

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php)

## In Memoriam.

A MELANCHOLY interest attaches to this number of the *Quarterly*, inasmuch as two of its contributors—Mr. Avery and Dr. Witton Davies, have passed away since their articles were received.

Mr. Avery had a distinguished career as one of our Baptist ministers until he became Secretary for the Religious Tract Society in 1909. He was a man greatly beloved by all who knew him for his unassuming spirit and fine character. Educated at Nottingham, he had a deep love for his *alma mater*, and it is a matter of congratulation that we have the records of the College from his pen. It was a labour of love, and is a worthy tribute to a distinguished Baptist Institution.

The career of Dr. Witton Davies was a romance of faith and perseverance. In one account he wrote of himself some time ago he tells us he still had all his intellectual work to do after his twenty-first year, yet in spite of initial disadvantages he rose to the highest rank amongst Hebrew scholars, being honoured with the Doctorate of three universities. For a time he served as Principal of the College at Nottingham, though most of his active service was given to Bangor. He took a deep interest in Baptist work and history and made some valuable contributions to knowledge. His affection for those who influenced his life and helped him in his student days was always deep, and it is borne witness to in the very characteristic article on Dillmann—one of the last things he wrote, and which reached the editor on the very day he died.

---

---

## The Stockholm Congress and Exhibition.

THE third gathering of The Baptist World Alliance at Stockholm on July 21st this year promises not only to be an epoch in the Baptist history of Sweden, but of Europe and the World. The meetings of the Swedish Baptist Union to signalise the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Baptists in Sweden will be held the week before. A considerable number of Swedish pastors and friends from America will be present

at this celebration, and I hope to have the honour of representing the Baptists of Britain. The World Congress will fittingly follow.

It may be recalled that the first Baptist World Congress was held in London under the presidency of Dr. Maclaren in July 1906, the second under Dr. Clifford's presidency at Philadelphia in 1911, the third should have been convened after another interval of five years, but the world war intervened, and so it comes to pass that not five years but twelve have elapsed between the second and third Congress, and almost on the verge of our gathering Dr. McArthur, who had been President of the Alliance since the Philadelphia meeting and would have been in control of the assembly at Stockholm, was called from us.

During this lengthened interval Baptists have made a good deal of progress in the world. The number of church members has grown from seven millions to ten millions, at least. In Russia alone it is estimated that there are more than one million, though for aught anybody knows there may be twice as many. In the United States of America there are more Baptist members to-day than there were in all the world when the Alliance was formed. Great strides have been made amongst the negroes—one of their leaders says that "negroes hav'n't sense enough to be anything but Baptists"! The high places of the earth have also been occupied by those who belong to our ranks, and the world has become aware of our existence in a way it was not before. It should hear more of us after Stockholm.

From present indications it would seem that there will be between two thousand and three thousand visitors at the Congress in addition to the Swedish delegates themselves, and the Immanuelskyrkan, which will be the headquarters, though it seats 2,400, will be taxed to its utmost. Happily the First Baptist Church is not far away and can receive the overspill. The Stockholm Baptists will not be unfamiliar with the task of receiving crowds, for the second European Baptist Congress (a sectional meeting of the World Alliance) met there in 1913, the first European Congress having met in Berlin in 1908. For some time this third World-Congress was projected for Prague, but travelling difficulties made such an arrangement hopeless, and to the satisfaction of everybody, Stockholm won the day. No more suitable or delightful location could have been found. Stockholm vies with Constantinople in its beautiful situation on placid arms of the sea, and the British delegates who journey in the special ship will have a fine view of the city from the deck of their floating home. It has already been suggested that

Atlanta in Georgia, that commonwealth which "has within its borders more Baptists than any other political division of the world," should be the scene of the next Congress five years hence. But of course we have to get through this Congress first, and to find the next President.

This is not the place to attempt any detailed discussion of the excellent programme that has been hammered together. It is hopeful that the note is not to be one of self-congratulation. In the present state of the world an air of complacency would ill befit those who have ever been pioneers. The general topic will be *Baptists facing the future*, and nobody would have been more ready to share in such a debate than Dr. Clifford, to whom, as European Vice-President, the initial presidency would have fallen, had he been able, as at first was hoped, to be there. If we are true to the grace God has given us one thing will be sure—we will face the future together. It has ever been the glory of Baptists that with evangelical fidelity, they have maintained evangelical liberty—these are the two focal points round which we sweep in our elliptical orbit, the orbit of all heavenly bodies. Already there have been divisive whisperings: let us fix our attention steadfastly on the great witness given to us for the world, and the whispers will die away.

*The Message of the Baptists to the World*, which will issue from the Congress, will possibly be its greatest contribution to the thought of our time. It will be presented by Dr. E. Y. Mullins, after consultation with some of the acutest brains of the denomination on both sides of the Atlantic, and it should go far to clear our position amongst other churches, and to establish it amongst ourselves. Of course it has to be discussed in the Assembly so that it may go forth with the whole weight of the Congress behind it.

*The Work of the Baptists for the World*, is to be set forth in the Exhibition, which is to be arranged in the Technical School. This is not to be as has been stated in some quarters a "Missionary Exhibition." It is to be much more than that, and something different, indeed the features which usually distinguish missionary exhibitions will be largely missing. By graphs and diagrams the progress of Baptists in all countries will be shown, and it is becoming already apparent that the comparison of one country with another will be very interesting. Maps showing the distribution of Baptist forces are being specially prepared, and there will be a reproduction of the sort of map that Carey must have had when he surveyed the world. Baptist books and periodicals from all quarters will be shown. Baptist buildings to which attaches special interest will be pictured. Portraits of Baptist worthies

will have an honoured place, but living persons will be excluded. A special niche will be found for pictures of statues that have been erected to Baptist people. Colleges and hospitals associated with Baptists all over the world will make a fine display. Each mission field will have a section to itself, arranged field by field, not by the societies or conventions responsible for the work. We shall see, for instance, at a glance what the Baptists of the world are doing for India, and so for Burmah, China, Japan, Philippines, Africa, Bolivia, as well as the mission work in other parts of South America, and in Home Missions of the States and Canada. The work amongst young people and in Sunday schools will be set forth. I venture to prophesy that everybody will be arrested by a special cartoon, thirty feet long, which is being prepared, showing '*The Nations Entering the Baptist Road*'—that it will indeed become famous in days to come. There will be several other notable features, but these shall be seen before they are described. The thing to remember is that this is something quite new; something that has never been attempted before. The creation and assembling means a great deal of thought and expense, and it may be hoped that it will not be dispersed after the Stockholm Exhibition is over, but that it may be taken around the world, and shown in important centres in all countries, gathering value on the way.

*Baptist Witness in Mission Lands* will have a day to itself, and will be represented, not only by those responsible for it, but by nationals from each country. The work in Europe will naturally claim special attention, and Dr. Rushbrook will be able to marshal delegates from most of the countries where Baptists are making progress. It is feared that Russia will be unrepresented; this will be a great disappointment, but perhaps it will call forth the greater sympathy and prayer for the work there. In Albania, Greece and Turkey there are no Baptists to be represented.

It will be a great gain for those whose lot is cast in places where we are but a feeble folk to discover how great our united testimony is: a great gain too for those of us who have entered into the large heritage our fathers have bequeathed to us, to meet our brethren who are yet bearing persecution and scorn for the sake of Christ. Indeed it will be a gain to us all to meet each other, and find that there is a distinct Baptist "ethos" common to the whole denomination, and that the future belongs to us, if we are only faithful to our trust. It may be hoped that delegates will return to their homes with a new propagative impulse to spread the truth for which Baptists stand, that there is nothing that need come between the soul of men and God who reveals Himself in our

Lord Jesus Christ—no ordinance, no priest, no church. Baptists put baptism behind faith, not before it.

Dr. Pitt and Dr. Shakespeare are the Secretaries of the Alliance, but the Congress being in Europe the arrangements have in large measure fallen to the European Secretary. By nature and by grace he is well fitted to carry the burden, and, enthusiastically seconded by the Swedish brethren, he will no doubt carry it successfully through. To Stockholm then!

W. Y. FULLERTON.

---

## A Baptist Doctor with the Prussian Army.

*The writer of the following article, Dr. Herbert Petrick, is at present taking a theological course at Regent's Park College, London, with a view to work amongst Continental Baptists. His article, studiously sober and impartial, is at once a "human document" of the deepest interest, and a powerful indictment of warfare, which is here forcefully depicted in its mass effect on men.*

**I**N writing the following, I should like to indicate that it is wholly a record of personal impressions. The experiences described went so deep, and were so overwhelming, that it is impossible to express them with the clearness of analysis. They are experiences and not conclusions. Since then, moreover, new experiences have intervened of a quite different character, belonging to the period of the Revolution, and of the great spiritual and economic distress which followed upon the close of the war.

In the fateful weeks of July, 1914, I happened to be working for my doctorate in natural sciences, and was on a geological expedition in the Alps. I remember clearly how a small group of strangers of different nationalities found themselves brought together by chance one day at the Grimsel Hospice. For some days I had been climbing mountains with several companions, without hearing anything of the world. But here we heard the latest news; Austria, in consequence of the murder of the heir-apparent to her throne, had declared war on Serbia. Every one of us realized that this was the prelude to greater events. None of us knew what war meant, but we felt ourselves already in the grip of strange powers. None knew the others, yet we all thought of the same thing. We talked of nothing else but the meaning of this, and its consequences. There was no spirit of

animosity. When one sat down at the piano, and played the *Marseillaise*, all of us joined in, and it was the same when another, later on, played *Die Wacht am Rhein*. On the next day we hurried off, and the Swiss mountains became forsaken and desolate.

Events followed in rapid succession. I knew that it was my duty to report myself to the military authorities in Berlin within twenty-four hours of an outbreak of war. I had, therefore to travel at once to Berlin. The established means of communication were already getting out of hand, and all the stations were besieged by helpless and complaining men, who had been abruptly frightened out of the peace of their summer holidays. I arrived at Berlin on the second of August. First of all I was trained in a fortress for six weeks as an ordinary soldier, to acquire something of military "polish." Then I was employed in the East for two years as an assistant-surgeon in different hospitals, prisoners' camps, and medical quarters. During the last two years of the war I served as a doctor with the Prussian Guard in Macedonia and Albania, and subsequently at the front in France. When the Revolution threatened to break out in Germany, in November, 1918, our detachment was suddenly despatched thither, to nip the Revolution in the bud, but it was already too late. On November 11th we were disarmed by the revolutionaries at the Leipzig railway station. With this, the war for me was over, and a new period began, which has made a deep impression on my life.

If I am to speak here of religious experiences with the army, we must not forget one thing—that the Church, and consequently Christianity, do not play the same part in the life of the German people as they do in England. For generations the State has lost its influence on the people. "Throne and Altar," "Capitalism and Church"—these two associations of ideas characterize the two chief preconceptions of Germans in relation to the Church. In accordance with the political preconception, the Church, and even the clergy, were regarded as the faithful servants of the State, or even as an instrument for the brutalization or spoilation of the people. Conservative circles, which extended from the nobility down to the lower "middle" classes (as a result of the numerous military and official castes), took an attitude of benevolent neutrality towards the Church; that is to say, they concerned themselves with the Church only so far as was absolutely necessary, at the chief festivals and public celebrations. Regular church-going, such as is customary in many English circles, was to be found only in the country, if at all. The ranks of political

Liberalism, which before the Revolution were confined chiefly to the working classes, took a hostile attitude towards the Church. The German working-class movement is, moreover, consciously built on an anti-ecclesiastical foundation. The idea of "church" and "state" is quite different in Germany from that which prevails in England. The origin of this difference may lie in the idea of the "Holy Roman Empire" of the German nation, in the mediæval conflict for centuries between the Papacy and Imperialism, and in the compromise of the Lutheran Reformers on the basis of an established Church. The Free Churches play no public part in Germany. They are small, and have still too much to do on their own account, before they can think of exercising influence in public affairs.

The result was that the Established and Free Churches did what has always been done hitherto, in case of war—they christened it "holy." They gave their benediction to men setting off, and preached sermons about the punitive and avenging God, instead of the God of love.

