as having been instituted by Christ Himself.

In Protestant doctrine there seems little unanimity as to the precise significance of these Sacraments.

THE SACRAMENTAL CONTROVERSY.

I take it that what we understand by the means of Grace are the outward and visible acts that mediate the consciousness of God's presence and Grace to our lives. What I want to discuss is the question as to how far the coming of God to our lives is dependent upon objective realities. Are these objective realities in any way independent of our subjective reaction to them? Can we have a purely subjective experience of the Grace of God? Or must there be a continuous interplay of objective reality and subjective reaction in our apprehension of God? These are the kind of questions that create the sacramental controversy, and they are at least worthy of our serious consideration. For the conclusions we reach about them will affect tremendously our conception of the Church of which we are members, and of the ministry in which we are engaged.

I am well aware that the task of defining the grace of God is almost an impossible one. It is difficult to translate into words that will satisfactorily define the experience, the coming of God's Grace to a man. May we take it for granted that what we understand by the Grace of God is just a realisation of God's presence in our lives, bringing a sense of forgiveness and fellowship.

What we want to think about is the method by which that realisation can be reached, or the method by which it is brought to us. For, of course, in this mystery of fellowship between God and man, it is quite impossible to split up a whole experience into component parts, and say, "This part is God's revelation and that part is man's apprehension." The two processes are coincident. They coalesce into one harmonious experience. God's activity and man's activity can only be separate entities in some vague theoretical sense.

THE HUMAN MIND.

It will also be wise, in discussing this subject, not to forget the mind with which God has gifted us. In some ways the human mind is the supreme Sacrament. Our subjective reaction to an objective reality is a very important factor when we are thinking about the means of Grace. It is the indispensable equipment without which nothing that is merely objective could have any significance at all. In other senses than he intended, there is still something to be said for Bishop Berkeley's way with the materialists. The human mind is the essential Sacrament

by which God mediates Himself to me, though it is difficult to postulate precisely what sort of objective reality it possesses.

MEDIATIONS OF GOD.

It is also obvious that God mediates Himself to man in varying degrees, or if you prefer it, in varying aspects.

There is a mediation of God as Creator.

There is a mediation of God as Provider.

There is a mediation of God as Sustainer.

And there is the highest mediation of all, when God reveals Himself as active for the moral and spiritual salvation of man.

In writing of the means of Grace, I am thinking chiefly of God's coming to our lives to achieve that moral and spiritual regeneration. I want to concentrate upon that one aspect of the theme, and that will obviously limit the field of our enquiry.

NATURE.

Understood in this sense, it is no use going to Nature for a mediation of the Grace of God. It may be true to say that if you fully understood a flower in a crannied wall, you would know what God and man is. But Nature will also provide you with objective realities that are "red in tooth and claw," as well as your peaceful flower growing in the crannied wall.

In any case, the men who have got most out of Nature have brought to it other mediations of the Grace of God gained by other means.

MAN.

Nor will it do merely to concentrate upon your fellow-men as mediations of God's Grace. It is true that a kindly, helpful life can be of great assistance to you, or a man's poetry or prose, or his music, or his art. But in every instance you are dealing with something that has been given to you at second-hand. A man can help you to God, only because he has achieved the Grace of God in his own life by other means. Therefore you are driven further back to the real source from which the mediated Grace comes. Neither Nature nor man constitute ultimate means of Grace, though both may point out to you the road you must travel.

SPIRITUAL CONTACT.

Whatever may be the means of Grace, there can be no doubt about what happens finally. The Spirit of God and the spirit of Man come into contact.

“ Speak to Him thou for He hears,
And spirit with spirit can meet.
Closer is He than breathing,
Nearer than hands or feet.”

Unless means of Grace lead to that end they are not worth bothering about.

Well then, is it necessary to have any intermediate means of Grace? Cannot the Spirit of God and the spirit of Man together dispense with intermediaries and find contact with each other?

PRAYER.

I am sure we all believe that to be possible. We believe, for example, that in simple direct PRAYER the contact is established. Simple Prayer has no objective embodiment, but it is really the highest means of Grace. Not even the Incarnation takes precedence over it. Otherwise you would have to throw away the Old Testament and the accumulated experience of the race. So long as the experience of Prayer remains, we must believe that the Grace of God can be mediated to men, without any physical embodiment.

THE BIBLE AND PREACHING.

Another means of Grace which requires no physical enactment, no symbolic representation, is the reading of the Bible. Coleridge's testimony about the finding quality of the Bible will be vouched for by most people who sit down seriously to read its pages. I think that finding quality persists, however much the Bible may be misunderstood. But I am sure that for the most effective understanding of the Bible, and therefore for the most effective use of the Bible as a means of Grace, instruction and teaching are necessary. I would therefore be inclined to combine the Bible and Preaching as a most effective means of Grace. There, of course, you have no presentation in symbolic form of the Grace of God, but simply the direct appeal of mind to mind, which for the greater part of His ministry was the method of Jesus.

THE INCARNATION.

Then there is the Incarnation. Christ is of supreme importance in any attempt to describe the means of Grace. Upon our understanding of His mind everything else will depend. The meaning and significance of all symbolic worship enshrined in the Church will depend upon our understanding of the life and death of Jesus. For example, a man's belief about the death

of Christ will affect tremendously his conception of the Communion Service as a means of Grace. If you accept Jewish interpretations of the death of Jesus as a sacrifice of Blood offered to God to secure His appeasement, your Communion Service may then become the Eucharist. I am sure all our views about the means of Grace depend greatly upon our conception of the significance of Jesus.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS.

All I can do now is to state briefly my own position. Jesus is God mediated to man's understanding—an objective reality—but only for the men who knew Him in the days of His flesh. I find that Jesus, and my own inner experience influenced by the teaching of Jesus, are the only assurances I have that there is a relationship of Grace between God and Man. Without Jesus I may speculate and explore, but it is the Grace of God that has tabernacled among men in the person of Jesus, that gives me my ground of trust in the grace of God.

All that I am quite clear about in my own mind without discussing theories of a virgin birth or theories of atonement. The Death of Jesus may be essential to a revelation of God's grace, but only in so far as it would have meant his own denial of the validity of His revelation, if He had refused to die. But Jesus remains for me the Grace of God made flesh. I find in the historic Jesus of Nazareth my most helpful and most dependable means of Grace.

THE TRINITY.

I cannot say anything about the Trinity or the inter-relationships of personalities within that Trinity. I have never found a doctrine of the Trinity in my own experience, and I always squirm when my Unitarian friends talk about "you Trinitarians." I have no separable, distinguishable experiences that I can call God or Christ or the Holy Spirit. All I have been able to attain is a spiritual consciousness of an Unseen Presence in my life, and the Presence has the values of Jesus of Nazareth. To me, the mediation of that presence is the mediation of the grace of God, and the means by which That presence is mediated are the means of Grace.

I do not know of any tangible presence that is mediated, but only the intangible, impalpable, consciousness of the Presence in the Mind!

OBJECTIVE ENACTMENTS.

On the other hand there are certain objective enactments, which by their symbolism, aid me to a consciousness of that Presence. They have not brought to me any presence that is

physical or tangible or occupying space. They have simply helped to make me more aware of a spiritual realisation.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

First of all, I would mention the church assembled for worship. Christ once said, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." Again and again when I have been in church with like-minded people for worship, I have been specially conscious of a Presence pulsating in my thought. It may be mob Psychology turned into a Sacrament, but there it is. To me the church is a fellowship of the followers of Jesus, without any additional significance. And in that simple fellowship when it meets for worship I find a special means of Grace.

BAPTISM.

Then Baptism is reckoned by many to be a means of Grace. But the precise degree in which it is such a means of Grace, is a matter of very acute controversy. No one believes that Jesus originated the symbol of Baptism. It is even a debatable point as to whether or not Jesus instituted Baptism to be practised by the fellowship of His friends. It is an undoubted fact that the early church believed Jesus had instituted the ordinance and practised it. At first only adult believers were so baptised, but when Christian homes had been established by the second or third century, infants also were baptised, although the practice did not become very general till about the sixth century.

Personally I have always had great difficulty about this subject of Baptism as a means of Grace. Where there is a conscious, intelligent, subjective reaction, stimulated by a symbolic act, I can understand its value to the individual as a means of Grace. That it exerts any influence upon an undiscerning infant I cannot believe. That would require magical, mystery-religious views of God, which I am personally incapable of holding. I can understand the benefit for the child, if the act helps parents to dedicate themselves to the task of training the child for God, and if the act marks the Church's acceptance of its responsibility for watching over the spiritual welfare of the child.

Yet even in the case of the Baptism of a Believer, I can only find a symbolic act, the value of which depends upon the personal intelligent response to the spiritual fellowship, of which the act is an outward expression. Any magical regenerating power in the water used for the ceremony, is an idea beyond my power to understand. Baptism may help by its symbolism and the public nature of its avowal to bring to a focal point our

resolves to seek God. That, I believe to be its supreme value. But in the very nature of the case, it is a temporary and isolated experience.

THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

It is much the same with the Communion Service. Its significance as a means of grace will depend upon your whole theological system; your conception of the Death of Christ; your decision about His institution of the Lord's Supper; your understanding of the meaning He intended it to have; your reading of the historical development of ideas associated with the observance; all these will influence your views of the Communion Service as a means of Grace. All these are matters about which we might argue *ad infinitum*.

Personally I have found the Communion Service a great means of grace, because of its symbolism and its psychological suggestiveness. To me it is a simple, commemorative symbolic Act, in which the spirit of man pledges itself to the following of Jesus and in that very act reaps the harvest of an acutely discerned spiritual presence. At least I have found it so. The Bread and Wine are not indispensable to the preservation of the central vital experience of a Communion Service, but they help in the act of concentration.

CONCLUSION.

You can understand therefore that where sacraments are concerned, I have very little idea as to what particular species of theological animal I am.

I am ready to welcome any symbolic act, which by its suggestiveness will help to bring a realisation of the presence of God to a man's mind.

The psychological value of much ritual I recognise, even swinging censers, and incense and ornate altars. But means of grace, whatever they may be, are means and not an end. If any physical object mediates God's grace, I can only believe it does so by its psychological suggestiveness. The real presence of God can never be tangible or material in substance. It is a spiritual apprehension in the mind. "God is spirit, and they who worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." Anything that helps to that end is, I am sure, legitimate, so long as the Presence is not identified with the thing that helps to its realisation. At least, that is how it seems to me.

For what it is worth, then, I have offered you this little contribution to a mighty subject, and I have offered it in the form of a personal confession!

R. GUY RAMSAY.

Prayer and the Holy Spirit.

