

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>

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

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

Schleiermacher.

FRIEDRICH ERNST DANIEL SCHLEIERMACHER was born in Breslau in 1768 and died in Berlin on February 12th, 1834. He is one of the most influential of modern thinkers. In his own day he was one of the most effective of preachers and university administrators. And he has well deserved the title of "the father of modern theology." He is the apostle, that is, of that type of theology which endeavours to establish dogmatic not on the creeds of the Church or on the doctrines of the Bible, and not even on the principles which can be described by logical analysis, but rather upon the fact of human experience, the experience of the Christian of the power and presence of God. He is the forerunner of that type of thinking that would bring theology out of the cold storage of rationalism into the warmth and fresh air of experience.

Schleiermacher was fortunate in his parents, and especially in his mother. To her he owed more than he did to his father. His mother was a woman of keen intellect and real religious experience, and she did much in the training of her son's mind and spirit. His father was an army chaplain of the old type, rigid, unbending and narrow. The discipline of it was good for the son perhaps, but there was little in the father's mind that would be of help to a boy who was learning to think for himself. He early decided to enter the ministry, and with that purpose in view, he went to the schools of the Moravians at Nersky and Barby. The pious atmosphere of these places was much to his mind, but the discipline and the lack of originality in thought made him break away from it all. In 1787, he went to Halle to study theology. But he never quite lost the influence of the Moravian training, and what he learned with them had more to do with his later work than appears on the surface. It was there that he learned to stress the importance of personal experience of God as the foundation of religion.

When he went to Halle, he immediately got away from the atmosphere of pious devotion into that of dull philosophical rationalism. The university at the time was under the influence of Semler and Wolf, who were both rationalists of the most unbending type. But Schleiermacher was too much of the religious man to be really influenced by them. He gave over most of his time to the study of Kant, Fichte, Spinoza and Plato. Plato was to remain one of his great loves, and he was to spend many happy years in the translation and interpretation of his works. He also spent a good deal of time in the study of the

New Testament, especially of the newer sort of criticism that was becoming the vogue in Germany at that time. It was a pity, however, that he did not spend more time in the study of the Old Testament and in the study of the thought of the New Testament as opposed to the merely critical aspect of it. It would have saved him making obvious mistakes in his theological construction in later years. His reading was pretty wide, and because of it, he did not seem to be able to find any firm standing ground so far as theology is concerned, while he was at the University. But one thing was certain for him there. No theological system could be sound which left out the personal experience of those who were believers in religion. Religion was a personal possession of the soul, and not merely a system of dogmas. He had got that far at any rate, but no further, by the time that his University studies were finished. But that was the beginning of the whole matter for him.

For a time he acted as tutor in a private family, then he was ordained and acted as assistant for his uncle, after which he went to Berlin as a hospital chaplain. This appointment gave him plenty of time for the pursuit of his studies. Also he made many friends, among them the Schlegels, who were to become the leading representatives of the Romantic movement at the time. He shared their feelings to a large extent, especially in their attack upon the barrenness of the rationalism and dogmatism of the intellectuals, but his profound reading in philosophy and theology and his respect for the intellect prevented him going to the excesses that were so common in German Romanticists. He also had his early pietistic training and his personal experience of religion to save him from foolishness. But it was under this influence, and in this atmosphere, that he made his first excursion into theological literature, with his *Reden über die Religion*. In this work he vindicated the place of religion in the life of the complete man as against the representatives of the rationalist school who despised it. He also made his first attack upon the dogmatism of the older ethical teachers and upon the categorical imperative of Kant, which was to be the start of his constructive thinking on ethical questions. In the very next year he published *Monologen*, in which he elaborated in greater detail his ethical standpoint, and vindicated the place of the individual in society. Soon after that he left Berlin and went into the country as the pastor of a little church which gave him even more time for study. It was while he was there that he began to publish the results of his studies in Plato. But while he was a devoted student, he by no means spared himself in his criticism. And in these essays as well, his own standpoint as an ethical teacher, his effort to build up the conception of life as a realm of ends

and purposes, comes out. In 1804 he went back to Berlin as pastor of Trinity Church, and later, as one of the founders of and Professor in theology at the new University of Berlin. All the time while he was lecturing he was also preaching, and was drawing large audiences. His sermons bore vitally upon the needs of the day, they were undogmatic in their tone (theologically at any rate), they were full of common sense, and were delivered with fire and passion. His whole effort was to build up the power of religion in the personal life. He found that in preaching he was able to do a good deal in bringing home the powers of religion to the life and thought of men. He was one of the rare examples in modern Germany of a theologian who could or would preach. In Germany it is so common for the theologian and the preacher to be out of sympathy with each other, even if they are not opposed to each other. Schleiermacher was not only a teacher: he was also a preacher of conviction and power. A theology to him that could not be preached was no theology.