In the first weeks the people streamed to the Churches, even in Germany. They were taught that their fathers also, at such times, went to Church. They did not know what the Church stood for, because the last time they had been to a service was at their confirmation. For a time the new and unfamiliar held them captive. But they soon found out that what the preacher had to say could be read to much greater advantage in the leading articles of newspapers. Church-going dropped off. There followed the very grievous material distress of the blockade, and the endless duration of the war. Men became more and more weary. The agitation of men's minds increased to an enormous extent, up to the Revolution.

I do not believe that it was a genuine search and inquiry after God which drove people to Church at the beginning of the war. Why God? Our cause was the right one, and if there was a God at all, He would naturally be on our side. Church-going was an accompaniment of the great "mass-suggestion" which possessed Europe at that time. It was the old herd-instinct which massed men together. At a time when all standards of good and evil were changing, men sought to attain certainty by substitution of the judgment of the crowd for the judgment of tradition. The Church was unprepared, and therefore incapable of raising this primitive "urge" of men to the heights of conscious religious experience. What a different world we should be living in to-day if the Church of 1914, by its prophetic power, had been able to transform and ethicize the longing of the crowd! Infinite resources for the building of the Kingdom of God would then have been released.



This was the religious atmosphere (if we can call it that at all) from which the German soldier came. He had no consciously religious experiences, no clear Christian ideas, to take with him to the war. Consequently, the inner experiences which were his in the war could only exceptionally shape themselves into a personal relation to God or to Christ.

It was not light-heartedness, and it was not over-weening confidence, which led men to offer themselves voluntarily for military service. They knew that nothing beckoned them but deprivations, hunger, pain, and, finally, death as deliverance. They "knew" this, but a deeper power, working at the back of their consciousness, drove them forwards. This power became stronger from month to month, the further behind us lay the home-life. War-enthusiasm soon evaporated, but something else, something deeper, occupied its place. The more we were assimilated to the unique life of the trenches, the more we became different men. Hitherto we had been accustomed to make our brains the centres of our lives. Every act of ours had to have a purpose. Our thought had to have a meaning. Even our emotions had to have a rational cause. But now we were suddenly transplanted into another world, and the brain lost its controlling value. It became an organ working automatically, like the stomach. Suddenly the brain no longer sufficed to assimilate our new experiences, or even to organize them. We lived a life infinitely removed from all "understanding." We asked no longer for the causal connection; for us it was no longer there. If a particular event suddenly cut into this life of unreality, we were not surprised, but took it as something of which we had known for a long time. So also in a dream, nothing seems wonderful.

This dream-state was the characteristic feature of life during war-service. The unconscious partly below, partly above the level of consciousness, stepped into the place of conscious life. Consequently, the religious experience of the soldier on campaign worked itself out in this realm of unconsciousness. Is it not impressive when we, who are so often conscious of the conflict of the animal and the human within us, and of the triumph of the animal, have moments at which the animal, the impulses of cowardly egoism, are subdued? When we achieve something of which we are no longer capable in our normal rationality? When it is no longer *we* who act, but some higher power of which we are but the instrument?

Because I served as a doctor I have nothing to tell about heroic and gallant deeds. But the significance of life lies in the small occurrences of day after day. In March, 1917, I was at the battles near Monastir in Macedonia. There were only a few German doctors amongst us, and the losses in those battles were

heavy. Germans, Austrians, Bulgars, and Turks came to my dressing-station, sometimes bringing wounded Italians and French colonials with them. For twenty-seven hours without break I was kept busy with the wounded, until I could do no more through fatigue, hunger, thirst, and mental exhaustion. I sent a messenger to the nearest medical post, which was about six hours' ride away, asking for reinforcement. On the next day the messenger returned with the news that some hours before his own arrival the doctor at that post had shot himself. Why? Nothing more than that his nervous system had given way. Can anyone imagine the extent of the loathing, the pain, the misery, accumulated in the soul of a service doctor through four long years of war? The common soldier experienced the delivering intoxication of an attack. We doctors had to drink the bitter dregs of disenchantment. We were constantly surrounded by lacerated, broken-down men, living corpses. It involved an enormous nervous effort to stand firm against the misery continually accumulating. Every one on service experienced hours of the deepest depression; alas for him, if he did not find again the way to life! I know a number of doctors whose nerves gave way, and who had to be sent to the asylum. Suicide amongst soldiers and officers was not infrequent. Such hours as these have hardly led men to God. An inner desolation was the fundamental note of our service-life, called out by the senselessness of our occupation. Why should we restore to health these sick and wounded men? Either they remain life-long cripples, or they are cured and sent again into the mill that crushes men, till they are dead or incurably crippled. The best is, after all, to make an end as quickly as possible. Is it not more desirable to pass from life into unconsciousness?

In the Balkans there was no hope for those seriously wounded. I fell ill myself in inner Albania in the autumn of 1917, through simultaneous infection by malaria, dysentery, and typhus. It took nineteen days for me to reach the nearest German hospital, accompanied only by a soldier. Every day I had high fever, but in the mornings conditions were better, and we could ride for some hours. Then from exhaustion I had to rest amongst the shrubs, or in a native hut, until the next day. I received great kindness from a Turk, into whose house we went one day when I was very ill. When we reached the hospital after nearly three weeks of hard toil, the doctors shrugged their shoulders and, after examination, said, "You know we cannot do anything for you. Your heart is too weak for you to come through. Will you have an injection of morphia? Anyhow, write at once a good-bye letter to your sweetheart." I had no injection of morphia. I lay there for weeks, incapable of being sent on. By my side the wounded and the sick died almost hourly. Some had an injection of morphia

and all their pain was past. Was it murder? I have done the same myself. No, it was less a murder than throwing a hand-grenade!

There is blood on the hands of us all, though it is invisible to-day. But the red drops have burnt themselves into our souls. Men stood above those views of right and wrong that belong to peace. The life of war has its own inner laws. But it was a hard fight, of which those at home had no suspicion before we had overcome the old ideas. Much in war-morality which seemed terrible to those at home, loses its terrible character when we remember that it was not egoistic, and not utilitarian. To be self-centred, and to be greedy for gain, these are the two sins which penetrate so deeply into the life of the common man, and which emerge in their most repulsive form in the type of the war-profiteer. We had looked on the Gorgon face to face, on life in its most naked form, and to many a man the price was life.

At the Macedonian front we had to suffer for a time from the fact that groups of Serbians had formed in our rear, and were carrying on an extremely stubborn and pitiless guerilla warfare against us. In one village a Serbian peasant was captured, who was said to belong to such a group. He had come secretly into the village to visit his sick child. The trial was short. A German soldier received the order to take the man out of the village and shoot him. When the German did not return a search was made. The fettered Serbian was found shot in a field of maize. Not far from him lay the German, with shattered head. He had shot himself.

What had gone on in this German's soul? He went with the fettered man, whom he had to shoot. What evil had he done? Had he not simply defended his right? What was *he*, a German, doing there in a strange village? Would he not have done just the same in his own home-land? Had he also not a wife at home whom he loved? Why was this Serbian father torn from the sick-bed of his child? Was it for this that he had to shoot him, like a mad dog? Worlds divided these two men from each other, and yet they became brothers, and went together along the road to the eternal Beyond. As soldier, he knew, "I must obey orders." But, "I will expiate the deed with my own blood." Certainly these were not "Christian" thoughts, which drove this German peasant to suicide. But on the short road from the village to the field of maize he was conscious of that ancient religious command which required an eye for an eye, and blood for blood. Was not his death a confession and a sacrifice, something which is held to be the highest, even in Christianity?

In February of 1915 Hindenburg drove the Russians once for all off German soil by a wintry battle for ten days at the

Masurian Lakes in East Prussia. Our troops had to suffer heavily through the extraordinarily severe cold and the snow-storms. We had our dressing-post at a railway station. The severe frost-bites with which we had to deal were terrible. One day they brought us a young volunteer, still almost a child. He was in great danger, for both his arms and legs had been so affected by the cold that they were black with gangrene. Both legs and arms called for amputation. It was just the time when our ambulance corps changed duty, and those who had been on duty could lie down to sleep for a few hours, whilst others took their place. Suddenly there was a commotion amongst them. As I ascertained, one of our old orderlies recognized this youth, the volunteer at the point of death, as his own son. A peculiar emotion thrilled all of us as we looked on this scene of recognition, this happiness of the two men. What were the thoughts in the father's heart? Unexpectedly, and in the midst of all that wretchedness, he held his child in his arms. How must his heart have been torn by the thought, "Found, to be lost"! (As a matter of fact, the operation was successful, and the son recovered, after a long and severe illness; he was restored to his parents, though as a life-long cripple.) You might suppose this father's experience of the highest joy and the deepest grief to be the path to lead a man to God. But is it not just as easily possible that this experience of simultaneous joy and sorrow should so tear and benumb the heart that a man should not reflect about it at all—that is, should not think about God?

I believe that remarkable occurrences of this kind on service but seldom raised the question about their originator, about God. Life there moved in extremes. The prophet found God only in the gentle murmur of the wind, but our life was only storm, earthquake, and fire, and "God was not therein."

We certainly had, whilst on service, hours of exultation and hours of spiritual need. But this was not Christianity in the historical sense of the word. It was rather a primitive religion, such as perhaps the men of the ice-age may have known. It was rather the preliminary stage to a religion. We had the consciousness of being set free from the bonds of our own small personality. A sense of the absolute and the eternal enveloped us. An enormous intoxication came over us sometimes, which the ancients named "enthusiasm," a being possessed by God. We were moved by horrible things, the thirst for blood, sensuality, powers which stand on the border between the demonic and the divine.

The Christianity to which we were accustomed had little to offer us, there on service. Its forms were fashioned for the relations of home-life. We could do nothing with it in the

trenches. It was fine, when we were on leave, to go to church on Sunday, after a good sleep, freshly bathed and in clean clothes, and to sing the old well-known hymns, and to listen to the familiar words of the preacher. But that was "leave"; that was not our true life. It was fine, but it had nothing to do with the trenches. We did not want anything that had; we wanted to forget them in these few days of leave.

And there on service? In the German army there were chaplains of the Established Church only, Protestant, Roman-Catholic, and some Jewish; none from the Free Churches. Free Church ministers were either absorbed as ordinary soldiers, or were in the Ambulance Corps. I have often had the feeling that the so-called field-services were out of place. In the front line I have myself never met a clergyman. They emerged only in quiet times. They were well-clothed, chatted pleasantly with the men, and told the officers the latest stories from headquarters. They did not touch our inner life. They were figures from a world foreign to us.

It was different in the hospitals at home. There they were able to do a great deal of good, though less through official preaching than through a friendly word of sympathy. Their best service was rendered by some friendly act, a flower which they brought, a good book from which to read, a letter which they wrote to relatives. Here, in the security of the homeland, whilst a man was chained for weeks to his bed, many a word sown may have begun to germinate. Here a good pastor was often in his right place.

As I look back I see no occasion for the ordinary man to have had religious experiences whilst on service. War is something so opposed to God. It is so full of the Satanic—that is, of the consciously evil—that a pure experience of God can be possible only in the most exceptional cases. Of course, God stands ultimately behind all that happens, and so behind the happening of evil. It is, therefore, possible for man to experience God even through evil. But this can be only in quite exceptional circumstances. I believe that most of the so-called experiences of God whilst on service are sprung partly from what has been planted in the soul already in times of peace, partly from the subsequent operations of memory. Most men have seen in war-experience nothing but evil in its nakedness, and so far as they have thought about it at all, have been led to the conclusion that there is no God of truth, good, and beauty.

For ever stand those words over war which Dante placed over the entrance to Hell—

All hope abandon ye who enter here!

HERBERT PETRICK.

## As Others See us.

*[A group of Baptists have for some time been investigating the subject of the present attitude of the various denominations to Baptism. A questionnaire has been sent out, and we are glad to be able to publish some of the results. It goes without saying that we do not, in any way, endorse the opinions expressed by our critics.]*

### REPORT OF COMMISSION ON BAPTISM.

#### INTRODUCTION.

SOME few years ago the members of the Baptist Fellowship (now merged in the Free Church Fellowship) undertook to investigate the whole question of Baptism. A questionnaire, suggesting various matters for inquiry was drawn up. A section had reference to the Non-Baptist positions, whether Roman, Eastern, Anglican, or Free Church. As it seemed most urgent and more convenient at the time to gather opinions from the Pædo-baptist Free Churches, another questionnaire was drawn up, and circulated to non-Baptist members of the Free Church Fellowship. Replies were received from ministers and laymen belonging to various churches, Congregational, Presbyterian, Wesleyan Methodist, and the Society of Friends. Some of the replies were very full, amounting almost to treatises on the subject. For the most part the replies were from individuals, but in some cases groups representing different denominations reported the results of their common consideration of the questions.