THE direct references in the New Testament to the place of the Holy Spirit in prayer are few, but we are not justified in assuming on that account that the subject had no central significance for the Primitive Church and has none for us. We have no reason to suppose that what was explicitly taught only here and there failed of general recognition. We may fairly claim that a community that in all respects revealed its dependence upon the power of the Spirit would not miss the significance of the Spirit in the life of prayer. It may well have been the case that little needed to be said because the matter was taken for granted as an obvious first principle. There are two references to "praying in the (Holy) Spirit" (Ephesians vi. 18; Jude 20), but it is only in a brief passage in the Epistle to the Romans that the phrase finds doctrinal exposition and interpretation. "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (viii. 26f). The aim of the Apostle is to encourage his readers as they are overwhelmed by the thought of the grand Divine purpose he has been setting forth. They may well be conscious of infirmity as they seek to give form and substance to their inarticulate longings and aspirations. But they are assured that the Spirit Himself interprets their formless prayers and presents them as Intercessor before God. The God Who moves them to prayer by the revelation of His will also renders it effective and fruitful by the intercession of the Spirit.

The doctrine provides the basis for a Christian theology of prayer of the utmost practical value. Without it the life of prayer may easily seem a weary and discouraging striving, uninspired and uninspiring. It may appear more arduous than it really is, because it has no wings on which to rise. Without the assurance of the Spirit's help it may be, if not abandoned, allowed at any rate to become fitful and perfunctory. When we are least able to summon our energies for prayer is often the occasion when prayer is most desperately needed, and we are indeed in sorry case if there does not come to us the blessed illumination of the Spirit's ministry of intercession, by which we are led to see that prayer is not merely a human activity but one in which both God and man co-operate.

It does no violence to the Apostle's sense of our dependence upon the Spirit in prayer, but rather brings out the full range of his teaching, to say that what he really means is that we pray most truly when it is the Spirit who prays in us. If true prayer is due to the Divine initiative and if of ourselves we do not know how to pray aright, it is much better described as a Divine activity in which God invites our co-operation than as a human activity in which we invoke the help of God. Certainly, to interpret the Spirit's intercession as the Spirit praying in us best illuminates the meaning of prayer and most satisfactorily solves the problems and difficulties associated with it. If we approach the subject of prayer from the human angle we are not far from a magical interpretation, for it is easy to conclude that it is no more than a human means of securing Divine favour, as though God were instrumental to our purposes. But if we regard it as a Divine activity we recognise that we must set our desires in harmonious relation to the Divine will, and that we can pray with confidence, because prayer being a mode of the Divine working cannot fail in some real measure to further in the world the ends of God. Those who pray in dependence on the Spirit as their Helper will not be of those who ask and receive not, because they ask amiss.

It is in respect of petition and intercession that the higher, because more spiritual, view of prayer is most illuminating and suggestive. Petitionary prayer, though it is an immemorial practice of the religious spirit, has fallen into some disrepute in modern times, but the Pauline doctrine provides us with a reasonable theology that may be claimed genuinely to rehabilitate it. The pressure from the side of the natural sciences has been admittedly heavy, but it does not altogether excuse the failure so to conceive the spiritual order that prayer may not be regarded as a law of the Divine activity within it. There seems to have been far more deference to the scientists and philosophers than to the saints, with a corresponding lack of confidence in the testimony of religious experience. Of course, if prayer is simply a human operation, we may well deem it a presumptuous and childish attempt to challenge the well-established uniformities of an ordered Universe, although even then it is more than likely that we are interpreting the laws of Nature in far too rigid and mechanical a fashion. But if we conceive prayer to be primarily a Divine activity, we may be led to see that it also is to be counted among those uniformities which exhibit the ways of God's customary working. We may then be able to construct a positive theology of prayer which no longer reduces petition to auto-suggestion and regards intercession as having no other purpose than that of inflaming our zeal in good works. Recent

theology, happily, has assumed a bolder and less apologetic attitude, as witness Professor Farmer's notable vindication of petitionary prayer in his recent work, *The World and God*. This treatment does not offer a theology of prayer in terms of the Spirit, but it prepares the way for it by removing the preliminary difficulties.

The central problem of intercession lies in the fact that it assumes that other people may be influenced indirectly through prayer. The same problem arises in petition, when the answers to our prayers involve the necessary action of others. The problem is not whether God exercises influence upon the souls of men in response to prayer, but *how* He does so. To the simple believer who is content to carry out his religious practices in simple faith, this may seem no more than an academical question; enough for him that God is the Hearer and Answerer of prayer. But the issue is really of practical importance, for no sooner do we begin to reflect on the various conceptions of God's working in prayer than we discover that many of our difficulties and discouragements are due to inadequate conceptions of the "how" of prayer. Three solutions to our problem call for examination.

1. *We may conceive God as acting directly on others in response to our petitions.* This is to regard prayer as primarily a human activity, where God's doing depends and follows upon our asking. Apart from the possibility of this view leading to the thought of God being in our service and at our disposal, it is open to the criticism that it does not give sufficient justification for prayer. If God as our Father reads all our hearts and knows all our need and if we are persuaded that His attitude towards us is wholly gracious, mere asking seems superfluous. If in prayer we do no more than tell God what He already knows, there is no sufficient motive for regarding it as our highest service and for taking pains to persevere in its mastery. We are confronted here with a common difficulty which many entertain, and there is no way of overcoming it save by realising that prayer is itself a creative principle, whereby in the Divine economy God employs desire and aspiration to further His purposes. Certainly, when we study the testimony of the great masters in the art of prayer, we are impressed by nothing so much as their conviction that prayer is the highest function of the soul, because it is the highest form of co-operation with God. When Elizabeth Leseur describes prayer as "that high and fruitful form of action" which "works with God for souls," it does not need the perusal of her entire *Journal* to recognise that she means by prayer something far more than simple asking.

2. *The second solution presses into service the idea of telepathy or thought-transference.* It has at least this merit, that

it seeks to deal with the difficulty of the first solution. If mind may influence mind at a distance and without sensuous communication, it is conceivable that prayer is a special case of some such principle. If that is so, then prayer has a creative function of its own and is more than mere supplication. But so far decisive evidence in favour of telepathy is lacking, and we have no sufficient warrant for regarding it as other than speculative theory, in spite of its having the support of some competent psychologists. In any case, it does not give us the explanation for which we are looking, although it may provide us with a suggestive analogy. Prayer is not a means of communication between man and man, but an appeal to God on behalf of man. Thought-transference (if there be such a thing) may work without any necessary reference to God and may achieve results contrary to the Divine purpose. If it has any part in the machinery of prayer, it is only as a mechanism employed in a higher order of spiritual system. But even this is doubtful, for it is generally conceived to achieve its results on a level below consciousness, and is therefore sub-personal in its working.

3. *The third solution, which relates prayer to the Holy Spirit, is the only satisfactory one*, since it alone offers a theology of prayer that both puts God at the centre and makes prayer a creative principle in the complex network of human life. Through God prayer is inspired, and through the work of the Spirit as Intercessor it is rendered effective and fruitful. The fundamental requirement in any adequate doctrine of prayer is the discovery of a principle of relationship, whereby man is linked to God and man to man in God, and it is just this principle that the idea of the Spirit provides. He is, so to speak, the common factor in the prayer relationship. On the one hand, He represents men before the throne of grace, pleading for them by interpreting their prayers; on the other hand, He mediates between man and man, interpreting human spirits to one another, not as a mechanical telepathic principle, but as God's personal Agent. The Spirit indwells all men, and it is through Him that they are spiritually related to one another. And prayer is just the instrument which the Spirit employs to accomplish the Divine will and purpose in the web of human life. It is His instrument, not ours, which we use rightly only as we regard it as a Divine activity in which it is our privilege to co-operate. When prayer is inspired by the Spirit, Who reveals to us what we are to pray for and how to pray, it is taken up by Him to become part of His gracious ministry to the souls of men. Answers to prayer are His work, and they are sure because He ministers according to the will of God. Our prayers are then no utterances sent forth into the void, but the very means whereby

God carries out the providential government of the Universe. Human desire, purified and sanctified by the Spirit, becomes a way of the Divine working. On this view, prayer cannot be regarded as mere superfluous request, but must be seen as a sharing and co-operation in God's loving service to His children. Such a view of prayer confers upon us a sense of privilege that at once humbles and exalts us, for it reveals to us, unworthy as we are, how great is our high calling as God's servants in the world.

The idea of the inter-relation of human spirits in and through the Spirit is of supreme importance if we are to understand rightly the operation of prayer. Modern psychology has taught us to abandon all rigid individualism and to recognise that the group is not simply the sum of its parts, but an organism of inter-dependent members. This has a far-reaching significance for religion, and for prayer in particular. "I wonder whether you realise," wrote Baron von Hügel to a correspondent, "a deep, great fact? That souls—all human souls—are deeply inter-connected? That (I mean) we can, not only pray for each other, but suffer for each other? . . . Nothing is more real than this inter-connection—this gracious power put by God Himself into the very heart of our infirmities." However the psychologists may explain this "deep, great fact," the ultimate explanation is to be found only in the doctrine of the Indwelling Spirit. The great witness to it is the Church, in which the Spirit works at a higher level because all who are united in the Christian society have deliberately submitted themselves to the Spirit's working. As the Spirit-filled and Spirit-guided fellowship of believers the Church is thus the concrete symbol of the wider range of the Spirit's operations through the entire course and range of human life. Partial and imperfect as is the Church's representation of the Spirit's working, it is yet our best picture of the ministry of the Spirit to humanity at large. To that ministry, prayer is a necessary instrument, whereby under the Spirit's control and direction contact is established and communication effected between spirit and spirit. When we are willing to pray in the Spirit or, better, let the Spirit pray in us, we are permitted to share in a spiritual influence whose range and power transcends our knowledge. Our petitions and intercessions go forth to the uttermost ends of the earth and, perhaps, beyond, to further the redeeming purpose of God in ways that none but He can know. Christians, therefore, because they are members of the one body in Christ and also members of the one humanity, have no higher function than petitionary prayer. Prayer is for them, if they understand it aright, the highest form of spiritual service, not only because there is much that cannot be accomplished without

it, but also because it is the only sure means to right action. For when we are summoned to action under the constraint of the Spirit, it is only that we ourselves may provide the answer to prayer, whether the prayer be ours or another's, or whether it be on our own behalf or on that of others.