It was in 1821 that he published the book that is, of all his books, the best representative of his thought and the one that most clearly is an interpretation of his mature mind, *Der Christliche Glaube*. In this he made an attempt to re-fashion Protestant theology along the lines that he had already accepted as fundamental. That is, his foundation was not in the creeds nor in Scripture, but in personal experience, the experience of God mediated through Jesus Christ. His method was so new that he was naturally called upon to face a good deal of opposition. On the one hand, the evangelicals accused him of betraying the faith, and of opening the door to all sorts of theological dangers and innovations. On the other hand, the rationalists condemned him for parting with reason as the one guide to truth. But in spite of opposition, he went on. He proved capable of defending himself, and he did it with charm, ability and eloquence. It cannot be said that he made many or even any disciples, in the sense that he established a school of theology. But no man can read him without having an impression left upon him. And it is no exaggeration to say that he has influenced modern theology more than any other one thinker. No man who has tried to do any thinking for himself has been able to escape from his influence, even if he has wanted to do so.

The position of Schleiermacher in the field of theology is very much like that of Kant in the field of philosophy. That is, they set the problems for men to solve in the next generation, and they show them the lines on which they will have to be tackled. There is a great deal of difference between the final reconstructions of Kant and Schleiermacher, but they had many

likenesses. Kant's purpose was to submit reason to a critical analysis in order to discover from it what it was really, to find what was fundamentally necessary to constitute thought and what was derived merely from sensation which supplied the raw materials of thought. Far more by his methods than by the actual results that he secured has Kant proved himself to be the father of modern philosophy. In the same way Schleiermacher broke up the old ways of looking at religion and demanded that the first thing you needed to do when building up a theology was to examine what religion in its essence was, how it had manifested itself in past history and how it expressed itself in the personal life. It was that method which was important in Schleiermacher much more than his definite achievements. It was the critical method of Kant applied to religion, the scrapping of old methods of thinking and all old dogmas, and the critical examination of the nature of religion in itself. It was a startling thing for men to learn from him that religion itself was more important than what men said about it, even what the Bible said about it, even what the Church said about it, even what God was supposed to have said about it. You must study it at its fountain head, and the fountain head is the personal life of the man who has faith in it. That was his fundamental position, and from it he never swerved all his life. He found, of course, as everybody knows, that religion does not consist in dogmas but in feeling, in the realisation of the power and majesty of God in the soul of man. Dogma is not religion; it is only what man has said about religion. The establishment of experience as the foundation of theology was a new thing. It is commonplace now-a-days, of course, but in those days it was new. But even more important than the fact that Schleiermacher fixed upon feeling as the essence of religion was the fact that he went to religion itself to ask what it was, and conducted a critical examination of it to find out what its basic elements were. Religion was to shine and to be interpreted by its own light, otherwise it could not shine at all. That was his epoch-making contribution, and it is that that has justified his title of the father of modern theology.

Schleiermacher did not profess to be a critical and constructive philosopher. His business was religion far more than it was philosophy. He was a theologian first, because he was a preacher and because he wished to get clear for himself and for others the principles on which he preached. But at the same time, no man can preach for long, and no man can think about the problems of theology for long, without having to establish in some way his relations to philosophy. And in all his works Schleiermacher shows us what his position is. He did not try