The questions submitted appear (in italics) in the following report.

#### I.—THE NON-BAPTIST POSITION.

- 1.—*What is your view as to the number, nature, and significance of the Sacraments of the Church? Do you hold that a Sacrament should be: (a) Related to the experience of those who participate? (b) Of such a form as to represent that experience, the act symbolizing the fact?*

The first part of the question was, in the majority of replies, not dealt with to any great extent. For the most part, two sacraments are accepted, though one Congregational minister would recognise as sacraments, "Baptism, Communion, Marriage,

Burial, also in some sense, Ordination." Two Congregational ministers represent two very different attitudes to sacraments in general. One says: "A great part of the value of any sacrament consists in its fitness to aid the unity and continuity of the life of the Church. Any rite which is merely sectarian or merely the outcome of the circumstances of a particular time has but small value as a sacrament." The other remarks: "The sacrament of the Church is the conscious consecration of the lives of its members to the service of their Lord"—a view that might well be accepted by those who nevertheless value highly what are generally termed sacraments.

The second part of the question is answered in greater fulness. Practically all agree that a sacrament should be related to the experience of those who participate, but most guard against the anticipated Baptist conclusion by reference to the claim that "the parents as Church members" are the participants in Infant Baptism, or they claim that Infant Baptism has a relation to the experience of the child, a future experience which is open to him and desired for him. "In the case of Infant Baptism, the actual experience comes after the rite has taken place" (Congregational minister). "Experience—a result prayed for by parents and the Church" (Wesleyan minister). "The infant participates potentially" (Wesleyan minister). There is thus a tendency, on the one hand, to view the rite as related mainly to the experience of the parents or of the assembled Church, or on the other hand, as related mainly to an experience which might be the child's in years to come. A few feel that the relation of a sacrament to experience is not indispensable. As to the form of the rite, whether it should be of symbolic character, there is some diversity of opinion. It is recognised that if the act is symbolic it will serve a didactic purpose, but there are protests against over-emphasising the symbolic value of the rite. "The detail of the form should not absorb attention to the lessened perception of the spiritual fact" (Wesleyan minister). Four Presbyterian ministers agree as to the desirability of symbolism in the rite, but in anticipation of Baptist conclusions, reject "immersion as not representing common experience, but rare sudden conversions." A Wesleyan minister regards the fact signalled by the act of Infant Baptism as "the fact that the infant is 'covered' by the blood of Christ."

It may be concluded that these replies show that most non-Baptists connect the sacrament of baptism with experience only in a very vague manner, and do not attach very great importance to the symbolism of the service. If there were the same vagueness in relation to the Lord's Supper, as regards the participants and the form of the rite, what strange scenes would result!

In the face of some of the contentions advanced, Baptists must be ready to substantiate their claim that the common form of Believers' Baptism—immersion—is suited to represent more than one type of conversion.

2.—*If you practise Infant Baptism, what, in your opinion, is its significance and value to (a) the Church, (b) the parents? Do you think it is of any value to the child? Is it for you merely a dedication service or mainly so?*

(a) It is generally stated that the meaning of the service for the Church is that the Church in that act solemnly recognizes the child as belonging to God, and undertakes its part in the child's training. "The Church bears witness to its desire that the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit may be exercised upon the child from its earliest days, and to help the child" (Presbyterian layman). Others emphasise that the service has the significance of a declaration. It declares the "fact of the redemption of the infant" (Wesleyan minister). It is "a reminder of Christ's kingship over every life" (Congregational layman). Glimpses of another attitude are revealed in the following: Baptism is regarded as Disciples' Baptism. The child is baptised "not as one who in baptism is regenerated, not as one who previous to baptism is regenerated, but as one who, being in the Kingdom of God, is to be taught its truth" (Congregational minister). Again, "the Church makes its declaration, 'From this moment at least (pædobaptists differ as to the state of the soul beforehand) there is potentially in the child a supernatural as well as a natural life'" (Congregational minister).

In the main, therefore, the view held is that the service provides an opportunity for declaring the relation of the child to the gospel and to the Church, and for the Church to express its readiness to surround with all holy influences the child baptised that it may enter consciously in ever fuller measure into the understanding of Christian truth and into the privileges and responsibilities of the Church.

(b) Similarly, it is commonly urged that, as regards the parents, they are "stirred to a deeper sense of their privileges and responsibilities in relation to the child" (Congregational professor). "It provides an opportunity for their reconsecration" (Presbyterian minister). The parents are helped to realise that "they are to act in every possible way as the spiritual as well as the natural parents of the child" (Wesleyan layman). A Congregational minister finds much significance in the act of the parents in giving the child to the Church (represented by the minister), and receiving it back. Here the idea seems to be that it is not simply as parents that they have part in the service, but as parents



in the Church. Their child, too, begins its life within the Church, and the parents are called to be the ministers of the Church to the child. "The Church is a family joining together all ages" (Wesleyan layman). But the remark that occurs over and over again in the replies is that the service is chiefly of value for the parents in that it reminds them of their responsibilities to the child.

As to the value of the service to the child, such value is generally held to be *indirect*, and *conditional* upon the fulfilment of promises by parents and Church. The value to the child is that, owing to the influence and teaching of parents and Church, he becomes conscious of himself as a baptised person. "The child should be brought up with this sense that he is saved, and that he is Christ's, and not with the sense that he must be converted some day"—which latter is regarded as "an unhealthy idea" (Congregational minister). Similarly, a Wesleyan minister finds the value of the service to the child in the faithful discharge of obligations solemnly accepted, and in the child's growing consciousness of the meaning of the rite, which may be of such a character that he may feel it "a serious step to break away from all that the service means." A cautious hint as to the possibility of the direct and immediate value of the service for the child is given in one or two replies. Thus: "I do not deny that it may have value at the time even for the unconscious infant, while I assert that it has increasing value for it as the years of discretion approach" (Presbyterian minister).

As may be anticipated from the replies given to (a) and (b), there is much diversity of opinion as to whether the service is merely or mainly a Dedication Service. Replies range from a simple affirmative through various stages to a simple negative. "Mainly dedication service" (Wesleyan layman). "Mainly, but not merely, dedication service" (group). Others state emphatically that "it is more than a dedication service" (Congregational minister). Also Wesleyan minister almost in the same words. "More significant than a dedication service" (Presbyterian layman).

These remarks assume that a Dedication Service is a private or semi-private matter, while baptism, being the corporate act of the Church, involves much more. A Congregational minister holds the view that Infant Baptism is more than dedication in that, in the one the child is subordinate, is given; but "in the true meaning of baptism the child is the giver"—a sentence of which the meaning is not at once clear.

Two points for the consideration of Baptists emerge: 1. Is infant dedication with us sufficiently related to the Church? Has the congregation any real part in the service? 2. In view of the

justification of Infant Baptism as conserving the view that the child is to grow up a Christian and not simply "to be converted some day," can we hold what is true in this view, and yet believe that conversion "or some equivalent personalizing of religion," to use Starbuck's phrase, is general, and that therefore a solemn rite, such as Believers' Baptism, at this stage of experience is of special value? After all, the choice has to be made, even by the child who has been surrounded by Christian influences from earliest days.

3.—*Would you baptize all children, or only those of Christian parents?*

Where the chief value of the rite is regarded as its declaration of a general truth of the gospel, we are not surprised to find a willingness to baptise all children. The dividing-line is not denominational. Some Congregationalists and some Wesleyans would baptise all children, whilst other Congregationalists and other Wesleyans are firm in the opinion that only children of Christian parents should be baptised. Others, like one Congregational minister, would baptise "children of those parents Christian enough to wish the child to enter into relation with a Christian Church." Where it is held that the value of the service is in the solemn acceptance of the responsibility to train the child as a Christian, of course, some hope of that obligation being carried out must be present, and the hope must be based upon facts. A Presbyterian minister holds that "to baptise all is to degrade the sacrament." It is notable that no Presbyterian replies advocate general baptism of infants.

The general tendency, as far as may be gathered, seems to be toward the restriction of the rite to children of Christian parents, or at least to those cases in which there seems to be good hope of the child being properly taught and trained in Christian faith and conduct.

4.—*Would you immerse those who desired such form of baptism as a general confession of their personal faith: (a) if such had not been baptised in infancy? (b) if such had been baptised in infancy?*

(a) In general, we gather that persons *not* baptised in infancy desiring Believers' Baptism by immersion would be sympathetically dealt with in the non-Baptist Free Churches. Replies suggesting this were received from almost every writer. One Congregational minister would "not be willing to immerse except in an emergency," but almost all the Congregational, Wesleyan, and Presbyterian replies lead to the conclusion that if people not baptised in infancy desired baptism by immersion administered

by their own Church, some way of meeting their desire would be found.

(b) But there is a sharp division of opinion as to whether persons baptised in infancy should later be immersed, if they desired so to confess their faith. One Wesleyan minister would refer such apparently unintelligible people to the Baptists! Very many are strongly opposed to any one baptised in infancy being subsequently immersed as a believer. Again the division is not denominational. Whilst one Congregational minister would provide "for immersion to all who desire it," another would immerse only under very exceptional conditions," and neither would on any account allow re-baptism. Similarly one Presbyterian would be in favour of, another Presbyterian against, the immersion of believers baptised in infancy. There is similar division amongst the Wesleysans.

On the whole it may be judged that the replies for the most part are theoretical. Few, if any, cases of persons baptised in infancy desiring later believers' baptism by immersion arise in the Pædo-Baptist Free Churches. Sometimes the question may arise in the mind of an individual who is convinced of the soundness of the Baptist position, but what is regarded as loyalty to his own Church means that he takes no action. If the conviction is very strong he forsakes his own Church and joins the Baptists, or in some rare cases, on his own initiative is baptised in a Baptist Church and remains a member of his own Church. An instance has come to light of a most devoted Presbyterian elder, who, strongly Baptist by conviction, had been himself immersed in a Baptist Church. He refused to have his children baptised in infancy, and later they too were immersed in a Baptist Church, and became loyal members of a Presbyterian Church!

As long as the view abides that Infant Baptism and Believers' Baptism are essentially the same rite, differing only in minor details, and there is a "high" view as to the importance and the implications of the rite, so long will there be a strong objection to the two rites being administered to the same persons. There is no way out of this difficulty except through a realisation that the two services are distinct in *meaning* and *value*. As far as can be gathered from the replies, some would not find it impossible to make this adjustment.

5.—*Is some form of Baptism essential to Church Membership in the communion to which you belong: (a) Constitutionally? (b) In actual practice?*

It may be assumed that historically some form of baptism has been regarded as essential to Church membership in all the Free Church communities except the Society of Friends. There

is a great deal of difference in modern opinion and in modern practice.

All the Presbyterian correspondents reply in the affirmative to both parts of the question. So the Presbyterians seem to share with the close membership Baptist Churches in stressing baptism (although differently interpreted and for the most part differently administered) as an essential pre-condition of Church fellowship.

The Congregational replies vary considerably. Some Congregationalists state that both in theory and practice baptism is essential to membership. Other Congregationalists state that neither in theory or practice is this the case! Others believe that baptism should precede membership, but consider that in practice it is often neglected. It is easy to discover where the division of opinion arises. Some Congregational ministers and laymen, holding a certain view of baptism, would like to insist upon its necessity for Church membership. Others, holding a somewhat different view, are willing to leave the matter on one side.

The Wesleyans reply for the most part that baptism is "expected, recommended, but is not regarded as absolutely obligatory." A Wesleyan layman replies in the negative to both parts of the question, but Wesleyan ministers on the whole incline to the view that baptism is expected. Probably baptism is the rule. Whether it is insisted upon or not depends very largely upon local custom or ministerial attitude. Recognizing some tendency not to insist upon baptism, some Congregationalists and Wesleyans deplore the tendency, some others approve the tendency as being in the right direction.