The distinction which has been drawn between the Church and humanity without as two social organisms with their centre in the Spirit, but at different levels of realisation and effectiveness, reminds us that prayer is a corporate as well as an individual exercise. The priesthood of prayer is committed to the Church as a community, and not merely to the individual members. In so far as the Spirit has free course in the Body of Christ, the Church will exercise itself in the fellowship of prayer. The power of prayer is enhanced when it is a corporate act, for fellowship expands the individual capacity, and the wider the circle the more numerous the media of the Spirit's activity. No function of the Church is more characteristic than that of prayer, and when for it the Church substitutes other forms of activity as its principal business it soon begins to manifest an unmistakable weakness. Worship is not only adoration and thanksgiving, it is also prayer in the primary sense of the word, petition and intercession. Whatever may be the measure of the Spirit's impact upon humanity other than by the agency of the Church, we may be sure that it is chiefly through the praying community that God does His work in the world, for it is ever the Divine method to help and serve men through men. We may therefore think of the Church as the Divine society within the larger organism of the world, called into being and maintained in order to reconcile the world to God and to transform it into the fashion of His Kingdom. But the Church fulfils its task only as prayer is its life-breath, its supreme means of co-operation with God. Only when it is right in its understanding and practice of prayer, does it become a royal priesthood, offering to God all else as in the Spirit it offers the sacrifices of prayer.

So far we have considered prayer solely as a personal activity, as action by persons upon persons through the intercession of the Spirit. But there are objects of prayer which appear to have no personal reference, such as favourable weather to ensure a good harvest. Here it would seem that prayer cannot be a creative principle and must be simply bare supplication. But the truth surely is that the Spirit Who indwells the hearts of men is also immanent in the world of things. We are too apt to conceive Nature after a mechanical fashion, as though it were a huge machine controlled from without by God as Chief Engineer. Present-day science suggests that a much truer analogy is that furnished by the relation of body and soul,

according to which Nature is a vast organism animated and controlled by the Spirit of God. Such a conception enables us to conceive how prayer may be taken up by the Spirit and employed by Him in His administration of the world of things, just as He uses prayer in the realm of personal activity. Nor need we suppose it improbable that there are personal intermediaries other than human beings even in the realm of things, for there are highly intelligent moderns who see reason to believe in the ministry of angels. But however that may be, it is reasonable to suppose that the Spirit whom we recognise to dwell in us indwells also the world of Nature, for unless this is so we cannot bring the Universe of men and things into a single unity. To realise this is to know that prayer is a creative principle that operates through the entire range of the cosmos, whereby through His Spirit God seeks to bring all things into subjection to His eternal purpose.

The doctrine of the Spirit is thus seen to afford the proper key to the mysteries of prayer. It furnishes a principle of interconnection, whereby the world of men and things finds its unity in the Spirit. Many of our difficulties in prayer arise from our tendency to think of God "as a kind of super-intelligent benevolent 'third party'," to employ a phrase of the late Canon Streeter in his book *Reality*, over against the praying subject and the object of prayer. But the doctrine of the Spirit enables us to realize that the God Who is above us is not other than the God Who indwells the Universe of men and things. If we begin at this point we can understand that true prayer is prayer in the Spirit, whereby the Spirit prays in us. This makes prayer creative, the most worth-while activity of the human soul, the highest form of spiritual service. Such prayer cannot be casual and perfunctory, for it calls for the offering of ourselves in selfless sacrifice and in earnest and intense desire. It will rise to importunity and suffering in the measure in which the soul enters into and shares the passion of the Divine travail for the world's redemption. Because they have never learnt the true meaning of prayer, or having learnt it are too indolent to practise it, many believers are sadly impoverished in life and unfruitful in service, and have become a serious source of weakness in the Church and of delay in the coming of the Kingdom. It may be too much to hope that all the faithful will ever undertake the full privilege of the priesthood of prayer, but we may and ought to pray that the number of those who have heard and responded to the call of the Spirit may be increased. There has never at any time been lacking a righteous remnant who have gladly offered themselves to be used in the ministry of the Spirit's intercession. Our own day has such saints, and they are the true pillars of

the Church, upholding it by their prayers and proving themselves the very salt of the earth. But their company needs to be increased, that the Holy Spirit of prayer, the Intercessor, may have freer course in furthering amongst men God's purpose of establishing His Kingdom.

W. E. HOUGH.

Heredity.

IT is a matter of common observation that children are both like and sometimes surprisingly unlike their parents. Their likeness in feature, habit, illnesses, temperament and so forth, we loosely call heredity. Their unlikenesses occasion comment, "Wherever does he get it?" We assume that particular trait has got into his character or physique in some other way.

In point of fact, however, unlikenesses as well as likenesses are inherited, if by "inherited" we understand "received from parents by way of the germ cells". There is much that is still profoundly mysterious. All origins go out in mystery. Nevertheless certain biological discoveries have recently been made that throw light on the subject, and open up possibilities of further knowledge of the greatest interest and importance.

The experiments of the Austrian Abbé, Mendel, with peas are pretty well known; and the law that he formulated, called after him "The Mendelian Law". He found that if peas with certain characteristics were crossed, the peas subsequently obtained reproduced these characteristics according to a certain regular proportion. If, for example, tall peas were crossed with dwarfs, the first generation were all tall, but the second generation were tall and dwarf in the proportion of three to one. The former characteristic, therefore, he called "dominant", the latter "recessive". It was found on further experiments that the same rule applied apparently to other plants besides peas, and to the animal world as well. It was presumed it would apply to human beings: But the possibility of experimental cross-breeding not being open, the matter could not be verified. The Mendelian law of heredity came, therefore, to be accepted; but it was not explained.

During the last thirty-five years, however, a great deal of experimental microscopic work has been done by hundreds of biologists, and the explanation now seems to be established

beyond reasonable doubt, and to open up a further field of investigation of the greatest interest. It appears that the most important part of the substances of two parents (both of the plant and animal worlds) which fuse together to form the nucleus of an offspring, consists of a whole series of tiny units to which the name "genes" has been given. These genes, it is believed, are the factors which determine heredity.

When the male sperm, of microscopic minuteness, penetrates the larger female cell and causes fertilisation, the genes in these two cells may combine in an infinite variety of ways to form the new cell, which by process of growth and repeated division gradually becomes the body of the new offspring. And the particular combination of genes in that first cell is perpetuated in every cell that develops from it, the genes themselves being the formative factors in the development of the body, governing such diverse things as height, colour of hair and eyes, development of organs and features, resistance to disease, temperament and so forth.

If a cell is examined under the microscope the nucleus which contains these genes can be clearly seen. It has a different appearance according to whether the cell is ready to divide or not. But when it is about to divide or is in process of division, minute dark wormy things are just visible. To these is given the name of "chromosomes". And these chromosomes carry the genes. In a loose way we may liken them to strings of beads, each gene being a bead, and each according to its position in the string having a vital function to fulfil in building up the body. These results have been established in the main by innumerable experiments with the fruit-fly, which for various reasons is peculiarly suitable, and it has even been established in some cases at what particular point along a chromosome a particular gene lies that fulfils a particular function in body-building.

Now the number of chromosomes in a cell varies according to the plant or animal concerned, but it is constant for all the cells of all animals or plants of a particular species. Thus a sweet-pea cell has fourteen, the fruit fly eight, a human being forty-eight. Always, however, there is an even number. They go in pairs. And the genes located in each member of a pair fulfil the same functions; so that if a particular gene happens to be defective, and its opposite number is sound, the development of the body in the particular part governed by that gene is not impaired. If both are defective, then the corresponding defect in the growth of the body appears. It is as if all plants and animals were provided with a complete set of spare parts; only if any spare part required were also

defective would the organism suffer. Now when a reproductive cell is formed, whether in male or female, its peculiar character is that it only contains one set of chromosomes. A male cell entering a female cell thus provides the initial cell of an offspring with its two complete sets of chromosomes, carrying two complete equipments of genes, one from the father and one from the mother. And it is very interesting to learn what happens. Take, for example, Abbé Mendel's peas. One or more of the genes governs height. If a certain gene is "defective" it will produce a dwarf pea. But there will only be a dwarf pea if both the genes concerned are thus defective. If one is sound, it is enough to enable the pea to grow tall. So the sound gene that controls the growth is called "dominant", and the other which lies low, so to speak, is called "recessive". Where both or one is dominant, then there will be height; only where both are recessive will the dwarf appear.

We can perhaps see best in diagrammatic form what happens. Suppose we cross a pure tall where both genes are dominant, with a dwarf where both are recessive. $D =$ dominant, $r =$ recessive. $D.D. \times r.r.$ It is obvious if you take one from the father and one from the mother to form the new combination for an offspring, the only possible combination is one of each, $D.r.$ And the dominant will have it. All the offspring of the first generation will be as Mendel found, "dominants". But if these are paired off with each other, $D.r. \times D.r.$, there are four ways of doing it: $D.D.$, $r.D.$, $D.r.$, $r.r.$ The first three containing each a dominant will produce tall peas; only in the fourth case with two recessives will there be a dwarf. The reason for the proportion, three to one, which Mendel discovered, is now apparent. And a good many other things begin to become apparent too, as we realize that owing to our physical kinship with all God's living world, the same things happen in the cells of human bodies. Let us look at one or two in particular.

Not all dominant characteristics are inherently superior to recessives. Brown colour in the eye, for example, is a dominant, and blue recessive. But plenty of people are perfectly satisfied with blue eyes. Fortunately for us, however, genes which are required to provide us with factors that are important or vital to our development are always dominant, otherwise the human race would soon peter out. Defective genes may be responsible for the failure of some vital organ to develop or function as it should; for example, for feeble-mindedness or feeble resistance to certain diseases; and being recessive they may be latent in apparently normal persons. And we may be carriers of hereditary defects without showing any signs

ourselves. Suppose in our diagram above D. were normal mindedness and r. feeble-mindedness, then all the children of the first generation would be all right. But if any of the offspring married into a family where feeble-mindedness were latent, the chances are one in four that any child would be feeble-minded; and three in four that the defect would be handed on to the next generation after. We can also see the dangers of in-breeding. If there is any latent defect in the family, and two children of the same family married, the chances are one in four that it would come out. Defects that are naturally eliminated by marrying with other stocks tend to develop by much in-breeding. On the other hand, we can see how that in the case of animals, where the weak or defective can be destroyed, in-breeding can produce also types of exceptional strength and purity.

Another problem becomes a little clearer too as a result of these discoveries; and that is the problem with which we began, as to how it is that a child will suddenly develop characteristics so unlike either parent or grandparent. It is possible for a recessive characteristic to lie dormant for generations, and then for it suddenly to appear. Not all families have portraits of distant ancestors; but it has happened more than once that in a child people have seen a remote ancestor come to life again, as they glance at an old family portrait on the wall.