to build up a system of philosophy, and you have to get at his ideas by gathering together scattered references. But on the whole his position is clear. The unifying principle of the world is God. It is in God that all things inhere and consist. God is neither separated from the world nor bound up in it. That is, Schleiermacher is neither deist nor pantheist. He claims that we can know only phenomena. In much the same way as Kant does, he draws a distinction between things in themselves and things as we see them, *noumena* and *phenomena*. We cannot know *noumena*; we can only know *phenomena*. And he is open to the same criticism as Kant. You can say bluntly that we do know *noumena* and that *phenomena* is what we know of them. But all our knowledge is derived from the phenomenal world. There can be no knowledge of reality other than what we experience of reality through our senses. In the same way we cannot have a complete knowledge of God; we can only know God as He manifests Himself to us and as we find Him. Not that that matters to Schleiermacher. For to him religion does not consist in the fulness or accuracy of our ideas of God, but rather in the immediate consciousness of God's power, in the experience of His presence in the world and in ourselves. Thus our ideas are not of absolute importance; it is only the experience of God that is that.

But while you get scattered thoughts of his philosophical position in his various works, it is not in them that Schleiermacher shows his real power. He does not profess to be a philosopher, except in so far as a preacher and theologian and Biblical scholar has to be that. We have seen that the central fact of his thought is that he conducted a critical analysis of religion itself and found that it consisted in a feeling of dependence upon God. His chief book opens with that. Religion consists in the specific feeling of dependence upon a power outside of ourselves. The fact of God is an unescapable fact of the human personality. We do not advance to it at the end of an argument, as though from the presence of something in us or in the world, we moved along a line of logic to the position that there must be a God to explain the facts. God was not at the end of an argument, but rather at the beginning of it. He was an unescapable element of the mind. He was bound up with the human spirit. We do not have to withdraw from the world or conduct any analysis of thought in order to find God. We have Him within ourselves, the one universally fundamental fact of personality.

Now when he says that religion consists in feeling, we must not assume that he means no more than sensation. Neither must we think that he means that one element in the personality, and

one alone, and that perhaps the lowest, is involved in the relationship of man with God. What he means by feeling, so far as religion is concerned, is a sense of awareness of the presence of God, which is mediated to us through the emotions. He would urge just as much that religion consists in obedience to the divine will and also in the attempt to understand the divine mind. But his reaction to the intellectualism of his time was such that he was willing to run the risk of being misunderstood in order to make clear that religion is not a matter of brains or dogma but a matter of experience. We do not know God because we understand Him; we understand Him because we know Him. Schleiermacher knew quite well that the exercise of the will and of the intellect are a necessity, if we are going to have a full life. He knew also the fact of the unity of the personality. But he was so keen on showing the centrality of the fact of religion in the sense of the presence of God itself and of the feeling of dependence upon Him, that he was prepared to run the risk of being misunderstood. Better be thought to be romantic than intellectualistic. At the basis of all religion, and not only of the Christian religion, there is the sense of the union of the soul with God. And that union, even though it be spread over the whole personality, manifests itself, and must manifest itself at its highest in the emotions. That is why he says that religion is found at its highest in the feelings.

This sense of God is immediate. That means that the old arguments for the existence of God are of no meaning to Schleiermacher. God is His own argument. He needs no evidence. He is present in the personal life and His power, as it manifests itself in the personal life, is unescapable. But again it must not be thought that Schleiermacher concentrates upon the personal life as though that, in and by itself, carried the conclusion with it. He knows as well as we do that the individual can go astray. He was sufficient of a psychologist to know that a man could misjudge his feelings. It is unsafe to base the argument for the fact of God upon His presence in the personal life, seeing that there are so many who have no sense of the presence of God. The individual is conditioned by the society in which he lives and of which he forms a part. And the way in which that society re-acts to religion is based to a large extent upon the training that it has received in religion. Thus, for the preservation of religion in the world, you need more than so many isolated men and women, all receiving an impression of God for and by themselves. You need a handing on of religion from one man to another. Every world religion consists in the communication of the creative experiences of great individuals, the communication of truths which could have come in no other

way than by the way of experience. Thus the distinctive truths of the Christian religion cannot be discovered by a process of reasoning. They are what they are because Christ knew them in His own soul and made them real to the souls of others. Thus Schleiermacher does not run the danger of subjectivism, at least not to any great extent, for the simple reason that he knows that the experience of the individual is created by and conditioned by the society of which he forms a part. Christianity is an historic religion, and it is only in the society of the Church that you can have a full Christian experience.