6.--*Is your Communion Service in theory and practice confined to those who have been baptised?*

In general we gather that in the Free Churches an invitation to the Communion Service is extended either to "members of other Christian Churches," or to "all believers in Christ." Some may assume that all so invited have been baptised, and hold therefore the theory that communion is for the baptised alone. Congregational layman replies, "We ask no questions. I suppose it is taken for granted that those communicating have been baptised." Several correspondents agree that in theory Communion is for the baptised alone, but admit that practice varies; whilst others state that in their view neither in theory or in practice is there any such restriction. One Congregational minister would emphasise as a condition of attendance at the Communion, "faith and love and evidence of regeneration," whilst another would keep the

Communion Service for the baptised unless it were "a matter of conscience to refrain from baptism."

Whilst most of the Wesleyan replies suggest nothing in theory or in practice as to baptism being an essential pre-condition of attendance at the service, one adds, "If I knew of such a person (attending Communion) unbaptised, I would approach him on the matter." There seems to be a greater approximation in practice than in theory as to this matter.

Amongst the Baptists themselves there is variety of opinion and usage. In some a general invitation is given to all Christians, in others to members of "other Christian Churches," and in some—"close Communion" Churches—to members of other Baptist Churches. In the last case, it is assumed that such have been baptised as believers by immersion. The fact of "open membership" Baptist Churches—admitting as they do unbaptised persons to membership—is apparently lost sight of.

7.—*What is the nature and value of any rite you observe to mark the "Personalizing of Religion" or admission to full membership of the Church?*

An interesting contribution from a member of the Society of Friends deals with "birth-right membership." Children, both of whose parents are members of the Society, are themselves regarded as members, no further step being taken to admit them to membership. This suggests the idea advanced by many Pædobaptists as to the relation of children of church members to the Church. They are regarded as already within the Church. It is interesting to note that a Christian community which has abandoned baptism in any form has yet retained an idea that is certainly enshrined in infant baptism as viewed by a considerable number of those who practise it.

Further, with regard to the procedure in vogue in the Society of Friends, applications for membership are made to the Monthly Meeting. Those received are welcomed at a subsequent meeting of the Society. The correspondent adds, "Many friends feel that there is need of a more definite opportunity for young people to consciously to take upon themselves the responsibilities of membership." In the mission field, the candidates make a statement of their faith in their own words before the Society.

Other communications furnish information as to procedure which is for the most part familiar. With Congregationalists there is usually a catechumen or instruction class, interview of candidates by the minister or by Church members appointed, reception of report and vote of the Church in meeting assembled, and finally the giving of the right hand of fellowship at the Communion Service. Some send in Orders of Service used by them.

In many of them appear questions to candidates and answers given by them at their public reception into Church fellowship. There is evidently a tendency amongst Congregationalists to make the admission to membership a more impressive and solemn act.

Presbyterians have an established procedure: Instruction, inquiry by the session of elders, session follows the minister in giving the right hand of fellowship. At the following Communion Service the names are read, the new members welcomed, and prayer is offered for them.

Wesleyans report an increasing tendency to make use of their service for "The Public Recognition of New Members," a solemn service, in which the new members definitely acknowledge their faith in Christ as Saviour and declare themselves as Christians." Some Wesleyans express regret that the service is not more widely used.

A Welsh group (Congregational, Calvinistic Methodist, and Wesleyan) all mention a "charge" to the new members at the service of reception, whilst the Calvinistic Methodists refer to the custom of public catechizing as being still in vogue.

8.—*Does your opinion coincide with that of your communion?*

It is of importance to discover, as far as may be possible, whether the opinions expressed upon Infant Baptism, etc., are simply the opinions of individuals here and there, and not the general opinions held in the branch of the Church to which they belong. Both Wesleyan and Congregational correspondents admit that there much diversity of opinion on these matters in their respective communions. Presbyterians exhibit less diversity of opinion, and their procedure is more uniform, not so dependent upon personal preferences. With the Wesleyans there are varying degrees of strictness on all matters of sacrament. "A small minority," one of them states, "approach to Anglicanism." Some of them would "make compulsory the admitted and recommended" service for the reception of members. As for the Congregationalists, it will suffice to quote a brief sentence from the reply of one of their number: "There is too much diversity of opinion within the denomination for me to answer the question with any confidence."

## August Dillmann, Orientalist and Bible Critic.

ON the 25th of April, 1923, the centenary of the birth of Christian Friedrich August Dillmann was celebrated at Berlin, when a bust of this great German scholar and writer was unveiled, the work of his eldest daughter, a distinguished artist. A sum of money was also presented with the view of founding scholarships for keeping needy and deserving students of theology at the Berlin University.

August Dillmann—as he is usually called—was born at Illingen, a village of Württemberg, where his father was schoolmaster. His early education was received first of all under his father, to whose piety and careful training in the home and in the school he never wearied of expressing his indebtedness. He then passed on to the gymnasium or Grammar School at Stuttgart, the capital of his native province. From 1840 to 1845 he was a matriculated student of the Tübingen University, where his principal teacher in New Testament subjects was the celebrated F. C. Baur. He studied Semitic Philology, Sanscrit, and Old Testament literature under the still more celebrated scholar, Heinrich Ewald. Baur and Ewald were in the very first rank as teachers in the Germany of Dillmann's student days. From Württemberg, famous for its religious fervour and for its attachment to the Old Theology, and from his paternal home, young Dillmann brought with him to the university a devoutness of spirit and decisiveness of conviction that were hardly touched by the intellectualism and radical criticism of Baur. But by the positive teaching and powerful personality of Ewald, Dillmann's whole being was roused, and to the end of his days he never ceased to be, to a large extent, dominated in his spirit, and even in his opinions by this great master mind. Perhaps no teacher in modern times had a larger number of pupils who became famous than Ewald. William Medley and James Sulley left Regent's Park College in 1866 to continue under Ewald those Hebrew studies begun with such promise under Dr. Benjamin Davies. Like Henry Sidgwick of Cambridge, their fellow-student in Ewald's classes, they transferred their allegiance in later years from Semitics to Philosophy. Ewald's world-wide fame as scholar and preceptor drew pupils from every part of the globe.

At the gymnasium and also at the university Dillmann won all the prizes that were obtainable. At the end of his fourth university year (1844) he passed his first theological examination with distinction, and his ordinary university career was closed. But before leaving he was awarded a valuable scholarship, given by the city of Tübingen to the best theological student of the year. This enabled him to spend another session at the university, when a very deep personal attachment between him and Ewald sprang up and grew until the death of the latter in 1875. At the close of his fifth year at Tübingen, Dillmann won the prize offered for the best essay on *The Formation of the Canon of the Old Testament*. During most of 1846-7 he acted as assistant pastor to a Lutheran clergyman near his native home. The two years 1847-8 were almost wholly devoted to the study of Ethiopic, begun under Ewald, and continued by visits to the great libraries of London, Oxford, and Paris. At the close of 1848 he was chosen *Repetent*, in 1851 *Privat Docent*, and in 1853 *Professor Extraordinary* in his native university. In these positions he taught not only the language and literature of the Old Testament, but also Arabic, Ethiopic, and Sanscrit. From 1854 to 1864 he functioned as Professor of Oriental languages in the Philosophical Faculty at Kiel, and for the next five years he was Professor of Old Testament theology at the university of Giessen, where in later years he was succeeded by a distinguished pupil—Bernhard Stade.

His longest and most important period of service was spent at Berlin, where he succeeded Hengstenberg, the leading German defender of traditional views on the Old Testament, a man with an iron will who dominated the theological faculty in the Prussian capital, and through his monthly organ to a large extent the theological faculties of other German universities. Dillmann's position in Old Testament criticism was virtually that of his master, Ewald—moderate; but to many of Hengstenberg's disciples, as to most British theologians of that day, both Ewald and Dillmann were considered extreme and even dangerous guides. Dillmann remained the occupant of this chair of Old Testament theology until his rather sudden death at the age of seventy-one. His last lecture was delivered on Saturday morning, June 23, 1894. For two hours he discussed in Seminar the first six verses of the last chapter of Malachi, laying special stress on the words, "The Lord shall suddenly come to his temple." His final words—the very last uttered by him from that chair—words familiar to many an old pupil—were, "*Das Weiteres nächste Mal.*" But in this case the "next time" never came, for on returning home he was ordered by his doctor to bed, an attack of pneumonia supervened, and he passed peacefully away on the



4th July, deeply mourned by his pupils, past and present, and by all who knew him personally or through his writings.

Dillmann was an outstanding teacher and writer. He and Harnack, the Church historian, had the largest classes of all the professors of theology. His lectures were always carefully read except in the Saturday morning seminar, when he let himself go and denounced pupils who revealed culpable ignorance in terms not likely to be forgotten. His sarcasm was in such cases biting, and occasionally there would be flashes of humour. On one of these occasions I once saw Dillmann smile, and an older (German) pupil told me I should think myself a lucky man to have witnessed a smile on this professor's face. Though Dillmann kept so closely to his manuscript, he read in a clear, distinct voice that was pleasant though not powerful. He read quickly, without hesitation, and it was often quite impossible for the quickest penman to write down all the references he gave us. It was his custom in expounding the Old Testament first to read the original Hebrew, then to give his own German translation of the text as amended by himself, and finally his comments, just as they appear in his matchless commentaries—the best example in the nineteenth century of the *Commentarius Continuus*, according to Karl Budde. He rarely corrected the text, and I once heard him say that the men who indulged too freely in that practice used this device as a substitute for a thorough knowledge of Hebrew. He was always in his place in the class by the time for beginning, i.e. after the expiration of the *Akademische Viertel Stunde* prevalent in the Fatherland. If a pupil came in a moment late Dillmann had a habit of raising his spectacles and following the delinquent till he was seated, the other students hissing and stamping during this interval. No one could listen to Dillmann without feeling that he believed in the divinity of the words he expounded, that he knew he was not handling the words of men, but the Word of the living God. The majestic face, all aglow with fire and force, and the penetrating tones in which he read—all gave the impression of sincerity and intense conviction. During the forty-eight years of his teaching career, Dillmann had the best of health, and was never once known to be absent from class until his last illness. He was like his greatest master, an unflagging worker, and was busy with his pen and otherwise to the last.

Dillmann's books belong to two periods almost equally divided, dealing with Ethiopic and with the Old Testament. He had learned Ethiopic from Ewald, and finding that very little was known of the language or literature, he resolved to supply the need for reliable works. He published a catalogue of Ethiopic MSS, which he had examined in Germany, England, and France,

a grammar and lexicon, and he also edited texts, both Apocryphal and Canonical. His grammar (second edition, revised by the late Professor Bezold, of Heidelberg) and lexicon are far and away the fullest and best in existence. The word that best characterises whatever he attempted is "thorough."

When at the age of forty-six he settled at Berlin, he had not published any work on the Old Testament, the subject with which practically all his future works were to deal. But the broad and deep foundation of philological science which he had laid were fitting preparation for the splendid superstructure that he reared upon it. His Commentary on Job was published in 1869, the year of his settlement at Berlin. Then appeared his expositions on other books. His views on the question of Hexateuch criticism are given in an appendix to his Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua. His principal point of departure from the prevalent critical school, that of Reuss—Graf—Wellhausen, was in his dating the original priestly code at a period earlier than that of J., E., or D. Ewald took the same view, calling this source *The Book of Origins*. Dillmann also makes E older than J, contrary to the teaching of the prevalent critical school. As regards the Priestly Code, however, Dillmann admitted that there are in it post-exilic elements. Neither Ewald nor his pupil Dillmann denied that the Hexateuch depends upon older sources, much of the latter however going back to Moses himself. He was a strong believer—so was Ewald—in the supernatural origin of the religion and legislation of "Moses," and of the teaching of the Old Testament prophets and psalmists. In his own house he once deplored to me in pathetic tones the fact that many of the younger scholars of Germany were denying that even the decalogue was of God and not of man. He had confidence, however, that they would see their mistake and return to what he considered the truth. He had a very high opinion of Driver, a careful and competent critic like himself, though lacking Dillmann's fire and religious enthusiasm. Of the Bampton Lectures on *The Origin of the Psalter*, by Cheyne, his opinion was expressed once in my hearing in one German word—*Unsinn* (nonsense). He considered Gesenius's *Thesaurus* as the best Hebrew Lexicon, far more reliable than the later editions in German or English. The first part of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon had just reached him when in 1892 we were speaking of Hebrew Lexicons. He did not like it on account of its fanciful etymologies and doubtful definitions. He gave high praise to Böttcher's Hebrew Grammar (accidence only, but the very fullest and most useful), and also the elaborate grammar of Eduard König. He had scant praise for the latter edition of Gesenius's Grammar. But Ewald's Grammar he declared to be the best of

all. He thought time spent on Rabbinical Hebrew as good as lost; but he attached immense importance to a study of the languages cognate to Hebrew. The present writer heard Dillmann lecture on the *Psalms* (he denied the existence of Maccabean Psalms), on the Book of Lamentations, and also on Biblical Archaeology and Old Testament Theology. Of these, the lectures on *Old Testament Theology* have alone been published, edited by Rudolf Kittel, 1895. Had he lived long enough he would probably have published the other lectures too. His lectures on the Psalms were remarkable for their learning and sane as well as devout criticism. In a letter to an American Baptist pupil Dillmann wrote (I translate): "It stirs in me feelings of deep gratitude that you have learnt to appreciate my earnest endeavour to maintain together fulness of faith and strict scientific method." That states in the briefest form the great merit of Dillmann's teaching in the classroom and in his books.