And now to revert once more to the germ cells, and the genes, the carriers of our heredity. There is a very interesting set of hereditary characteristics known as sex-linked characteristics, because they go with the sex of the offspring; the general principles being that sons inherit from the mother, and daughters are carriers from their fathers to their sons. These particular characteristics, therefore, are not transmitted according to the Mendelian law, but by a law of their own. And the reason for it is this: In the male one of the chromosomes of a certain pair is smaller than its mate and is almost non-functioning. Consequently when the germ cells form containing only one set of chromosomes each, some germ cells will have the complete set, and some germ cells will have a set that is complete except for one small non-functioning chromosome. So that when the germ cells of two parents coalesce to form the beginning of a new offspring, either two cells containing complete sets may be united, in which case the result is a female; or two cells containing one complete set and one set containing this non-functioning chromosome may be united, in which case the result is a male. If "C" represents a normal chromosome and "c" the small non-functioning one occurring only in the male and characteristic of the male, we could represent it diagram-

matically thus: Female cell C.C. Male cell C¹.c. Taking one from each and combining for new offspring, it is only possible to get the combination C.C¹. which is female, or C.c. which is male.

Now all the characteristics governed by genes occurring in this particular chromosome will obviously be related to the sex of the offspring. Suppose there is such a defect in the C¹. of the father, and not in the mother; then, obviously, no son can inherit it, but in every daughter it must be latent. Supposing such a daughter C.C¹. marries a healthy male C.c., then the daughters will all be of the type C.C. or C.C¹.; that is none will show the defect, but half of them will carry it, and be liable to transmit it to sons. But the sons will be of the type C.c. or C¹.c.; and, if the latter, will exhibit the defect as "c" doesn't function. That is there is a fifty per cent. chance of sons of such mothers developing the defect.

To sum up: in a male the C. chromosome must have come from the mother, and the C. chromosome of a father must descend to a daughter. So that if there is any defect in that chromosome it must be inherited in that way. Sons will inherit from the mother, fathers will transmit through their daughters.

The most interesting characteristics that are linked in this way are colour-blindness and haemophilia, or bleeding disease. And the implications are that a man need not fear to marry, if he is clear of it himself, whatever the history of such defects in his ancestry. If he is clear himself he cannot pass it on. On the other hand if he has the defect, he must inevitably transmit it through any daughters he may have to subsequent generations, though in any case he can't pass it on to sons.

With regard to a woman, if her father has the defect, or if it is anywhere in the mother's ancestry by female descent from any male ancestor who has had it, the defect may be latent in her; and she may be liable to pass it on to her sons, or through her daughters to their sons.

Where there is a danger of passing on so serious a complaint as haemophilia, persons so liable ought not to have children. And it is another case where nature seems hardest on the woman. For while if a man is clear himself he can safely marry whatever his ancestral record, a woman perfectly healthy herself may have to refrain if it is in her ancestry.

Now it is not always as easy as this to decide what is due to heredity and what is the effect of environment and upbringing; to decide as between nature and nurture. For characteristics don't fall into convenient and mutually distinct categories. Indeed there are some which can be the product of either heredity or environment. And there are some due to heredity which can

be eliminated by environment, by supplying in some other way for a hereditary defect. An outstanding example of this latter type is the Crétin, the pitiful, slobbering, undeveloped, large-headed idiot. It has been found that his trouble is due to a defect in the genes that govern the growth of the thyroid gland; his mal-development comes from an insufficiency of thyroid; and he can be changed to a normal creature if his trouble be taken in time and he is fed on thyroid gland extracts.

It is well-known to-day that only very few diseases are definitely proved to be hereditary. The great majority commonly regarded as hereditary, such as tuberculosis, are not hereditary in themselves; but only a weakness of resistance is inherited, which makes the individual more liable to infection by the germ. Which means that if appropriate steps are taken to increase the resistance in other ways, that particular hereditary defect may not prove serious.

But if a good environment can help to counteract a defective heredity, a bad environment can equally thwart a good heredity, and prevent latent capacities of good from developing. So that if one is asked which is the more important, "Nature or nurture" the only really scientific answer would seem to be "Both." But if it is asked "Which needs most attention from us to-day?" I should be inclined to say "nature." It seems that there is no small danger of upsetting the balance of nature by a disproportionate attention to nurture and a comparative neglect of heredity. In days when conditions were hard and human life cheap, there is no doubt that the quality of our human stock was kept up by the ruthless process of "the survival of the fittest." But now that the humaner principles of a more Christian civilisation demand that we care for the sick and the weak, it is imperative that attention be also given to questions of heredity and the quality of the human stock. It is an aspect of things to which the Germans are wide awake to-day, and if we disagree with the paganism of some of their doctrines, and the ruthlessness of some of their methods, we cannot afford to be indifferent to the underlying problem they are trying to solve. Julian Huxley puts it like this, "The hereditary constitution sets the limits to the possibility of the stock, and environment determines which of those possibilities shall be realised. . . . But the best environment will not bring out good qualities in a child with really defective inheritance." The upshot would seem to be that we need to give attention both to Education and Eugenics; and that the more attention we give to improving conditions and giving all alike, whether of sound or defective heredity, the best chance in life, the more important it is to give equal attention in such ways as

are open to us, to restricting the propagation of serious hereditary weaknesses and defects. "Just as we ought to give every child which actually comes into the world the best possible environment and education, so we ought to try and ensure that the children who are to come into the world shall have the best possible constitution; and this can only be done by some control of the individual's right to bring children into the world." Something can be done, and ought to be done, by way of legislation for extreme cases. But for the most part we must rely on a sound and educated public opinion, in which the enlightened Christian conscience of the Churches should be taking a bigger part. Our knowledge of these matters is far from complete, but it is growing. And increase of knowledge means increase of responsibility. "For him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, it is sin."

F. C. BRYAN.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England, 1640-1660,
by W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.,
21s. net.)

Dr. Jordan's massive and monumental work, of which this is volume III., is appearing at an opportune time, for the battle of 300 years ago may have to be fought again. The liberty of the subject is being challenged, not solely by the totalitarian States; and it is well that those who cherish freedom should study the fundamental principles of religious and political liberty which were hammered out upon the anvil of Civil War. In this volume an outstanding period in our nation's history is reached—the Long Parliament, the Commonwealth, the Restoration—and Dr. Jordan's examination is made with scrupulous care.

Considerable space is given to the Baptists, and Dr. Jordan suggests that "perhaps no other religious group in England during the period under survey made so important a contribution to the development of the theory of religious toleration as did the Baptists," and in another place he suggests there is reason for believing that, in the period prior to 1660, "the sect was larger than has usually been supposed."

It is safe to say that Dr. Jordan's work will become standard and indispensable. We look forward with keen anticipation to the concluding volume and the bibliography, which will be published concurrently.

A Brief Sketch of the History of the Baptist Church

at Woodhouse Carr (1838-1882) and Meanwood Road
(1882-1938), branch of South Parade, Leeds.

IT was not until the original Baptist cause in Leeds had been in existence for nearly fifty years that a "forward movement" was begun in the town, and it was under the ministry of John Eustace Giles, whose political proclivities brought him more than local fame, that twenty-six members of South Parade had been dismissed in 1837 to form the first Baptist offshoot in Leeds, over the river at Hunslet, which from that day to this has maintained its vigorous witness.¹ Two evening stations which were opened at the same period in Bowman Lane and Wortley Lane did not thrive and soon came to an end, nor did anything come of a venture at Halton. But a new station begun at Woodhouse Carr at the end of 1838 took root and flourished, and it is the centenary of this mission church, which still remains part of South Parade, that is being celebrated this month.

The story goes that one day when out for a walk after service, a group of young men came up from the centre of the town, where the old South Parade Chapel then was, along paths which led through green fields (alas, no more) until they reached Woodhouse Carr, which is situated some two miles to the north. So struck were they with the poverty of the existing Christian witness in this growing district (where the Wesleyans had some years previously put up two typical meeting-houses and where the Established Church had already for ten years displayed the first-fruits of the Napoleonic Wars in the magnificent and dominating church dedicated to St. Mark) that they straightway undertook to establish a Baptist mission in the heart of things. Woodhouse was not some recent upshoot of the Industrial Revolution, tremendously busy as its woollen and other manufactories were a century ago,² for it knew a history, which, though not greatly exciting, stretched back some hundreds of years: it was old when the Great Armada was new. It possessed a small but venerable Baptist tradition also.

In the early years of the eighteenth century, before ever a

¹ See its *Centenary History*, 1937.

² E. Parsons, *History of Leeds* (1834), I, 170, "The village itself, though placed in a beautiful natural situation, is rendered unpleasant and dirty by its manufactories."

Baptist church had been formed in Leeds at all, even before there was a Baptist community nearer than Rawdon, Thomas Hardcastle had lived in "Great Woodhouse." Hardcastle ("Thomas the first" we may call him), who had been chosen "elder" of the Rawdon Church, found himself after twenty years' service "incapable of performing his office as it ought to be done" because of the difficulty of attending from so great a distance; he therefore begged to be relieved of his office, whereupon at a church meeting on October 27th, 1744, he was solemnly and "according to his own desire and for the glory of God and by the consent and agreement of the said church . . . discharged from his office of elder. . ."³ He had both a son and a grandson named Thomas also, who apparently had a close connection with the Gildersome church; but the latter at any rate continued to live in Woodhouse, where he died at the end of the century. Later, when a church had at last been formed in the town (in 1779) a prominent Baptist of Woodhouse Carr was Joseph Sharp, who signed the church covenant of 1781 and was an influential member until his death in 1803; Thomas Langdon's funeral sermon for him was printed in the same year. Again, William Robinson of Buslingthorpe (generally reckoned part of Woodhouse) was one of the trustees of the old South Parade Chapel in 1825. But no attempt was made to provide a concerted witness in the district until 1838.

1838-1860.

It was in September of that year that "a brief statement of the Woodhouse Carr station having been made to the church by the secretary, it was resolved that the rooms at Woodhouse Carr be taken for the use of those persons who have been or may be sent out to preach under the sanction of this church," and that "Bros. Binns and Town be requested to carry out the purposes of the above resolution." On September 3rd an agreement for renting rooms at £12 a year had been signed between John Wylde, "treasurer of the Baptist church and congregations of Leeds," and William Beckwith of Leeds on behalf of the trustees of Abraham Rhodes, whose large woollen spinning mills were close at hand.⁴ The two rooms thus hired

³ Rawdon Church Book (Ms.). He signed the Church's Confession of Faith (1699) in 1715 and signed as Elder in 1724. See also *B.H.S. Trans.* IV., 45. For particulars of the Hardcastles, see *B.Q.*, N.S. VI., p. 73 (1932); and of Joseph Sharp, *ibid.*, p. 170. It is not impossible that the great Yorkshire evangelist, William Mitchell, himself laboured here in the last decade of the seventeenth century, for he certainly toured the outskirts of Leeds.