But at the same time, while he says all that, he is very indefinite as to what he means by God. He tells us distinctly that he is not teaching pantheism, and it is easy to see that he does not want to teach it. But many a man teaches what he does not know he is teaching. And Schleiermacher cannot go so far as to say that God is personal. 'God is a power not of ourselves of which we are immediately conscious. He will not draw from that the conclusion that God is personal. He knows that God is more concrete, if such a word can be used, than the pantheist will allow, but he cannot go so far as to say that He is personal. To understand that we need to remember that Schleiermacher was very much under the spell of Spinoza, and it is clear that when he tries to explain in what the fact of God consists, the Spinoza complex is too much for him and he draws back. But whether that is what he does or not, we shall never be able to repay our debt to him for bringing religion back out of the arid deserts of intellectualism and establishing it upon the solid ground of experience. Even though we cannot say exactly what God is, we know in our hearts that we must look upon Him as real. And with that, for the time being, we may have to be content. Scepticism was rife at the time through the attempt to build up religion on the basis of dogma. And Schleiermacher did good work in showing that it was not by way of the intellect but by a more fundamental way that men come into touch with the living God.

But for Schleiermacher there is something more than religion: there is the Christian religion. And it was his particular business to expound and defend this. Every historical religion rests upon a revelation. The Christian religion does just as much as any other. But the peculiarity of Christianity is not that we have an experience of God; you have that in all religion. The peculiarity of Christianity is that those who practise it have an experience of Christ. The central fact of the Christian faith is the experience of Christ as the Redeemer, and by that fact all other facts in our religion are tested. The Christian realises that he has got redemption and deliverance

through Christ, and that that redemption has been mediated to him through the Christian Church. Schleiermacher again does his best here to steer clear of subjectivism. There is no experience of Christ apart from the community of those who have that experience. In the fullest sense of the term, outside the Church there is no salvation. The Church is the community which maintains and keeps alive the divine life. Religion consists in personal contact between God and man, but apart from the community, there would be no contact between God and man. There are other functions of the Church, but that is the main one. The redeeming influence of it upon those inside of it is simply the same as the influence of Christ upon it.

But that does not go quite far enough. It is not enough to say that there is a Christian community or that the experience of God is mediated through it. You need to go further and ask how that community came into being, and how the experience has been handed on from age to age. We have men to-day with the experience of God and of Christ. How has that come? Schleiermacher would say emphatically that it has come through Christ Who is the Redeemer in the sense that He has mediated to men the knowledge of God. Christ does not differ fundamentally in kind from us, although He attains to a far higher spiritual nature than we do. The one thing that does distinguish Him from us is that He is sinless, and He was this because of the intimacy of His life with God. He had the consciousness of God completely unspoiled by any taint of any sort. This is, of course, a miracle, and cannot be explained as merely the product of preceding conditions. History may say that to some extent, the world was prepared for Christ at the time He came, and it can do something to show how His definite consciousness of religion had its precursors. Schleiermacher would grant that. But the real fact of the experience of Christ is unique. Nothing prepared the way for it. It cannot be explained. It was due to an act of grace on the part of God. God willed Christ, and so there was Christ. Christ is the Redeemer of men in the sense that He possessed in Himself the complete consciousness of God. For Him the lower elements of the personality had been mastered by the higher elements, and the God within Him had become complete. The way in which He redeems men is by establishing the supremacy of the consciousness of God within them, and to that extent, establishing the Kingdom of God within them. Not that that happens all at once. There is no high road or easy road to the consciousness of God. There was no such road for Christ. There is a clash for a time between the earth consciousness and the God consciousness, but the end is sure. And the victory is with God.

That, briefly, is Schleiermacher's position. It needs to be said again that it is in Christian experience that Christian dogmatics start. They cannot start anywhere else. They cannot go beyond what we experience. There have been in the history of religion all kinds of speculations on the nature of God, Christ, and the spiritual life. And often these speculations have had no sort of relationship to the life that men have had to live. What the Scriptures said, or the creeds, must be accepted, and the sole task of dogmatic was to examine what was given and to understand it and to show its bearings in wider and wider fields. For centuries before Schleiermacher there had been no attempt to find out whether there had been anything given, and if so, what it was. Christian life and Christian truth had little to do with each other. And that had had terrible results upon Christian ethics. Schleiermacher was the first to bring the Church back to purity and sanity. He set experience at the centre. Thought has the right to go anywhere where experience leads. It has the right, in theology, at any rate, to go nowhere where experience does not lead. In saying that, he set the tone of theology for future generations. And he probably saved religion from destruction, in that age, at any rate.