J. WITTON DAVIES.

## New Light on Dr. Carey.

THE Editors have asked me to indicate something of what fresh representation of Carey may be expected in my Biography of him, which in September will be published by Hodder & Stoughton. Though it is dressing my own window, I yield.

I have been out for all the human touches. In the days when Eustace wrote his uncle's *Life*, Christian biographers stressed their heroes' pieties and slurred their humanities. The modern method is almost the reverse. We take the pieties more for granted: our *interest* is in the humanities. My steadfast aim has been to recover and display *the man*,—to make *him* intimate.

Spurgeon thanked Smith for having rescued Carey from the lumber, which had so long overlain him,—for making him more knowable than Eustace had left him. But even Smith frequently lost the man in the movement. His pages disclosed the movement's magnitude and might, and the force of Carey's contribution, yet the man himself kept disappearing. This was in great part due to Smith's unfortunate abandonment of chronological order in more than half his story, so that we found ourselves thrust to and fro, back and forth,

hither and thither, through most of the Indian chapters, to our inevitable confusion. When we put the book down, the man did not stand forth. My chief solicitude has been to trace in due sequence throughout the development of the man's soul, believing with Browning that "little else is worth study." I have striven to reveal the progressive unfolding of his vision and faith, his endeavour and achievement.

Readers of *Samuel Pearce* oftenest thanked me for *The Preacher's Period*. I have attempted a similar preliminary study again, to show Carey as the product of his Times' converging forces, yet as giving them their new direction or momentum. Specially have I been keen to trace what British missionary forces were current, and to claim for him only that measure of primacy and pioneership consonant with these. He was distinctly *not* the first British missionary of modern times, though he did exert the most quickening influence.

From first to last I have indulged in no appraisalment of him of my own; but, in several "Forewords" to chapters, I have set appraisements by others, of acknowledged name.

The prevailing impression that he was "a root out of a dry ground," and that his career contradicted his heredity and the conditions of his early environment, needs, I think, some correction. For his father and grandfather were above the mental calibre of their class and their neighbours, and were, with his mother and grandmother, especially strong in the affections, endowing him with a nature, which *love* could readily constrain. I make much, too, of an uncle, of whom little has yet been heard, who in Carey's earliest childhood was back from long Canadian pioneering, and who cast on the lad the double spell of flowers, and of lands and peoples overseas.

Everybody has heard that he owed his conversion to the spiritual solicitude of a fellow-shoemaking apprentice; but this one's name and story have remained unknown. That it was William Manning,—the shopmate, who preserved Carey's signboard,—was the best guess; but, was, as it proves, mistaken. "What would we not give," once wrote Principal Price of Calabar College, Jamaica, "to get the name of this apprentice?" To my joy, in a bundle of Carey-documents given to Dr. Shakespeare during the war, I found it in a letter of Carey's to Ryland, and soon, by best fortune, this co-apprentice's whole ancestry and story. To him I dedicate my book. I predict that his name will be heard in hundreds of pulpits and of Sunday schools, and this Andrew, who led this Peter to Christ, will go to work again in the world, inspiring others to like fidelity and zeal.

By the industrious aid of my friend, Frank Bates, of

Northampton, I have learned things of the quickest interest about the master of these apprentices.

Since none can preach Christ's Gospel with passion who have not fought their way into their faith, I have loved to tell of Carey's four years' struggle with his spiritual and biblical questionings, till he reached a full assurance of Christian doctrine. Meanwhile, he was distrusted, of course, as a heretic, though he was really just a courageous explorer in the kingdom of God. I was startled to 'discover that the very preacher, who at that lonely time best rooted and grounded him in Christian wisdom, in far later years led undergraduate John Henry Newman to his lifelong apprehension of Trinitarian truth. It was an unexpected linking of the generations, and of contrary careers.

I trust I have laid to sleep the persistently-recurring notion of Carey's industrial incompetence.

I have most rejoiced to rescue the name of the mother of all his children from the cruel wrongs which have been done her. Biographers without exception have echoed her dispraise. Now that the facts will be known, feeling will rebound in her favour. She will be unanimously defended in her first-felt inability to accompany Carey to Bengal, and will be acclaimed for her eventual going *at one day's notice*. She will be deeply compassionated, too, for the price she tragically paid. Carey would wish me to lay this wreath upon her grave.

At the dedication of the Leicester Carey-cottage, I hinted the activeness of his *Nonconformist* witness in that mid-England town. But I have since learned much of the insistence and prominence of his Free Church challenge. He was passionate for the unfettering of all intellectual and religious inquiry, and keen to break the State's control over every realm of the spirit.

Will it distress my readers to learn that, like other hot-bloods in those stirring days in Leicester and Northampton,—the towns he knew the best—he was for some years openly *republican*?

I have traced more fully than any before how God laid on him and through him on modern Christendom the constraint of world-missions, agreeing strongly, as I do, with S. K. Datta that this is almost as inspiring as Carey's Indian achievement. But many a legend has needed resetting and revision, especially as to that Nottingham-day, when his colleagues made their second "great refusal," and Carey's anguish stabbed the soul of Fuller awake.

Not even in Kettering's Feast of Remembrance last October, when the past was glowingly rehearsed, did any

speaker seem to know that Christ had in vain called His Church through Doddridge in that very town, half a century earlier than the B.M.S. founding, to be the cradle of modern missions; nor that, despite the Nottingham Resolution, Carey's proposal, even at that twelfth hour in Kettering, was nearly negated and dismissed. Much else concerning that historic "Oct. 2nd" needed exacter recounting.

To most—even to students of Missions—the figure of John Thomas, Carey's pathbreaker and senior, is very vague. That he was eccentric and hopelessly involved in debt is nearly all that is remembered, notwithstanding his considerable Biography by the late C. B. Lewis of Calcutta. For, honest though this always is, and not seldom vivid, it has been long out of print, and lacks modern attractiveness. Yet the facts are there,—of a man who was an extraordinary complex of force and of fickleness, of the apostolic and the human, of the saint, the genius and the fool. As the first Englishman to greatly care for the souls of Bengalis, God honoured and used him for high ends, and he must not be forgotten. I have therefore painted his portrait.

A chairman's speech at the Centenary Meetings in Leicester seemed to *prove* that "Harvey Lane" had been stupidly blind to the significance of Carey's mission to Bengal, and coldly indifferent to his going from their midst. This judgment has since passed into an accepted tradition. But the full facts point in the opposite direction. "Harvey Lane" letters, hidden in "College Lane" vestry, first put me on the true track; and now, since my return from Calcutta, the accumulating proof has been crowned by a merchant's letter from Salendine Nook, written immediately after attendance at Carey's last two Leicester services—such a letter as would have rejoiced the heart of a Carlyle.

The story of Carey's planned voyage by the *Oxford*, then of his ejection therefrom with Thomas, and of their subsequent sailing with Carey's whole family in the Danish *Krön Princessa*, is at once one of the most distressing and romantic chapters of his life,—than which nothing so reveals him. Yet it has been given scant record.

My recent two years' Indian sojourn has been the crowning mercy of my life, vastly enriching my Carey-treasure, and delivering me from what would have been an unspeakable disaster. For, notwithstanding a meticulous care, I had in a hundred and one ways misapprehended much, which only life on the spot could reveal to me and rectify. Indian readers would inevitably have caught me out as having written from a distance. Now I trust they will feel that the Indian chapters are redolent of their soil and reflective of their sky.

I have not rushed Carey to Serampore. For a man is best worth watching, when he is tackling his first tough problems, making his first prentice-efforts, learning "tricks of his tools' true play." So I have taken time to tell his early settling in the Sundarbans, and his five and a half years as a planter-padre in N. Bengal. There he was winning his first-hand knowledge of rural, i.e. of real, India, was mastering the Vernaculars and Sanskrit, was growing his first great Botanic Garden, and was taking the due measure of his tasks. It thrilled me to realize that in those Mudnabati years he translated practically the whole Bible into Bengali, before he ever set foot in Serampore.

Years ago, Alfred North of New Zealand wrote and entreated me in my story to do justice to *John Fountain*. I was happy to have already forestalled his request. For it is a pity that such an one is so completely forgotten, or that, if recollected, it is as just a warning against political indiscreetness. He merits a better remembrance for his own sake, and as Carey's first British recruit. His career was brief, but his spirit valiant. I have rubbed off the moss from his stone.

Is it at all generally known that more than twenty years ere *the three* established themselves in Serampore, the Moravians had wrought there, till, after bitter disappointment, they abandoned the post in despair?

The difficulty of writing Carey's life after his joining Marshman and Ward in Serampore is its embarrassment of riches. For the three strands became so plaited, that they cannot be written of apart. The story is triple. No three men ever had a soul so single. Although Carey preceded them seven years, they seemed to catch him up, and made his labours theirs, to the winning of our equal reverence, wonder and love. It has to be three biographies in one, yet with Carey as still the central, the kindling and directive soul.

Have the *numbers* in the Serampore Settlement been realized? It startled me to learn that more than a hundred sat down regularly daily there together for meals—to say nothing of the incessant visitors. The hive was much bigger than I knew.

Mr. Wilson told me recently how keen he was to get a *full* account of Krishna Pal. I was glad I had already made his story a chief feature. For nothing can exaggerate his baptism's momentousness, nor the influence of all that happened in his home. One of my most valuable discoveries is the rush of converts that followed his heroic confession. As soon as he was blessedly taken captive as the first Bengali prisoner of Christ Jesus, a whole company of others began to yield.

The Mission had—oh, so long—been kept waiting for this one: events swiftly proved how well worth was the waiting.

I have fortunately come on many samples of Carey's preaching in the bazaars: preaching always pointed and direct, and abounding; as befitted the East, in parable: at times, caustic with satire. My heart has burned to find how even through all his academic career this vernacular preaching was his sustained practice and passion. From first to last he travailed for men's souls.

That was an exciting week when in the Library of the Board of Examiners, Calcutta, I unearthed the eighteen thick folios of the minutes and correspondence of the old "Fort William College," through the whole three decades of Carey's professorial service and of "Fort William's" teaching-career. The Librarian told me that they had almost been minded to destroy them as lumber! These folios set me in the living midst of Carey's tutorial conditions. I found scores of his memoranda and letters. I lived in his Government College world. His students and pundits grew familiar. His live and modern methods with his classes lay disclosed.

India's quickened self-consciousness has constrained her scholars to make fresh study of the development of their Vernaculars. The most approved such study in Calcutta is Prof. Susil Kumar De's *History of the Bengali Language and Literature from 1800-1825*. To the work and influence of Carey and of Serampore he devotes three chapters, and represents Carey as the most potent literary force in the Government College. He has much to tell of the educational output of his Pundits, under Carey's inspiration. I found the keenest interest being taken in all this in Indian literary circles, Rabindranath Tagore himself saying to me, "Why, Carey was the pioneer of all this revived interest in the Vernaculars!"