⁴ Mayhall's *Annals of Leeds* (1860), p. 317, for example, gives an account of an extensive fire in 1825.

were on the upper storey of a building in "New Speedwell," later Speedwell Street (so named from a well whose waters were reputed to have medicinal properties) and were approached by a flight of stone steps at the east end of the building. In common with the other tenants, the mission had the use of the pump and the water thereat and the privies and coal-house under the steps, "coal excepted." The Baptist tenants were to keep the windows, floor and door in repair, and a cautious note adds at the end of the agreement that there were "32 cracked squares in the windows." Following a report on the taking of these premises, a church meeting of October 2nd requested the deacons to fit up the rooms as a preaching centre, as they "were now cleaned out ready for the furniture." On the 29th of the same month the deacons were further requested to "provide such requisites as they think proper for the Woodhouse Carr station." A meeting on supplies was held forthwith "at Brother Morton's shop" next day, when it was resolved to put the rooms in order without delay, by securing the steps, installing a stove and "six seats with backs, to be numbered at the end, each sitting to be numbered and then let at 1s. per quarter," providing a Bible and two Watts's hymnbooks. Other miscellaneous details (such as the cost of candles, coals, white-washing the rooms, and the reduction of the rent to £10 shortly afterwards) reveal the frugality of those early arrangements and the slenderness of the station's worldly possessions; but nothing could daunt the apostolic zeal and simplicity of the men of South Parade of those days. They not only took the arrangement of the weekly services into their hands, but made plain from the beginning the church's unceasing solicitude for the young in their midst. After a local canvas for scholars for the Sabbath School, work began immediately with an attendance of eighty scholars on the first three Sundays. Messrs. Finnie, Fox, Trickett and Ostler were appointed to take charge of the new school, and "Brethren Dean, Matthews and Fearnside" were the first superintendents. Camp meetings and cottage meetings were instituted and were held in the neighbourhood for many a long year.

1860-1882.

The work prospered and twenty years later the station decided to purchase a home of its own. It was estimated that a new building would cost at least £300 to erect, and by April 1860⁵ the sum of £212 had been promised towards that total. Actually the cost was much higher and at the opening services sixteen months later ⁶ it was reported that £70 was still needed

⁵ *Leeds Mercury*, April 12th, 1860.

⁶ *Leeds Mercury*, August 8th, 1861.

to meet the outlay of £370. On February 18th, 1861, the foundation stone was laid by Rev. F. Edwards, of South Parade, in Cross Chancellor Street,⁷ the new site being a mere stone's throw from the old: the building was a single storey in unpretentious brick and comprised a schoolroom and three classrooms. The opening services were held on Sunday, July 28th, 1861: Rev. Mr. Mather, of Lady Lane Chapel, led the devotions in the morning, and Rev. A. Bowden, of Hunslet, in the evening. On Tuesday the 6th of August, a public meeting was held at which Mr. John Barran (later Sir John) took the chair: in the list of speakers appear the following names, long and affectionately cherished among us:—a former superintendent, W. Allison, of Selby, C. Goodall, J. B. Bilbrough and Godfrey M. Bingley.

As far as attendances show, the school saw some of its most prosperous days in the sixties, and the morning services of that decade have certainly never afterwards been equalled. Familiar names among the workers are those of John Town, G. H. Robinson, H. Newton, E. Fearnside, Thomas Oates (Secretary) and T. K. Firth (Treasurer). In common with most churches of the period, the old school undertook a good deal of social work which is now performed by secular authorities. Together with a prosperous Friendly Aid Society and a good library, for example, it had many excellent and active institutions which have since passed away for ever. In the early days, also, most of the boys and girls in the Sunday school had to be taught to read and write, and their wild, mischievous habits to be borne patiently with, when they could no longer be held altogether in check.

After little more than ten years it became clear that the small premises in Cross Chancellor Street were no longer adequate to the church's growing needs, and in 1874 a plot of land for a larger structure was actually purchased near at hand, at a cost of £377; by 1875 an "extension fund" amounting to £247 had been raised or promised and at the end of the following year the money still required was only £31, which deficiency was turned into a surplus of £150 in 1877. In the meantime, having perceived that the drift of its members was tending away from the "Carr" towards Meanwood (which lies to the north-west), the church abandoned the project of rebuilding nearby and took the bold decision to follow the members and establish a home in new territory half a mile or so up the road from town. In a word, it wished to do pioneer work and did not wish to remain in a district which by now was plentifully supplied with churches; it would lead, not follow.

⁷ *Leeds Mercury*, February 21st, 1861.

1882-1938.

And so at Clifdale (by no means as yet a "built-up" area) on April 19th, 1881, a bleak and melancholy day,⁸ the foundation stone of a new and far larger building was laid. So great was the optimism, that according to the scheme projected, only half the land available was to be built on at first, and Baptist "School," not "Church" yet, was to be the lettering on its brick frontage; the "Church" thereby explicitly and ambitiously anticipated has never materialised. It was John Town (1842-1921) who laid the stone, and to no single man does the church owe so much: many an old scholar has been found to pay respectful tribute to the memory of his loved and gracious personality and his work and influence as leader and teacher, counsellor and friend. The costs of purchasing the land, erecting the church and supplying it with furniture amounted to £2,800. Not for ten years was the church free from a lingering debt, which, from a total of £900 when the opening took place, was gradually reduced, by the sale of the abandoned site ("at no profit") in 1887 and of the old premises (in 1888) to the Quakers, and not least by the unstinted and unselfish labours of the members, until at last it was finally extinguished in 1892.

The opening services were held in March and April, 1882. On Thursday, March 23rd, Rev. George Hill, M.A., of South Parade, preached in the afternoon, and in the evening a meeting was held at which Mr. John Barran, junior (eldest son of the first Sir John) occupied the chair.⁹ On the Sunday following, the morning and evening services were conducted by Rev. T. Michael, of Halifax, President of the Yorkshire Association, and in the afternoon, Rev. G. Hill was once again the preacher, having Mr. John Town for chairman. The special services were continued not only on Sunday, April 2nd, when Rev. T. G. Rooke, of Rawdon College, preached morning and evening, but on the 9th also, when the preachers were Mr. John Town in the morning and Rev. C. A. Davies, of Bradford, at 2.30 and 6.30. The jubilee of the church lay only six short years ahead.

In the eighties and nineties the familiar names of Firth, Stead, Wigglesworth, Broadley, Holmes, Farthing, make their appearance. The memory of the last-named of these is perpetuated on the west wall of the church in a tablet which records how Rev. G. B. Farthing, his wife (formerly Miss Wright, a teacher in the school), and their three children were massacred at Tai-yuan-fu on June 9th, 1900, during the Boxer risings. Mr. Farthing, a Scarborough boy, was a student at

⁸ Disraeli died that day, and in Leeds there was a fall of snow.

⁹ *Leeds Mercury*, March 24th, 1882.

Rawdon College, and spent his vacations serving Meanwood Road. At the turn of the century Messrs. Holmes and Durrant were superintendents of the school in the morning, and Mr. G. H. Robinson in the afternoon. Mr. Robinson, happily still with us, retired from his post in 1920, having rendered faithful service for sixty years; he provides us with a remarkable link with our past and has many a golden memory of the old days. Another member with a precious record of nearly 62 years' membership was Miss Arabella Lister, who was with us from the beginning until her death in 1898.

The records show that as far as attendances go the school was at the most prosperous period of its history in the eighties; a steady weekly average of 140 scholars was no mean achievement for a school of its size, but as has been said, the morning attendances never again reached the heights attained in the sixties. In recent years the graph of attendances has shown a perturbing and precipitous descent.

The church had no resident minister until 1889. In December, 1888, Rev. G. W. Bonell was invited to hold the pastorate of Meanwood Road jointly with that of Beeston Hill, but not many years afterwards he felt obliged to resign from this dual arrangement and concentrate his energies at Beeston Hill. He was followed by Rev. E. Moore, of Bootle (1899-1909), famed for his fiddle and his politics. Then came the all too brief ministry (1914-21), interrupted by war service, of Rev. W. K. Still, honoured secretary of Rawdon College; it is not only, however, of Mr. Still himself that pleasant memories still abound, but of his wife also, and of those whom Meanwood Road find it difficult to conceive as other than "the boys." Later ministers have been P. E. Dennis (1923-24), H. Bratt (1925-28) and J. H. West, B.A., B.D. (1930-36).

Architecturally the present chapel building has been styled ¹⁰ "an admirable specimen of free classic design in brickwork, and one in every way worthy of attention as showing what can be done by the aid of good cutting brick."

FRANK BECKWITH.

¹⁰ *Leeds Mercury*, March 24th, 1882, quoting from an address by the President of the Leeds Architectural Society; a short architectural description follows, with the names of the architect and contractors.

A "Carey" Letter of 1831.

THESE have come recently into the possession of the Baptist Missionary Society copies of four letters written by William Carey from Serampore. The earliest, written from Calcutta on May 3rd, 1810, is to his father, Edmund Carey. The other three are to his sisters, Ann and Mary. They are dated March 10th, 1812, June 5th, 1830, and October 25th, 1831. The copies were made in 1895, apparently from the originals; they were sent by William Carpenter, of Wood Green, to Thomas Wright, of Olney, and have been presented to the Baptist Missionary Society by the Rev. A. E. Allen, now of Pimu, Congo.

The last of the letters has special interest, as authentic Carey material for the last few years of his life is rare. It is given in full below. Ann Carey (1763-1843) had married William Hobson (1756-1826); their home was first at Cottesbrooke, and later at Boxmoor. Mrs. Hobson cared lovingly for her invalid sister, Mary ("Polly"). In the letter there are allusions to Carey's sons, William, Jabez and Jonathan. Lucy was the daughter of his eldest but deceased son, Felix; she had married James Penney, of the Baptist Missionary Society. Levi Hobson, one of the younger generation of the Hobson family, went out to India but not as a member of the Mission. Dr. Rippon was the celebrated Baptist minister of that name. Mr. Goode was probably the Independent minister from Potterspurty, whom Carey had known in his youth. "Dear Morris" was Webster Morris, printer and minister in Clipston and Dunstable.

The letter shows the old man thinking lovingly of his family and friends, recalling the few survivors of his English years, modestly disdaining notoriety, sincerely concerned for the state of his own soul, assured, as ever, of God's triumph, and eager for the ending of slavery and other evils.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Copy of A LETTER FROM WILLIAM CAREY TO HIS SISTERS: MRS. ANN HOBSON and MARY CAREY: Written from SERAMPORE: 25th October, 1831.