But in saying that dogmatic is to be tested by experience, he implies that many things enter into dogma that have no right to be there. And in that also he separates himself from the majority of thinkers. What cannot be tested by experience cannot be accepted by reason. That is simply another side of the assertion that what cannot be preached ought not to be taught. An unpreachable dogma is useless. And in the same way an untestable dogma is so much dead weight. There can be no experience of the virgin birth and of the second coming and of the last judgment and so on. So out of dogma they ought to go. They may possibly be derivatives of experience, but they are not part of it. We have here a plea not only for the spiritualising of theology but also for the simplification of it. And it would be well if more tried to copy it.

There are contributions of Schleiermacher to thought that are of vital importance. But we need to guard ourselves perhaps from misconception before we try to pass judgment. We need to be sure that we know what Schleiermacher means by "feeling." He does not intend to separate "feeling" off from any other part of the personality. Neither does he intend to separate the feeling of a person off from that of the community. But many have forgotten that and have charged him with too narrow an interpretation of religion. He speaks of the feeling of dependence so much that, if you read carelessly, you may think that he has nothing else to speak about. We need to bear several

facts in mind. First, he is making a protest against the intellectualism of his day. That cannot be mentioned too often. In his protest he went to extremes. It was the only thing to do to get his point home. He had to make theology turn a complete somersault, and if he had hedged and qualified his remarks, he would have made no impression upon anybody. Second, his whole ethical position is to be found in the conception of the realm of ends. That is, the Christian is not merely a passive recipient of the grace of God; he is a man fired to go out and do his best to prepare the Kingdom of God to come to the earth. For Schleiermacher everything goes off into morals. And it is the moral test that is final for him and for us. Religion consists in the sense of the reality of God, but once that sense is there, it spreads over the whole personality and takes will and mind along with it. Schleiermacher runs the risk neither of subjectivism nor of sentimentalism.

Schleiermacher gives us no real picture of a historical Christ. There was such a person. He acknowledges that. He knows that Christianity is a religion of history. He knows that that is the case with all great religions. He knows that the central fact of the Christian is an experience mediated through the Church to him, but coming to him ultimately from Christ. But the difficulty is that he makes no real union between the Christ Who is present in the experience and the Christ Who was a living historical figure in Galilee. The fact is that Christianity is a system of thought that revolves round two centres. The one is experience, and the other is the Jesus of history. And for the second, there must be a rigid and honest historical criticism as a pre-requisite of dogmatic. And that Schleiermacher does not give to us. You are left with the impression that with him Jesus is not a person of history at all, but a purely ideal figure. He opens himself out to very severe criticism not only from the Christian but even more from the non-Christian. He suffers the risk of being accused of building up his whole system upon an experience which may after all be a gigantic error and delusion. He needed to show by a strict examination of history that there was in Jesus the realisation of the fact of God and the power to mediate to others what He Himself possessed. He needed also to show that there is to-day an experience of the eternal Christ, a meeting Him in the secret places, and not only through the medium of the Church, and he needed to show how that eternal Christ is related to the Christ of history. All that he failed to do, and that is a weak point in his whole argument. There is no way of getting from the fact of the present experience of the Christian to the reality of the Gospel portrait of Jesus. You cannot deduce Jesus as a man of history from the conscious-

ness of the Christian of to-day. And in thinking that it can be done, Schleiermacher lays himself open to the criticism that there is no Jesus of history, but that all we have is an ideal figure. In fact, that is just the criticism that is passed upon the Christian religion by many to-day. To them it is a mere system of ideas which have no basis in a person. And if that were true, it would eventually mean the end of the Christian religion.