Before I left England, I had caught flashings of Carey's humour. But in the Imperial Library, Calcutta, I found a whole Bengali book of his, which gleamed with its playfulness,—a book of 150 Indian stories, which he gathered and edited, as a text-book for his Government students, to enliven his classes,—a book of Indian wisdom and humour. It has never been translated into English, and has long been out of print. I had to deposit Rs. 100 for its brief loan. I have told its forty best stories.

Before Carey had been six years Government Professor of Sanskrit, Bengali and Marathi, he was thrilled by a far greater missionary vision than before, which swept all his plannings into a vastly wider orbit. Thenceforth, he and his colleagues *expected and attempted God's greater things,—for*



*all India, and even Asia* and not simply for Bengal. It is a sublime story, and has not been made vivid before. What they set themselves to dare for China takes one's breath.

The private Diary of Mrs. Marshman—hitherto unused—lets us into many a privacy of the home-circles at Serampore,—aye, and into all the tremors of their hearts under the Government's threats and forbiddances.

The bundles of letters and documents found in the B.M.S. catacombs by Lawson Forfeitt during my absence, and a later packet still, which Principal Robinson unearthed for me at "Regent's Park," have been Godsend. Two-thirds of the former were domestic—letters to Carey from his sons, his invalid sister, his nephews and nieces and personal friends. The latter was his answering letters to his youngest missionary-son. Scarcely any of these had been used in the earlier Biographies. They have been priceless illustrations of the constancies and chivalries of his family-life—gold and crimson threads to stitch into my carpet. They enable me to tell much worth knowing about his three missionary sons. I should have gnashed my teeth, had they been found too late.

Since Smith's *Carey*, evidence has increased of America's very early and active co-operation with him and with Serampore. It has been a particular pleasure to set this forth.

I prophesy that the contemporary snapshot accounts of Carey, which I have set, according to their dates, as "Fore-words" to my later chapters, will be hailed as some of my best treasure. They make him stereoscopic. The writers were warm from the events. Their minds were glowing.

May my chapters *The Threatened Woe, The Schism The Woe*, which have "made me lean," reveal to all the tragedy of the present-day challenge, which is wearing down the strength and breaking the hearts of noble leaders in India and in England, as Carey's, Ward's and Marshman's were broken a century ago! Sentences of Carey's letters were shamefully torn from their clear contexts by the adversaries, and were published for the hurt of Serampore. His simple and overwhelming answer was the reprinting of these complete, and without comment. Surely, history repeats itself!

I trust, too, that *The Master Builders* will reveal to those most conversant with *modern* India how amazingly attuned to its highest aspirations were Carey's ideals in founding Serampore College, and how imperative it is (by the equitable aid of all the benefitting Societies) to sustain that College in full strength.

T. R. Glover, in his considerable reference to Carey in his

*Daily News* article on 21 May, says that my Life of him "will contain new evidence of the botanical distinction of the cobbler, whose letters are preserved at the headquarters of the great Botanical Gardens that he planned outside Calcutta." Doubtless, he meant the Horticultural Society's Garden, which Carey founded and laid out. And I *did* get rich treasure in its office. But even more in the Library of Calcutta's "Botanic" itself, where, after many days of fossicking, I discovered invaluable botanic letters of his, and the proof of his Indian life-long correspondence and co-operation with the Garden's illustrious successive superintendents, Drs. Roxburgh and Wallich. He wrote to the latter, I learned, more than 200 letters. Wallich's tribute to him was, perhaps, my most exciting Indian find.

It has not been seen nor shown before how—after months of appalling tempest—Carey's sun went down in an evening sky of serenest promise—his every chief hope realised.

And now, though I have thus raised expectation, I am more than ever conscious that he was greater than I have had power to tell. But at least I have spared no time, effort, nor money to ascertain the reliable facts and present their story. My one ambition has been to grow others of his outlook and spirit.

S. PEARCE CAREY.

26:5:23.

## The Baptist Board.

THE Records of the Baptist Board carry us back to other men, ways, times, and places. The Minutes date back to January 20, 1723.\* Dr. Whitley reminds us that "many Elders and Ministers of the Baptist Churches met weekly at the Hanover

\*The dates in these Minutes are recorded successively: Jan. 20th, 1723, Feb. 17, 1723/4, Feb. 29th, 1723/4, March 16th, 1724, March 23rd, 1724, March 30th, 1724, April 13, 1724. This peculiar dating is due to the fact that there were two methods in use. The older made the year begin on 25 March, so that March was the first month, September the seventh, October the eighth, November the ninth, December the tenth, January the eleventh, February the twelfth. The newer system started the year with 1 January. Therefore between 1 January and 24 March, till the year 1753, when the old style was abolished, it is always needful to read with care. The sequence of dates here, where Wilson has carefully specified that February was the ambiguous date, 1723/4, makes it certain that the date is what we should call 1724 throughout, even for the January. A reference to a calendar will show that the 20 January was Monday in 1724, not in 1723.—EDITOR.

Coffee-house in Finch Lane, London, forming what we should call a fraternal," formed on 17 September, 1714. The Baptist Board, however, limited its membership from the beginning to Particular Baptist ministers only. The earliest Minutes are headed, "The Minutes of the Society of Ministers of the Baptist Particular persuasion meeting at the Gloucestershire Coffee House on Mondays at 3 o'clock, whose names are as follows." John Gill's name appears in the list, with S. Wilson as first secretary. Churches still existing, like Devonshire Square, Maze Pond, and Metropolitan Tabernacle, are thus linked up through their pastors with the earliest meeting of the Board. As Dr. Ewing wrote, "It is interesting to realize that the life of the Board links us with the days of Isaac Watts and Bishop Butler; and that when the Board was founded, John Wesley was an undergraduate at Oxford, and George Whitfield a little boy in the Bell Inn at Gloucester.

It will be noted that there was an older Fraternal, founded in 1714, to which at least four of these men belonged. That embraced ministers of the General Baptists also. But in 1717 there was a deliberate move to organize Particular Baptists separately, of which the Fund is a striking example. Two years later a series of meetings was held at Salters' Hall of all London (and a few country) ministers of the three denominations. These meetings divided each of the denominations on the question: Shall we advise subscription to certain of the Articles of Religion of the Established Church? the real objection being to one on the Trinity. All the ministers had signed these once. The point was whether they would advise others who equally had signed them, to sign again. In the end, seventy-eight said Yes, seventy-three said No; and of the London Particular Baptists, fourteen said Yes, two said No. Now, as only one London General Baptist said Yes, while fourteen said No, the Particular Baptists were far less willing to fraternize with the Generals, whom they suspected of being uncertain as to orthodoxy. The Fund declined to accept subscriptions from the non-subscribers, and the old Fraternal was imperilled. The closing of the coffee-house where it met gave the needed impetus, and though it went to another, the stalwarts of the Particulars drew off and founded our "Board." They did admit the one non-subscribing Particular.

Although for a long time it was only a small society, it took itself very seriously, calling itself the "Baptist Board" probably in imitation of similar societies of Independent and Presbyterian ministers. The members of the Board met together for purposes of advice, administration, and arbitration where these things were explicitly sought, and for conference on the general welfare of the denomination. Surely it speaks well for the real fraternal

spirit of the Baptist ministry that for nearly two centuries now (whilst other more ambitious associations have had their rise, decline and fall), this society has maintained its meetings and is as active as ever. It is not expedient for the Board to glory, or else we might say that the Baptist Missionary Society, the Baptist Union, and the L.B.A. are but children of yesterday in comparison with our historic body! Ivimey says, "The business of these meetings at the coffee-house was conducted with great regularity." They gave their opinion and advice in any matters of difficulty in the churches that were referred to them by both parties; they received applications from country ministers to assist them from the Particular Baptist Fund, which was founded in 1717; they sanctioned and recommended the collection of money in London for the building and repairing of meeting-houses in the country; they watched rigorously over the purity of the members composing the Board, as the original minutes emphatically illustrate; they received to their friendship ministers upon their being settled as pastors in the churches; they appear to have generally acted as a body in assisting destitute churches and at the ordination of ministers, to have very strongly discouraged and to have affectionately supported one another against traducers." That is a record of which the Board may well be proud, and in the judgment of the writer of this article there is great occasion for similar fraternal vigilance, sympathy, and encouragement to-day!

The meeting places of the Board were various, viz. The Gloucestershire Coffee-house was the meeting-place for ten years; Blackwell's for seven years; the King's Head, St. Swithin's Alley, for about twenty years; the Jamaica Coffee-house from 1760 till 1823, when the Board moved to the B.M.S. premises in Fen Court, Fen Church Street, that Society kindly offering the Board the use of their rooms *gratuitously*. The levy prior to this was 6s. 6d. per member, an addition being made of 16s. in 1799 in consequence of the rise in tobacco!

In 1727 was formed the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist. "It is the privilege of this body to present addresses in person to the sovereign on important occasions, such as an Accession, Royal Marriages, Deliverances from Danger, great Victories, Restoration of Peace, and the like." This privilege has again and again been exercised. In recent times there was a visit to Windsor in connection with the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria; the Board also presented an address at the Court of St. James in connection with the accession of King George; whilst Buckingham Palace was visited when the Board presented an address in connection with the

termination of the war in 1919; and also most recently with an address of loyal congratulation on the approaching marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of York.

In 1730 it was agreed that punctuality should be enforced by "the forfeiture of twopence, to be determined by the majority of the watches present, unless the person be sick or out of town. Mr. Gill excepted against it." Such self-discipline is most commendable, and many secretaries of religious societies would rejoice to-day if punctuality were thus enforced!

There are cases of applications for membership having been refused on the ground that "the ministers agreed that your company is not desirable to them."

The Board has appointed special prayer meetings on special occasions. On May 29, 1734, it was agreed to have a prayer meeting at Mr. Braithwait's on account of the removal of several honourable and useful ministers by death." On September 20, 1745, the year of the Rebellion, it was agreed to set apart a day of humiliation and prayer on account of the situation of the affairs of the nation. On October 20, 1747, it was agreed that two meetings of prayer be set apart at two different places on account of the mortality among the cattle—the war in which the nation is engaged—and the decay of the vital power of religion. On March 27, 1750, it was agreed that a day of humiliation and prayer be recommended to be kept by our churches on account of the late alarming Providence in the two shocks of an earthquake which have lately taken place.

In the alphabetical list of members arranged from 1723 to 1817 we note with interest the names of Benjamin Beddome, Dr. Gill, Dr. Rippon, Dr. Stennett, Jas. Upton, etc.

At a special meeting on March 14, 1820, the objects of the Society were stated, viz. to afford an opportunity for mutual consultation and advice on subjects of a religious nature particularly connected with the interests of our own denomination; that this Society do consist of approved ministers of the Particular Baptist Denomination residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster; that no minister resident in London be permitted to attend the meetings of this Society more than three months without becoming a member; that a subject be discussed the first Tuesday in every month, the subjects to be selected and circulated among the members at the commencement of the year.

It may be interesting here to indicate some of the subjects selected a century ago. This list was drawn up April 25, 1820:

1. What steps can be taken to promote the interests of religion in our Denomination at large?
2. How far is it practicable to form an Association of the

Baptist Ministers and Churches in London and its environs?

3. Is the practice of fasting of perpetual obligation?
4. How can we account for the differences in the theological opinions of wise and virtuous men?
5. Was Samson's death an act of suicide?
6. Is there reason to apprehend the prevalency of Popery in this country?
7. What is Hyper-Calvinism?
8. What is the province of reason in matters of religion?

An echo of a very important controversy in connection with our Baptist Missionary Society, is found in the following petition, July, 1832, to the House of Commons: "That your Petitioners fully convinced that the principles which have uniformly guided the proceedings of the Baptist Missionary Society, have strictly accorded with the pacific spirit of the gospel, and equally satisfied that their missionaries in Jamaica have acted in conformity with the instructions given them by the Society, view with indignation the attempt to criminate their missionaries as parties in the late Insurrection, and rejoice in the signally triumphant manner in which these charges have been refuted. That your Petitioners contemplate with the liveliest sympathy the violent and illegal outrages committed on the persons and families of the said Missionaries, and the serious losses sustained in the destruction of the Society's property, and earnestly implore from your Honourable House redress for the past and protection for the future; more, especially as your Petitioners humbly conceive that the proceedings of which they complain are totally at variance with the British Constitution and an insult to the dignity of the Throne. That your Petitioners are fully convinced from the decided hostility which has constantly been shown by the great body of slaveholders to the labours of Christian missionaries, that the system of slavery is irreconcilably opposed to the progress of the Gospel, and therefore do earnestly pray that your Honourable House will, without further delay, adopt such measures as to your wisdom shall seem meet for the immediate and entire abolition of that system throughout the British Dominions." A brave, notable, and dignified utterance, worthy of being rescued from the hidden minutes of our Board! Baptist and Dissenting grievances were considered at many meetings in 1833, and representations on the subject were made to the Right Hon. Earl Grey, who was First Lord of the Treasury. In October of 1833 a memorandum was inserted in the Minutes on the death of Rev.