My dear Sisters,

Through the good hand of God upon me I am now in health, though a series of attacks of fever has kept me very weak through the greater part of the this year. After three weeks or a month silence, I preached last Lord's day at the Danish Church. My not preaching was not because of absolute

inability, for I scarcely ever omitted attending at Worship, but my friends thought it would be likely to bring on new attacks. I never felt myself so old as I now do, indeed, I never, except in the very hot months of March, April, May and June, felt the burden of age, and during those months almost every young person feels old. My whole family is also in good health. Mr. and Mrs. Baker went to visit William last week and found them well. I had lately a letter from Jabez giving me an account of their being all well. Jonathan and all his family were here last week in good health, and Lucy who is now Mrs. Penney was with them. Thus, so far as worldly things are concerned you see I have abundant reason for thankfulness. I have not lately seen Levi or heard of him. I was in Calcutta a month ago, but was too ill to go to see anyone. I believe Levi and his family are well. I wrote to him on Saturday, but have not got his answer, had they not been well I should have heard. When I look around me I see almost all those both in England and India with whom I was formerly on terms of intimacy removed to another world. None of my former acquaintances in England are living but Dr. Rippon and Mr. Goode—I dined with Mr. Goode's nephew, a clergyman, seven or eight years ago, and when telling about his uncle he said, "The old gentleman is now seventy-four years old." I was astonished, for the last time I had seen him he was a young man about thirty-six. I could not bring my mind to make the jump from thirty-six to seventy-four at once. There are men living who were ministers when I was in England, as Dr. Steadman and Rowland Hill, but I had no acquaintance with them. Mr. Burder formerly of Coventry, with whom I was well acquainted is I believe still living, and so is my old Friend Morris. Dear Morris wrote to me for letters and other documents to assist him in writing memoirs of me, after my death, but there was a spirit in his letter which I must disapprove. I therefore told him so in my reply, and absolutely refused to send anything. Indeed I have no wish that anyone should write or say anything about me, let my memorial sleep with my body in the dust and at the last great day all the good or evil which belongs to my character will be fully known. My great concern now is to be found in Christ. His atoning sacrifice is all my hope; and I know that Sacrifice to be of such value that God has accepted it as fully vindicating his government in the exercise of mercy to sinners and as that on account of which he will accept the greatest offender who seeks to him for pardon. And the acceptance of that sacrifice of atonement was testified by the resurrection of our Lord from the dead, and by the commission to preach the gospel to all nations, with a promise or rather a

declaration that whosoever believeth on the Son shall be saved, shall not come into condemnation but is passed from death unto life.

I trust the public events now taking place in the World will ultimately bring about such a state of things as shall be for the glory of God. I wish to see Idolatry, Mahomedanism and all the political Establishment of religion in the world swept from the face of the earth and also to see slavery and war abolished and Infidelity cease. I account Socinianism and Arianism as nothing but modifications of Mahomedanism. Or if you will Mahomedanism only a modification of what they choose to call Unitarianism. They must all stand or fall together.

I am, my dear sisters,

Your affectionate brother

Wm. Carey.

Let me hear from you as often as practicable and give me all the news, especially that which relates to Northamptonshire and Leicestershire. I trust you are remembered by me in my addresses to the throne of Grace.

DR. ALDWINCKLE'S THESIS.

The Baptist Union scholarship in 1936 was awarded to Mr. R. Foster Aldwinckle, B.A., of Regent's Park College. He proceeded to Strasburg University, where he has been awarded the D.Th. for a thesis on *The Object of Christian Worship*, a study of the notion of objectivity in relation to religious experience. We are glad to see that the thesis has been published and copies (5s.) can be obtained from the author at 6a, Meadow Close, Clacton-on-Sea.

Abraham Booth's Ordination, 1769.

IN Volume 1 of Dr. Whitley's *Baptist Bibliography*, entry 19 of 1769 is as follows :

ABRAHAM BOOTH of Prescott Street
Confession of faith delivered at his ordination
with charge by B. Wallin and sermon by S. Stennett.

The confession, charge and sermon can be seen at various Libraries, as indicated in the *Bibliography*, but in 1916, when Volume 1 was published, it appeared probable that the introductory discourse of William Nash Clarke, who presided at the ordination, had not been printed. A copy of this introductory discourse has, however, recently come into my possession. It is contained in a printed booklet of ninety pages, and precedes the confession, charge and sermon. The title page is as follows :

A
C H A R G E
and
S E R M O N
together with an
Introductory Discourse
and
Confession of Faith
Delivered at the
O R D I N A T I O N
of the
Rev. Mr. Abraham Booth
Feb. 16, 1769, in Goodman's Fields
Published at the request of the church

L O N D O N,

Printed for G. Keith, *Gracechurch Street*; J. Buckland, *Pater-noster-Row*; W. Harris, *St. Paul's Church-Yard*; B. Tomkins, *Fenchurch-Street*; J. Gurney, *Holborn*, 1769.
(Price One Shilling)

William Nash Clarke at this time was minister of the Unicorn Yard Church, and the same year received the Hon. A.M. degree from Rhode Island. His introductory discourse, now printed in full below, reveals something of the procedure at an ordination service 170 years ago.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

INTRODUCTORY DISCOURSE

BY

WILLIAM CLARKE

AS we are assembled together, in the presence of GOD, to ordain a bishop or overseer in this christian church, and to be witnesses of that solemnity; methinks there are various reflections which may naturally occur to our minds upon so serious and important an occasion.

WHILE we are led to acknowledge the sovereign grace of GOD, manifested in raising to himself a people out of the ruins of the fall; we have also the highest occasion to adore the wisdom and goodness of the great head of the church, in forming those, whom he has thus made the happy subjects of his grace, into particular societies, whereby they become subservient to each other's welfare, and are instrumental in promoting the common cause of the dear Redeemer.

THE church of CHRIST is fitly represented by the similitude of a body. As a body is composed of different members, and each member hath not the same office; so the church of CHRIST consists of a number of persons, who are designed to answer various purposes, each of which is connected with the good of the whole.

WE are laid therefore under additional obligations to acknowledge the wisdom and grace which the blessed GOD has expressed in his conduct towards us, in appointing pastors and teachers, for the edifying the body of CHRIST. Very important are the ends of a gospel ministry. It is the more ordinary means of the conversion of sinners, and of the gathering those who are not already gathered; whereby the interest of CHRIST is promoted, and christian communities continued in their church state, when those who have served their generation are called home. By the word and ordinances of the gospel good men are fed with knowledge and understanding, their views of divine things are brightened, their graces are strengthened, and they fitted for the service of GOD here, and the enjoyment of him in glory.

so important are the ends designed to be answered by the pastoral office, that, while those who sustain it have reason to adopt the language of the apostle, *Who is sufficient for these things?* the church of CHRIST hath abundant cause to consider itself under special obligations to the great shepherd and bishop of souls, for continuing a succession of men, who are in some degree qualified and disposed by his grace for the arduous services of that office. Blessed be GOD, that in this our day, there are a number of such persons—persons who are possessed of a sincere regard for the honour of CHRIST, an affectionate concern

for the welfare of precious souls, and are intrusted with talents for public usefulness!

OUR obligations to the LORD JESUS CHRIST are also further increased, for the gracious assurance of his presence with his ministers to the end of time. And as we have thus always reason to acknowledge, with grateful sentiments, the constant care and kindness which he exercises towards his people; so more especially when he is pleased to interpose in the behalf of a community, by providing them a pastor to go in and out before them, and break the bread of life unto them.

WITH all cheerfulness therefore I congratulate you, my brethren and friends, upon the present joyful occasion. You have had reason to sing both of mercy and judgment, and may this day set up your Ebenezer, and say *Hitherto hath the Lord helped us*. It is not many years since Providence removed from you a very eminent servant of CHRIST; whose memory is still held in very high esteem. Under that afflictive dispensation your faith and patience were long exercised. At last GOD appeared, and you were again blessed with a very valuable pastor, whom you justly esteemed, and the LORD greatly owned. In the midst of his usefulness, and when every thing did wear the most promising aspect; He, who has a right to dispose of his servants as seemeth good in his sight, removed him from you. A gloom covered your faces, and sorrow filled your hearts. In your distress you cried unto the LORD; he heard your cries—answered your requests—and has directed you to one, whose settlement among you may be considered as a fulfilment of that gracious promise, *I will give them pastors after mine own heart*. In this fresh and gracious appearance of Providence in your favour we heartily rejoice with you; and as we are now, at your request, to separate our dear brother to the office to which you have called him, give me leave to offer a few things relative to the service of ordination.

THE inquiries which naturally fall under our consideration upon this subject, relate to the persons who are to appoint officers in the church, and to the manner in which they are to be appointed.

IF we attend to the scripture-account of the choice and appointment of proper officers to take care of the civil affairs of the church, we shall find that the brethren chose the persons, and that the apostles appointed them: *Wherefore brethren, say the apostles, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom WE may appoint over this business.*¹ *The prophets and teachers, who were at Antioch, were directed by the Holy Ghost to separate Barnabas and Saul*

¹ Acts vi. 3.

for the work whereunto he had called them.² And Titus was left in Crete to ordain elders in every city.³ From whence it appears that the persons who appointed or ordained officers in the church, whether as deacons, or pastors, and teachers, were the apostles, and more ordinary ministers of the gospel.

THE other inquiry that falls under our notice, respects the manner in which the officers in the church are to be appointed. When the brethren had chose out of their number proper persons to take care of the civil affairs of the church, they set them before the apostles; *who prayed and laid their hands on them.*⁴ In the account which we have of the separation of *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the work to which they were called, we find that the prophets and teachers *fasted, prayed and laid their hands on them.*⁵

THE common objection made to the practice of laying on of hands in the service of ordination is, that it was a rite used with a view of conveying extraordinary gifts; and that as these gifts are ceased, the medium that was appointed for the conveyance of them doth cease likewise.

IN answer to this I would observe, that it doth not appear that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were always bestowed when imposition of hands was used. We are informed that *Stephen*, full of faith and power, did great wonders; but it is not mentioned as the effect of the laying on of the hands of the apostles; nor is it improbable but that he had the power of working miracles before he was separated to his office by the imposition of hands; for it is said of him, that he was a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost; a phrase used in the second of Acts, to denote a person possessed of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Nor does it appear that *Barnabas* and *Saul* did receive the power of working miracles by the laying on of the hands of the prophets and teachers. They had been already sometime ministers of the gospel, but now being called to more public work, they were solemnly set apart thereto by fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands: which account we have without any intimation of extraordinary gifts being received or intended by this method of separation.

IF it could be proved, which I think I may say it cannot, that in the times of the apostles, the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit did always accompany imposition of hands; yet even this would not set aside the validity of the practice of laying on of hands, unless it could also be proved, that this was the only design of it. May we not well suppose, that prayer was made for all those supplies of grace and wisdom which the nature of

² Acts xiii. 2.

⁴ Acts vi. 6.

³ Titus i. 5.