Joseph Hughes, A.M., who was thirty-seven years the faithful pastor of the Church at Battersea, and who, having been one of the first with whom originated the plan of the British and Foreign Bible Society was from the commencement of that Society one of its secretaries, and continued till the time of his death one of its most strenuous and zealous supporters.

Coming to later records, it is noteworthy that after the rescinding of the word "Particular" from one of the rules, and after much prayer, Rev. J. Clifford, M.A., of Praed Street, was admitted to the membership of the Board in 1861! It would be a fine thing if Dr. Clifford could be persuaded to put upon record some of his own personal recollections connected with the Board. Some of us will long remember his loving tribute to former secretaries such as Revs. J. Blake, J. Hunt Cooke, W. J. Styles, and W. H. King, at the luncheon in January when the 200th Anniversary of the Board was celebrated.

In drawing to an end, we note that during all these two hundred years the Board has kept steadily to its function of being simply and mainly a fraternal meeting of London Baptist ministers. Its object has been conference, though from its conferences important associations have arisen. Its work has been to develop love, and communicate thought, the greatest power of all for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. In 1920 it removed from the Baptist Mission House to the Church House, Southampton Row, and its meetings have never been more popular and useful than at the present time. Testimony must be borne to the fine series of Presidents of recent years, viz. Revs. W. J. Fullerton, F. C. Spurr, Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, M.A., the late Principal Gould, and Dr. J. W. Ewing, whilst the quality of the discussions is being well maintained under the present leadership of the Rev. S. W. Hughes.

Surely we must all feel that though much of its former work has passed to the Baptist Union and the London Baptist Association, this ancient body must not be allowed to decline, but should rather command the active support of every London minister.

ARTHUR J. PAYNE.

# The Late Midland College

(concluded).

## 4.—VARIOUS OFFICERS.

1. **WARDENS.** When the amalgamation of General and Particular Baptists took place in 1891, the College was reorganized as described in Section 7, and under the new constitution it was provided that a Warden should be elected annually, who should not be eligible for re-election, and that during his term of office he should be entitled to preside at all meetings of the Institution. This office was filled by Rev. J. Clifford, M.A., D.D.; Rev. J. G. Greenhough, M.A.; Rev. J. Jenkyn Brown; Rev. W. Evans; Rev. T. Barrass; Mr. W. Hunt, J.P.; Rev. G. M. McElwee, M.A., B.Sc.; Ald. W. R. Wherry, J.P.; Rev. W. Bishop; Mr. Alfred Bradley; Rev. G. Hill, M.A.; Rev. C. W. Vick; Mr. W. B. Clark; Rev. L. C. Parkinson, M.A.; Rev. J. H. Atkinson; Rev. G. Hugo Heynes; Ald. Sir Joseph Bright, J.P.; Mr. J. L. Ward, J.P.; Rev. R. F. Handford; Mr. P. H. Stevenson; Rev. R. C. Ford, M.A., B.D.; Rev. F. C. Player, B.A.; Mr. Jos. Turner; and Mr. R. M. Craven, D.Sc. The duties of the Warden did not extend beyond the delivery of an inaugural address at the Annual Meeting of the College, and the chairmanship of Executive Meetings.

2. **TREASURERS.** In the latter half of the period of its history the College had six treasurers, who succeeded to the office as follows :

- 1858. Mr. G. Baldwin, of Nottingham.
- 1861. Mr. T. W. Marshall, of Loughborough.
- 1890. Mr. S. Bennett, of Derby.
- 1892. Mr. W. B. Bembridge, J.P., of Ripley.
- 1893. Mr. J. S. Smith, J.P., of Mountsorrel.
- 1913. Mr. G. Massey, J.P., of Spalding.

Mr. Marshall, who held the office for twenty-eight years with marked ability, was the son-in-law of his predecessor. He was a bank manager, a man of fine character, and was in great request as a lay preacher for special occasions. He always wore at white cravat, and when Dr. A. M. Fairbairn met him in 1883, he asked the Principal of the College why a *minister* was chosen for the office of treasurer. Mr. Marshall's neighbour, Mr. J. S. Smith, J.P., was treasurer for twenty years, and, like Mr. Baldwin, was enthusiastic, efficient, generous in sympathy with the Principals. Mr. Massey served the College well at a time of great anxiety.



3. SECRETARIES. The list of Secretaries and Joint Secretaries for the past eighty years, contains the names of sixteen ministers, most of whom were eminent in the service of the Kingdom of Heaven, and four of whom are still spared to us. As nearly as possible, they are mentioned here in the order of their succession: Joseph Goadby, Hugh Hunter, S. Wigg, J. C. Pike, William Underwood, James Lewitt, Samuel Cox, Harris Crassweller, Thomas Goadby, William Evans, C. W. Vick, C. Payne, J. R. Godfrey, Robert Silby, E. Carrington, and Edward Elliott. There were also laymen who rendered good service in the Joint Secretariat—especially with regard to finance—such as Messrs. W. Hunt, J.P., S. Hall, G. Brailsford, and P. H. Stevenson—of whom the first and last named survive.

#### 5.—CO-OPERATION AND UNION.

1. The removal of the College from Chilwell back to Nottingham in 1883 for the purpose of securing to the students special training at the newly-established University College, made possible co-operation between the two Colleges in Forest Road—Congregational and Baptist—so that from 1893, Rev. J. A. Mitchell, B.A., Congregational Principal, was instructing seven Baptist students in Church History, New Testament Exegesis, and New Testament Introduction. This work was continued in following years by Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., B.D., then of Lincoln. Subsequently, until the closing of the Midland College, teaching was given (e.g. in Apologetics and Homiletics) by Principals Revs. J. B. Paton, M.A., D.D., and D. L. Ritchie, and (e.g. in Old Testament Introduction and Christian Apologetics) by Professor H. F. Sanders, B.A., B.D. On the other hand, the Baptist Tutorial staff lectured on such subjects as the Apocrypha, New Testament Greek, and "The English Version of the Bible, 1611-1912." "The interchange of tutorial services" between the two colleges was declared by the Baptist Council to be to "mutual advantage."

2. In 1898 a scheme was adopted at Rawdon and Nottingham for the united working of the two Colleges for three years, as under—

(a) That all candidates accepted at Rawdon shall proceed to Nottingham, and all candidates accepted at Nottingham shall continue there for their Arts course, unless that has previously been taken elsewhere, in which case they will enter immediately upon their Theological course.

(b) That together with Arts, the course at Nottingham shall include Homiletics, English Bible Introduction, and Outlines of Theology.

(c) That a Resident Tutor shall be appointed for Nottingham,

who, in the event of the union of the Colleges, shall be a member of the staff of the Joint College.

(d) That there shall be one Principal for the two Colleges, and that the Rev. T. V. Tymms, D.D., shall be that Principal.

(e) That the Senior Students now at Nottingham, together with the students who subsequently complete their Arts course there, shall proceed to Rawdon for their Theological course.

Rev. S. W. Bowser, B.A., on the recommendation of Dr. McLaren and Dr. Angus (who were fully acquainted with his acquirements at University College, London, his teaching work in Birkenhead and Liverpool and his Honorary Secretaryship of the Lancashire and Cheshire Association), was unanimously invited to take the position specified in Clause (c). The arrangement continued in force until 1903, with the result that in four years fifteen Rawdon men studied at Nottingham, and eleven Nottingham men studied at Rawdon.

3. The Joint Committee responsible for the inception and working of this scheme, who had stipulated "that no action should be taken which would be likely to hinder ultimate union with Brighton Grove, Manchester, in one United Northern College," at their meeting on 25th November, 1901, came to this conclusion :

"Inasmuch as there is no possibility of college union save at Manchester, and in co-operation with the Brighton Grove College : Resolved that the Secretary be instructed to communicate with the Manchester Committee through Principal J. T. Marshall, M.A., and ascertain whether they are willing to appoint representatives to confer with us on this subject."

The result was that arrangements were made for a Conference between ten representatives of the Rawdon and Nottingham Joint Committee, and an equal number of Manchester representatives, and on 13th January, 1902, this agreement was reached :

"That in the judgment of this conference it is desirable that the amalgamation of the three colleges should be effected at Manchester, provision being made in the scheme of union for the efficient teaching of those principles for the sake of which Brighton Grove College was established."

A scheme of amalgamation was prepared accordingly and was submitted to the Committee of the three Colleges at Midsummer, 1902, who approved it with very slight modification, and a Provisional Committee was appointed to continue the negotiations. Progress was made with the nomination of the Staff for the United College, and more than one Church expected to lose its pastor on his appointment to a professorship. Rev. G. Hill, M.A., of Nottingham, was invited to become Governor, and

the Provisional Committee deemed "it essential for the due discharge of his duties that he should *from the first* take up his residence in the buildings of the United College." But a "suggestion had already been made that Principal J. T. Marshall should remain in residence at Brighton Grove, and the terms were reported on which he was prepared to continue to board the students." To this it was objected "that it would create an impossible situation if the students should live with one of the Professors, and apart from the Governor."

So was created a deadlock which terminated the proceedings. Ostensibly, "the whole scheme of amalgamation fell to the ground owing to the divergence of opinion as to who should occupy the existing residence, when the work of the United College began."

Upon receiving (8th June, 1903) the report of their representatives on the Provisional Committee, the Council of the Midland College expressed its "profound regret at the failure of the negotiations for the amalgamation of the three Colleges. It thanks its representatives for their services, and especially begs to record its gratitude to the Warden, the Rev. G. Hill, M.A., for his untiring labours and the conspicuous ability with which he has conducted the negotiations." The disappointment was painfully felt at Nottingham and elsewhere. It could not fail to have its effect in depressing the work and in contributing to

#### 6.—DIFFICULTIES AND DECLINE.

1. But it seems probable that the disappearance of the Midland College from among our denominational institutions was due primarily to the amalgamation of General and Particular Baptists in 1901. Union was effected between two Foreign Missionary and two Home Missionary Societies, between two Loan Building Funds, and between Associations and Conferences throughout the country. It was a triumph for Christian Brotherhood. But it fell short of advancing the cause of ministerial education. Unlike the other Colleges, this institution, to quote Dr. Clifford, was "the College of a denomination." Its property was owned, and its affairs were controlled, by the General Baptist Association. In the later years a public meeting on behalf of the College was held during the Annual Assembly. Some were sanguine enough to hope that the Baptist Union might accept responsibility for the College, as it did for the Home Mission. But the connexional spirit was lacking, and it was deemed inexpedient, if not impossible to give special official recognition to the smallest of the English colleges—a recognition which was not offered to the other colleges, and which they would not have been likely to accept. When the leaders at Nottingham found that the organization upon which they had relied, viz. the General Baptist Association,

was passing away, they secured the transfer of the administration to a constituency similar to that of other Colleges, and including ministers and representatives of supporting Churches, and personal contributors. The officers and other members of the Executive were to be elected at the Annual Meeting of the constituency, and two representatives were to be added by each of the following bodies: (a) The Council of the Baptist Union; (b) The East Midland Baptist Association; (c) The West Midland Baptist Association. Unfortunately for Nottingham, the "territorial" idea did not find acceptance. For instance, churches in London and Yorkshire which had supported Regent's Park or Rawdon, continued to do so, and ex-General Baptist Churches in London and Yorkshire continued to support Nottingham. Of course, the bulk of the income at Nottingham was derived from the Midlands, but its constituency became weaker rather than stronger, and it was soon evident that the area of a college constituency could not be strictly confined by any geographical term. *General* Baptist affinities were weakened, and there was nothing comparable with them to take their place.

2. The result in the matter of finance may be briefly stated. The income of the College from collections and subscriptions had risen in 1892 to £603, and in 1900 to £640, but it declined in 1913 to £400, and in 1917 (i.e. "war time") to £200. Through a long course of years these amounts were supplemented by grants, etc., from various extraneous sources, and even in 1917 the following were received: From Joseph Davis Charity, £88; General Baptist Fund, £40; Misterton Trust, £28; Reyner Trust, £20; Cottage and Shop Rent, £39; total, £215. But the College had no other property. In 1918, however, Dr. John Clifford reached the sixtieth anniversary of his entrance to the Christian ministry, and the Council held that the occasion could not be more fittingly commemorated than by raising a "Clifford Diamond Jubilee Fund" for the endowment of the institution at which he made preparation for his life work. Dr. Clifford consented, and an appeal was issued to the Churches in the principal centres of the Midland district. Leicester took up the challenge with enthusiasm and was prepared to raise two-fifths of the £10,000 required, but from other towns there was little or no response, and the effort was abandoned. In the course of discussions covering the preceding years, some members of the Council would urge that in order to secure an efficient head for the College, it was necessary to raise the annual income to a higher figure. At another time the opinion would be emphasised that "if you get the right man, the money will come." And so there was no movement but that of the "vicious circle," until the Endowment Fund was suggested, only to be dropped almost immediately.

3. During the term of the Rev. Thomas Goadby's office as Principal, 1873-1889, the teaching staff of the College was never so complete as the Executive intended it to be. Between 1889 and 1891, the work was in charge of a "Tutorial Syndicate," on which Revs. E. E. Coleman, J. Clifford, M.A., O. D. Campbell, M.A., W. Evans, W. Miller, C. Payne, and W. R. Stevenson, M.A., served for longer or shorter periods. Then came the appointment of Rev. T. Witton Davies, B.A., "as tutor and professor and general director of the College." "In view of Mr. Davies' expressed preference for tutorial as distinct from presidential duties, it was suggested by the Council that he be asked to undertake the entire management of the College, with residence for awhile, in the hope that, should the funds come in satisfactorily, he should be provided with a colleague who would relieve him of all except tutorial duties." But the "colleague" was not found, and the published reports show that for the seven years of his tenure of office, Dr. Davies took rank as "Principal and Professor of Biblical languages and theology." When he resigned, the Council of the College passed the following resolution on 20th July, 1898 :

"That after the communication of Rev. T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D., M.R.A.S., of 30th June, followed by his intimation of his acceptance of the invitation to the Bangor Baptist College, and to the Bangor University College, the members of the Council feel that they can only acquiesce in the arrangements in the spirit of the resolution passed at their last meeting. At the same time they desire to place on record their high appreciation of all the good work done during the seven years that Dr. Davies has so honourably discharged the various duties of the Principalship; they also rejoice in the testimony borne by past and present students to the great help and inspiration derived from Dr. Davies' instructions, influence, and example; and again congratulate him on receiving an appointment to positions for which his special acquirements and aptitudes so fully qualify him. The Council also gladly and gratefully acknowledge the unobtrusive and efficient assistance which Mrs. Davies has rendered in regard to College correspondence, and other matters; and they pray that both Dr. and Mrs. Davies may have much pleasure and great prosperity in their prospective sphere of Christian service."

In Section 5 the conditions are given under which Rev. S. W. Bowser, B.A., received his appointment as "Resident Tutor." When the proposal for union with Rawdon and Manchester Colleges came to nothing, Mr. Bowser became "tutor and resident Principal," and then "resident Principal." Mr. Bowser, like Dr. Davies, had to proceed without the proposed "colleague,"

and in 1909 he was recognized simply as "Principal" of the College.

The Warden, in his inaugural address on 20th October, 1898, truly said, "No single individual is capable of acting as Principal and Professor of Biblical Languages and Theology and Church History."

The discouragement arising out of these difficulties was very great, and so the College was ill-prepared for the decline which was accelerated by the outbreak and continuance of the Great War.

4. On the resignation of Principal Bowser in 1912, for the sake of economy the College ceased to be residential, and the students were "boarded out" in the neighbourhood, whilst the Principal's residence was occupied by a "House Governor" who superintended the students and kept open the necessary classrooms. At the meeting of the Council on 11th December, 1912, the following resolution was passed: "In accepting the resignation of the Principal, the Rev. Sidney W. Bowser, B.A., the Council desire to express their high appreciation of his personal character and faithful service. In the midst of difficulties arising from various causes, Mr. Bowser has shown such patience, industry, and steady persistence as merit a cordial acknowledgment. The Council are grateful to Mr. Bowser for his unfailing interest in the students under his care, and for the example of ministerial diligence and Christian courtesy which he has always set before them. With regard to his work as tutor, they wish to make special mention of his classes in the Greek New Testament, to the exceptional value of which frequent testimony has been borne. They assure Mr. Bowser of their sincere esteem, and trust he may have before him many years of useful work in the service of Christ and the Churches."

After 1915 there was no addition to the list of students, and in 1917 only two men were left. On 11th November, 1915 it was resolved: "This Council rejoices that some of the students have offered themselves for special service in this time of national crisis, and expresses the hope that all the men will take similar action. In view of such conditions, the Council resolves to suspend the work of the College for the remainder of the Session, and intends to resume when the war is over. The Council undertakes to give careful and sympathetic consideration to special cases of inability on the part of the men to render national service."

Messrs. R. Hurt and H. Lloyd were accepted for service in connection with the R.A.M.C., and went into training, but Mr. Hurt's health broke down. Mr. Lloyd rendered good service at Salonica until he was invalided home. Messrs. A. Baldwin and P. Hampton were rejected on medical grounds. Mr. A. E. Calow,

the last of all the Mildand students, was accepted by the Y.M.C.A. for service in Egypt, and was proceeding thither in the *Maloja*, when that vessel was sunk by the enemy off Dover, and he saved himself by swimming. National service was also rendered through the use of the College building by the military authorities. When it was no longer occupied by students, it became a temporary hostel, at one time for a detachment of the W.A.A.C., and at another time for as many soldiers as could be accommodated there.

Until the Congregational College was closed (under war conditions) in 1917, Principal Dr. D. L. Ritchie and Professor H. F. Sanders, B.A., B.D., continued their valuable co-operation in tutorial work. From 1913 to 1917 Rev. E. J. Roberts, M.A., B.D., served as Baptist Tutor. He was a graduate of Oxford and Glasgow Universities; had studied at the Baptist Theological College of Scotland, at Mansfield College, Oxford, and at Marburg University; had taken first class honours in philosophy at Glasgow; honours in the final school in theology at Oxford; M.A. and B.D. at Glasgow, and was a Prizeman in Logic, Philosophy, Hebrew, New Testament Criticism, and Divinity at Glasgow, and Prizeman at Mansfield College, Oxford. In 1914-15 Rev. C. H. Watkins, M.A., D.Th., who had studied at Nottingham, at Mansfield College, Oxford, and at Oxford, Berlin, and Heidelberg Universities, did valuable work. Special lectures were given and occasional classes were held by friends who readily rendered help under the difficult circumstances of the time, and their names may be recorded here: R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D.; J. D. Freeman, M.A.; R. C. Ford, M.A.; F. S. Granger, M.A., D.Litt.; G. Hill, M.A., D.D.; G. Howard James; A. E. Owen Jones; T. Phillips, B.A.; F. C. Player, B.A.; and F. C. Spurr.

#### 7.—APPLICATION OF ASSETS.

1. When it became evident that there was no alternative to the carrying out of the second paragraph of the resolution of the special Constituency Meeting held on 9th June, 1914, the Council, on 1st July, 1919, resolved to "recommend to the Trustees the immediate sale of the College premises on Forest Road," and appointed a "sub-committee to make inquiries with regard to other College property in Nottingham, and if they should deem it expedient, to arrange for the sale of it also." The result was that the Forest Road property, sold to the Y.M.C.A. to be used as a hostel, realised £3,500; the Mansfield Road property realised £720; and the Hyson Green property £200. Total, £4,420. The majority of the Trustees decided that it was desirable to devote the proceeds of the sales to the forming of scholarships open to students in English Baptist Colleges

who had matriculated at a British University, or passed some equivalent examination, that the Trust for this scheme and for the Pegg Scholarships should be made co-extensive, and that the approval of the Board of Education and of the Charity Commissioners should be sought accordingly. In this decision the Trustees of the Pegg Scholarship Fund concurred, and here it should be explained that under the terms of his will, dated 30th March, 1867, Mr. Robert Pegg, of Derby, bequeathed the sum of £2,000 to be applied to the foundation of two scholarships in the General Baptist College, Chilwell, the annual income thereof to be disposed of from time to time in manner thereafter mentioned. They were of the value of about £45 each per annum for two years, and were open to students of the College who matriculated in the University of London, and who also passed an examination in Hebrew, in the Greek of the New Testament, Church History, and the Christian Evidences. The scholars under the Trust were : G. H. Bennett, 1882-3 ; F. Cunliffe, 1884-5 ; T. A. Plant, 1886-7 ; F. G. French, 1890-1 ; N. H. Marshall, B.A., 1898-9 ; J. H. Rushbrooke, B.A., 1899-1900 ; Gwilym Davies, 1902-3 ; C. H. Watkins, M.A., 1905-6 ; G. H. Matthews, 1905-6 ; A. C. Underwood, 1908-9 ; and C. M. Coltman, M.A., 1913-5.

It will be observed that the Trustees proposed that in the new scheme the scholarship shall be made available for all English Baptist Colleges, whether the Trust Deed be of a Calvinistic or an Arminian type, whereas the late College from the beginning had been a distinctly Arminian foundation, and the property at Nottingham, from the sale of which the proposed scholarships are to be derived, was purchased with General Baptist money.

The names submitted for Trusteeship in the proposed scheme are those of gentlemen resident in the East Midland District (whereas the scholarships are to be available for English students generally) with the exception that the names of Dr. Clifford and Rev. W. J. Avery are included. But as the filling up of vacancies (upon the number of Trustees being reduced to seven), is to be effected by the Council of the Baptist Union, it may be hoped that such a piece of provincialism will find its remedy. The Secretary of the Board of Education, on 5th February, 1923, issued a draft scheme for the College Foundation. Any objections or suggestions respecting the draft scheme may be made to the Board in writing within two calendar months from that date, as per advertisement.

2. The contents of the College Library were distributed thus : Upwards of 800 volumes were given to the Library of the Baptist Union Women's Training College, "Havelock Hall," Hampstead, and 426 (including a number of pamphlets) to the Baptist Historical Society. Of the 1,300 books left, 200 were



voted to ministers in the East Midland Association, and to lay preachers through their Association. The remainder found purchasers.

3. In 1917, when the military authorities were about to occupy the College premises, much of the old furniture was sold to make way for army fittings. Some household effects were retained until 1920, and when a selection had been made from them by representatives of the Women's College, for use at Hampstead, the rest were also sold.

#### 8.—THEOLOGICAL CONTINUITY.

The principles for the advancement of which Dan Taylor founded the "Academy" in 1797 are more "living and active" than ever, and are distinctly symbolized and inculcated by means of the "John Clifford" Chair for "General Baptist Biblical and Theological Teaching" at Rawdon College. Toward its maintenance, annual grants are made, with the approval of the Charity Commissioners, of about £220 from the Joseph Davis Charity, and £40 from the General Baptist Fund (see section 6). Total, about £260. In order to complete provision for the Professorship it is the intention of the Executive of the College to raise (as soon as the financial condition of the country will permit) a capital sum to yield about £140 per annum, and thus secure £400 in all. The first to fill the Chair is Rev. Professor A. C. Underwood, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., who commenced his training at the Midland College, whence he proceeded to Oxford, and afterwards served on the Staff of the Baptist Missionary Society at Serampore College.

And so, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, where Dan Taylor, a century and a half ago, first meditated on the problem of Baptist ministerial education, and had two young men in his own house at Birchcliffe for training, Rawdon blends his tradition with that of his friend John Fawcett, training men that they may be wise, and may turn many to righteousness.

W. J. AVERY.

N.B.—The proofs of this article have been read and slightly amended by the kindness of W. E. Winks.