⁵ Acts xiii. 6.

their work did require, and for that success which the important ends of their office rendered desirable, and that the laying on of hands was a solemn pointing out the person, whom they separated to the work to which they were called, and on whom they implored divine blessings whether of an ordinary or extraordinary nature?

FORASMUCH therefore as we find in the sacred writings, that the separating those who were called by GOD to office in the church devolved upon the ministers, and that it was done by prayer and imposition of hands; and as it does not appear that the practice of laying on of hands was confined to the conferring the peculiar gifts of the Holy Ghost; and we have no intimation of its being laid aside; we are now come, at the desire of this church, to separate Mr. *Abraham Booth* to the pastoral office in this community, according to the primitive manner, by prayer and imposition of hands. In order to which, give me leave for the satisfaction of this assembly to make the few following requests.

SINCE it cannot but be considered as a matter of great importance in the settlement of a pastor, that a conscientious regard be had to the word of GOD, and the leadings of Providence; I beg leave to request that one of the members of this church, in the name of the whole, would give an account of the steps which have been taken by this community in order to its obtaining a pastor.

Which was accordingly done by a brother of the church.

As you, the members of this church, have invited Mr. *Abraham Booth* to be your pastor, permit me to desire you, both the brethren and sisters, publicly to recognize your invitation by lifting up your right hand.

Which was accordingly done.

As this church have invited you, my brother, to take the oversight of them in the LORD, and have now publicly recognized their invitation; be pleased to give us an account of the steps which you have taken relative to their call, and also to declare your acceptance of the same.

Which was accordingly done. And Mr. Booth then proceeded to deliver a confession of his faith.

The Great Raid of 1670

on certain London Churches under the new
Conventicle Act.

THE Conventicle Act of 1670 endured till 1812, and has therefore been of great importance. There was precedent for it in the Elizabethan Act of 1593, which could be enforced in the last resort by banishment or death; but even Archbishop Sheldon found that public opinion would not tolerate a man being executed just because he would preach; and Bunyan was only (!) kept in prison for twelve years. An Act was passed in 1664 which substituted a fine of £100 or transportation for seven years. Even this was too strong meat. Indeed, while general opinion was against convictions, most angry passions were stirred, especially in naval circles. The ship-builders at Chatham threatened a strike if any attempt to enforce the Act were made there. It is often supposed that indignant sailors piloted the Dutch fleet into the Medway, where they burned many ships and towed away more. When the Act ran out in 1668 there was general relief in all dissenting circles.

The bishops, however, could not reconcile themselves to the speedy erection of new buildings and the wholesale appearance of preachers. Sheldon obtained reports from every parish in his province, and persuaded Parliament to pass a permanent Act, to come into force on May 10th, 1670.

Under the new Act, penalties differed from those of the temporary 1664 Act, or that of Elizabeth. A first offence entailed fines only: 5/- per hearer, £20 per preacher, £20 per owner of premises. There was no power to arrest, except for trial, and on conviction and payment of the fine the offender was freed. There was no power to imprison, as had previously been the case. Yet, as the State Papers and other records show, men did stay in prison, the process was probably either that they refused to pay and were detained for debt; or that they refused to abstain and were somewhat illegally detained; or that they were excommunicated. There were many strings to a persecutor's bow, though the informer wanted only his one-third of the fines.

Now Sheldon believed in striking while the iron was hot. In 1662 most careful arrangements had been made to fill every London pulpit the next Sunday after the wholesale resignations. This time it was decided to have spectacular raids made on the most famous of the new conventicles, at the first opportunity after May 10th. We are fortunate in having one of the informa-

tions, which appears to have been laid before the Lord Mayor. It runs as follows :

“ Mr. Vincent in hand alley Bishopsgate street Mr. Watson
The Quakers Devonshire house The Anabaptists Dunning
ally The Anabaptists in Petty france near Bethlem
The Quakers in Gracechurch street Mr. Dolittle in
Monkwell Street Cock pitt in Aldersgate street Salisbury
Court a publick Meeting in Blackfriars a publick
Meeting in Swan ally Coleman street Glovers Hall in Beech
lane.”

To execute an ordinary Act, the parish constable was the usual person, though in London the Lord Mayor had special officers also. But this Act had a clause that the militia might be employed, or any other of His Majesty's forces, horse or foot; and that any J.P. or alderman of London might call for any assistance he liked.

This particular information was placed in the hands of Sir Andrew King, colonel of the Green Regiment of the trainbands. He endorsed it with notes of the arrangements to be made. And when the officers reported back to him the results, further notes were made on the back. These are rather illegible and rather mystifying. Even where the words are clear, the meaning is not. The various notes seem to run as follows :

“ Major Wallis wth his Compy to march without Bush-gate & carry his orders — Capn Hary to march out Cripelgate & carry yt order — Sargt Turner with 10 files of ft Tho Bludwork to salsbery court and Blackfryers with a warrt—10 files of L.C. Rowswet to Bl.fryers to deliver (?) etc. ye warrante—
6 files for caldin]aly of captain bratle—[next page] Maj : Wallis [illegible] his sarj. to advise had made Procl. & yt they continue—I ordered him to exec.^{te} ye war.
[next line] hee came & said hee was to assist,
ye C: Po: [sic] I ordered him to aprhnd said minister & sume others./6 files of Capt Bratleys ordered to ye quakers meeting in Gracious street.”

This single sheet, together with 45 other papers relating to the Green Regiment, passed to the Executor of Sir Andrew. He was also chapter clerk of Westminster Abbey, where all these military papers thus found an unexpected home. This sheet is numbered 11461 in the Abbey muniments. Our attention was drawn to it by Mr. Wilfred S. Samuel. It may be the text for many comments: first, on the conventicles conducted by ministers.

Thomas Vincent, educated at Westminster, Felsted, Christ Church, was appointed rector of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, in 1657. The vestry voted him £50 "in case he leaves the parish," on August 21st, 1662; for he would not conform. During the plague he won wider fame by his courageous ministry. In 1668 the Conventicle Act expired, and his friends built a special room with galleries, in Hand Alley, Bishopsgate Street, as was reported next year to the bishop. On May 25th he was fined £20 for preaching, first offence. This fixes the date of our document very closely.

Thomas Watson, educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, had been very important in the Presbyterian organisation of London, scribe of two Classes, assessor of the London Provincial Assembly, commissioner for approbation of ministers. He therefore resigned in 1662, but took the Oxford Oath to bow to the new order, so that he had no need to remove five miles from London. In 1669 he hired part of Devonshire House from the countess, and fitted it with two galleries, and pews. The Bishop of Lincoln in a letter of April 25th, 1670, refers to this "conventicle in Fisher's Folly," and the letter may have prompted the information being laid.

Of the Quakers in another part of Devonshire House, very much is known and has been published; so also in Gracechurch Street.

Thomas Doolittle, of Kidderminster and Pembroke College, Cambridge, was elected rector by the parishioners of St. Alphage, London Wall, in 1653; they built him a house, and laid on the New River water with a leaden pipe and a brass cock. On ejection, he and Vincent conducted worship in his house in Bunhill, and he took pupils, one of whom secured an Edinburgh M.A. in July 1664. At the plague he went to Romford, where he was presented as likely to become chargeable to the parish. By 1669 he was back in the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, preaching in a house built on purpose in Mugwell Street. This attempt to arrest him in May failed. His adventures have been fully recorded, and his success as a tutor was great.

We may now study the Baptist places concerned in this first raid of May 1670; the information rather corrects previous ideas as to this district.

Dunning's Alley was occupied by General Baptists, headed by John Griffith, a leader, from 1654. Despite his voluntary offer of civil obedience, he was repeatedly arrested; in 1665 in jail at Aylesbury, along with Keach and Jennings, in whom Colonel Blood was afterwards interested to secure their liberation. In 1672 he was in the King's Bench prison, and that may be the result of this raid; a general pardon freed him.

Petty France, near the Bethlehem hospital, was the site of a meeting-house provided by Edward Harrison from Kensworth. He had been helped by another ex-clergyman, Benjamin Cox, and by Samuel Tull, but Cox seems to have died. In 1669 Harrison had been indicted for holding a conventicle, but the 1664 Act had expired, and no one seems to have pressed the 1593 Act, under which Bunyan was still being held. So nothing seems to have resulted. Here again he persisted, and in 1672 he secured a licence for this house.

The meeting-house in Swan Alley is well known as the headquarters of Henry Jessey till his death in jail, 1663. He was buried in the graveyard of Bethlehem. At this time there was trouble as to a successor; a letter of July 21st, 1669 to Broadmead opened a correspondence showing that they wanted another ex-clergyman, Thomas Hardcastle. As he had joined here before June, and was imprisoned six months this year for preaching in London, it is highly probable he was arrested here on this raid. Two years later he was living at Bitton, in Gloucestershire, where he took out a general licence for Presbyterian teaching. This Church asked for no licence in 1672, secured Henry Fitten as pastor two years afterwards. When Henry Forty went to Abington, and Buttall to Plymouth in 1682, this Church disbanded, after a very chequered existence since 1616.

Glovers' Hall on Beech Lane had been the private chapel of the Abbots of Romsey, in their town-house. It was hired by a Church which had been very famous. Its heads in 1649, Thomas Gunn and Thomas Mabbatt, had signed the first Baptist Confession which attracted attention. Five years later it was the leading Church, with such important members as Edward Cressett, soon to be Master of Charterhouse and a Tryer for all England, also John Vernon, soon to be general in Ireland. It was to this Church that Myles came from Swansea and received guidance for his work in Wales; he found them housed at the Glass House on Broad Street, which they had fitted for worship with two banks of galleries. They were turned out in 1660, and returned to Glovers' Hall. Accounts were published, and reprinted by Thomas Crosby, of how they were repeatedly molested there by the soldiery in 1662. This episode shows them staunch, and links with the story of another raid in 1683, which does seem decisive, for there is no trace in 1689.

A most remarkable omission is that of Kiffin. His Church was so important that, in February, 1669, Hanserd Knollys, Edward Harrison and Kiffin had ordained Daniel Dike, an ex-clergyman, to take charge of two hundred people meeting in Finsbury Court by the Artillery ground. Dike had been indicted at Hicks Hall, and again seems to have proved there was no

longer any Law to forbid. Now, however, there was an explicit Law, yet when these instructions were given, for this very district, nothing is said as to Kiffin or Dike or the Court. This may be due to the fact that Kiffin had been recently captain in these very trainbands.

Norcott's Church in Wapping was probably being raided from the Tower. Hobson's had been in Bishopsgate and is not mentioned here, so apparently this had collapsed. Knollys' Church in Wapping, and Loveday's in Tower Hill, would again receive attentions from the Tower, as also the Seventh Day Church in Whitechapel.

It is strange that there is no warrant to deal with the Church formerly on Gun Alley, Little Moorfields, presently to worship at Paul's Alley, Barbican. Conceivably it was in 1670 at the Cockpit in Aldersgate Street, which hitherto has not been mentioned as the meeting-place of a conventicle.

Salisbury Court in Fleet Street had a meeting-house, appropriated for parish worship after the fire. This warrant shows it had been used again by nonconformists; there is no reason to connect it with Baptists. The Blackfriars meeting is not identified; it also is improbably Baptist.

W. T. WHITLEY.

A Book of Personal Religion, edited by Nathaniel Micklem.
(Independent Press, 3s. 6d. net.)

It is doubtful if we who are Free Churchmen appreciate the wealth and range of our spiritual tradition and inheritance. Our fathers had a firm grasp upon the Gospel; they built upon the Rock; their beliefs were held with passion; the roots of their faith went deep. The Principal of Mansfield College realises that we cannot go back to their theologies, but he feels that we must at all costs get back to their religion. So he has browsed among the authors and writings upon which, next to the Bible, our fathers nourished their spiritual life, and in this book he gives extracts from Bunyan, Calvin, John Owen and others. As we read and ponder Doddridge's *Rules for Prayer* and his thoughts on *Spiritual Dryness*, we realise that these men possessed a spiritual experience whose message is timeless. The book is timely for this day of crisis when the Church is increasingly thrown back upon the central verities.

Reviews.

The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England, by Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt. (George Allen and Unwin, 10s. net.)

With the help of the Hibbert Trustees, the Librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, has been able to publish this very interesting and scholarly survey of the contribution of the religious group to which he belongs to the life of the community as a whole. It is an important work and has behind it much painstaking research, some of the difficulties of which can only be understood by those who have themselves attempted it. Some five hundred individual Unitarians are referred to in these pages and many of them were known only in their own localities. Mr. Holt has not been content with generalisations; the statements he makes are the result of a careful examination of records from every part of the country, and are supported by detailed evidence.

The word Unitarian is not easy to define, but, as the author well says, "the significance of a word is given by its life history not by its etymology or by the definitions that compilers of dictionaries try to impose upon it." Mr. Holt has been anxious to be as comprehensive as possible and occasionally seems to claim as Unitarians some who were themselves chary of the name, but in the main he is thinking of those members of English dissenting congregations who developed heretical views after the middle of the eighteenth century and members of those congregations organised avowedly as Unitarian after 1774.

Anti-Trinitarian views go back far earlier than this in English religious history. At the time of the Reformation the Socinians and not a few Anabaptists rejected the orthodox creeds, and their views passed over into England by various channels. So-called "Arian Baptists" from Holland were burned for their heretical views in 1575, and the last Englishmen to suffer death in this way were Unitarians in outlook. This was in 1612. Only a few years later non-Trinitarian views were expressed within the Church of England by John Biddle, and with him there began a tradition that was to continue till the days of Theophilus Lindsey, who by leaving the Church and founding the chapel in Essex Street really began the modern Unitarian movement. The oldest Unitarian congregations came, however, of Puritan and Dissenting ancestry. Under the influences of Deism in the eighteenth century certain Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists adopted unorthodox views regarding the Person of Christ and the Atonement, and these formed the

nucleus of the denomination as we know it to-day. So far as the Baptists were concerned it was the Generals rather than the Particulars who were affected in this way. The industrial north has always been a Unitarian stronghold and the churches there were formed in the main in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Many distinguished men and women have been connected with the Unitarian movement. In the seventeenth century John Locke, John Milton and Sir Isaac Newton all held some form of Unitarian views. Dr. Joseph Priestley was an outstanding figure a century later. Josiah Wedgwood, Florence Nightingale, Charles Dickens and Joseph Chamberlain had all contact with Unitarian Chapels, and James Martineau stands out as the great modern prophet of the denomination.

Mr. Holt's purpose is to set the life of this group in its true perspective as part of the larger life of the nation and to ask what has been its contribution to social progress. He is not concerned with theological or ecclesiastical problems and is at times a little disingenuous on these matters. "Unitarians believe the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life, and so attach less importance to assent to the Creeds than to the lives that men live," he writes. And again, "They held that only those doctrines should be accepted which were in the New Testament, and that of these only such as are intelligible to human reason should be regarded as matters of faith." But since such matters are not his theme it is perhaps unfair to suggest that definitions like these (and there are several in these pages) do not really get to grips with the issues that have separated Unitarians from other Christian bodies.

Along three lines, Mr. Holt believes, Unitarians have contributed to social progress. They have shown outstanding devotion to civil and religious liberty, a passion for education and a sense of responsibility. In a series of chapters he deals in detail with their contributions to the Industrial Revolution, Parliamentary Reform and other movements for freedom, a new social order, local government, and education. It is an impressive picture that he builds up. From the days of Thomas Firmin (one of Biddle's disciples) to those of L. P. Jacks, Unitarians have been in the forefront of all movements for better conditions of life.

One is tempted to ask what different notes would be struck if one wrote on "The Independent Contribution to Social Progress in England" or "The Baptist Contribution to Social Progress in England." Studies like this would be well worth making. In our own case we could claim nothing like the same interest in education, nor have we had in our ranks so many leading employers from the industrial north, nor have we shown

quite so intense a "regard for respectability and conventionality in manners" but in other respects we have surely shown the same kind of radicalism, and added to it an evangelistic and missionary zeal that have had considerable social results. We also can claim to have been very early in the field with the plea for full religious liberty. It would indeed be interesting to know whether Thomas Helwys had been at all influenced by Socinian thought during his time in Holland. We can claim, too, a notable part in the struggle for civil and religious liberty and in the general field of social reform. Are these things a part, then, of our common Puritan ancestry, and quite independent of our varying theological conceptions?

This is a very valuable study, bringing together a mass of material and opening up many different lines of thought. The debt this country owes to the dissenting groups is seen to be the greater the more closely it is scrutinised. The book is produced in a manner worthy of the firm that has published it, but we have noticed printer's errors on pages 288 (the "e" missing in "Congregationalist") and 324 ("Calvanistic" for "Calvinistic").

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Did Christ Really Live? by H. G. Wood, D.D. (Student Christian Movement Press, 5s. net.)

The Christian faith has a historical basis, and any doubts which may arise concerning the existence of the Christ of the gospels need to be faced fairly and frankly. Dr. Wood considers that these doubts are more prevalent than is generally supposed, and selects for special study the Christ-myth theory, of which there are many variants, all of which go back in substance to the writings of the late J. M. Robertson. According to this theory the gospels are symbolic and arose out of a Palestinian mystery cult. In the story of the Passion it is suggested that we have, not a history of events which actually took place, but a ritualistic drama which represented and became a substitute for the practice of human sacrifice. The arguments in support of this theory are many and various and at times become very intangible and elusive. The dramatic quality of the gospels is pointed out, everything they contain is treated as symbolic, and the accounts of the miracles are considered as sufficient evidence that they do not record actual events. Positively the argument is based upon researches into the practice of human sacrifice in various parts of the world and supposed parallels are discovered to certain details of the Passion narrative. To the serious student of the gospels the argument as it develops, looks far-fetched and

pointless, and Dr. Wood proceeds with careful and painstaking scrutiny to disclose its many gaps and inconsistencies. He shows that the data upon which the theory is based are unconnected with each other except where they are mutually contradictory. He points out that the dramatic quality of the gospels is a natural feature of their vivid style, and that historic facts are capable of symbolic interpretation, where the truth concerned is of a deep spiritual nature. He discloses the arbitrary manner in which the criticism of the gospels proceeds, so that the generally accepted canons of historical evidence are conveniently disregarded. On the other hand there is no hesitation in exalting what is at first a surmise from some trivial detail into an assured fact. Thus Robertson himself writes on one occasion "we may perhaps infer where we cannot trace the development that preceded the reduction of the Jesus myth to its present form." To which Dr. Wood makes the just comment "Rationalists who infer where we cannot trace should not despise Christians who believe where we cannot prove."

The fact is that the whole subject is approached by these theorists from a two-fold prejudice. In the first place it is assumed that "miracles do not happen" and therefore the gospel narratives are discredited from the start. In the second place it is considered desirable that true spiritual religion should be set free from the supposed incubus of attachment to historical events, and that therefore anything that discredits the historical foundations is exalting the spiritual content of the religion concerned. Both of these dogmas are proved to be false in principle and in fact.

One wonders whether the theory is worthy of such a close scrutiny. One would have welcomed a fuller treatment of the relation of religion to history, of miracle to historical evidence, the weight of evidence behind the gospel stories, and the portrait of Jesus which emerges from the results of modern study. Such matters would be more within the scope of the members of the Religious Book Club for whom, among others, this book is intended.

E. H. DANIELL.

Baptists as Champions of Religious Freedom, by J. H. Rushbrooke, M.A., D.D. (Kingsgate Press, 4d.)

This is the text of an address delivered at the Northern Baptist Convention in Milwaukee in May, and it is of far greater value and importance than a pamphlet of a dozen pages usually suggests. Dr. Rushbrooke holds that it is still an imperative necessity to reassert the principle of soul freedom which is a

primary element of the tradition we have received from our fathers. Over wide areas of the world it is challenged, and Baptists in championing it occupy a position of peculiar advantage.

The Call to Worship, by D. Tait Patterson. Revised Pocket Edition. (Carey Press, 3s. 6d. net.)

This book of services needs no commendation. Nearly a decade has passed since the original edition was issued, and it has stood the test of time. In this revised edition the prayer section is much enriched, and new features include The Adoration of God, our Lord and the Holy Spirit; an Order for the Recognition and Dedication of Sunday School Workers and an Order of Service for the Opening and Dedication of a new church, both Orders being admirable. Possibly the Order for the Reception and Dedication of Deacons is a little slight, and, in another edition, the spiritual work of the deacon's office and the responsibility of the church members to the men and women chosen by them, might well be stressed.

We warmly congratulate the publishers on a very tasteful production, and we hope it will find its way into the studies of all Baptist ministers and lay preachers.

Dacca, by H. D. Northfield, M.A. (Carey Press, 1s. net.)

A big book, not in bulk but in interest and content. It deals with one town, one mission centre; and in the course of nine short, virile chapters, the author gives a convincing picture of the day-to-day life of a missionary and indicates some of the problems which face him in this "front line post." Get the book and read it with care: you will then be better informed on missionary work and policy, and appreciate that a "cut" in the home supplies means the cutting off of travel to outlying districts.

Finger-Tips on Glory, by Reginald Kirby (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1s. net.)

Mr. Kirby, now the minister at Collins Street, Melbourne, is remembered in this country for his ministries at Harborne and Huddersfield. This volume contains Bible studies of a fine evangelical quality.