In the same way he does not really give us an intelligible view of God. On his own judgment of the methods of dogmatic theology, he could not. You have no right, according to him, to go beyond what you have in experience. You have experience of a power outside of yourself upon which you are dependent, but you cannot go further than that and say that that power is personal. This all springs from the fact that Schleiermacher is not, in theology any more than in philosophy, concerned with things in themselves. We cannot know anything except in so far as it acts upon us. It is open to object here that we do know God, and that we know of Him what we experience of Him. Our knowledge is real so far as it goes. We could not have experience of power and majesty and love unless they all sprang from a person outside of ourselves. That would be a perfectly legitimate thing to say. Were God not personal, we should have and could have no experience of Him. That is what we should say. But Schleiermacher would not say that. Much as he tries to keep clear of pantheism, he cannot do so entirely. But it needs to be noticed that he is not really interested in the question of what God is: he is only interested in the question what God does.

But in many ways, even though Schleiermacher did not answer questions, he set them. He set first the question as to what we really mean by Christian experience. He set second the question as to what is the secret of the Christian religion. He had no doubt himself of the uniqueness of it. It was unique in the sense that Christ had a consciousness of God that no other had, and that He had mediated to others redemptive power. And that set the question as to what that experience of Christ really was, and in what way it had been mediated to men. He finally made Christ the centre of the Christian religion. And he set there the question as to who that Christ was, and what was His relation to the Christ of Whom in this day we have experience. Those are the questions that theology ever since has had to answer. But in this world, the really potent thinker is not the man who answers questions, but the man who asks them. So long as they are fundamental enough. It is he who is the progressive thinker, and it is he who sets the lines for others to travel on.

H. J. FLOWERS.

The Baptists and the New Testament.*

WE who are Baptists claim that the New Testament is the authoritative word to which we appeal for the basis and sanction of our conception of the nature of the Christian Church, and the mode and subjects of baptism.

"Confessions of Faith" were once rather popular among us, though they were objected to by some during the eighteenth century, and during the last century were said by many to be unnecessary.

Joshua Thomas (of Leominster) maintained that a "Confession of Faith" was needed to set forth our interpretation of the truths contained in the New Testament, and to make it clear whether we were Unitarians or Trinitarians, Calvinists or Arminians, believers in baptism by immersion on the ground of faith, or otherwise. In consequence of the various declarations made by religious bodies who professed to found their belief and practice on the New Testament the Baptists also had need of their "Confession of Faith." Some liberal-minded Baptists, however, argued against this view, and the Rev. J. Jones (Mathetes) and others maintained later that there was no need whatever of a Confession. If the Confession contained more than the New Testament it would contain too much. If it contained less it would be too little. If it only contained the same it would be superfluous. It may be, however, that Confessions are of value as expressions from time to time of the doctrine of a denomination and the interpretation of the New Testament accepted by it at that period. The evil was that Confessions were made mill-stones and not milestones. It would appear that the members of the Baptist denomination in general (like those of other denominations) needed the guidance of greater minds, and that the individual church from the days of Paul downward was not always able to deal with its problems of life and thought without direction from outside. That accounts for the rise of Associations and Councils, and that is perhaps the reason for their continuance among Baptists. Notwithstanding all this, the

*This paper was read by Professor J. Gwili Jenkins, M.A., D.Litt., at the Welsh Baptist Ministers' Summer School, Llanwrtyd, and has been translated from the Welsh by the Rev. R. H. Jones, St. Clears.

New Testament was the touchstone of the Baptists for their doctrines, and it is to the word and to the testimony that they loved to appeal for authority for their faith and order when formulating a Confession, and sometimes in opposing it after forming it. They believed that all the books of the New Testament were of equal value and inspiration, though some of them noted that Paul at times spoke his own mind, declaring *his belief* that he had the mind of Christ. Yet in spite of their loyalty to the letter of the New Testament they, in common with the great body of the Church, put away several customs once regarded as important; such as frequent or weekly communion, the love feast, the holy kiss, and the washing of the disciples' feet; although the practice of the Early Church lay behind all these and they believed a definite word of the Lord to be behind the custom of washing the feet. It is difficult to know how they surmounted words like those of John xiii. 14, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet, for I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." Here is a command as positive as any, and it is not strange that J. R. Jones, of Ramoth, and Christmas Evans for a time, were entangled on facing it and hearkened unto Archibald McLean. The Baptists in Wales were divided also more than once in regard to the "laying on of hands," and though the custom has been retained in some of the older churches until to-day, not only at the setting apart of officers, but at the admission of members, the body of the denomination have learnt to regard it as one of the things that passed away with the apostolic age, holding that the gift of the Spirit is no longer conferred on any one by empty hands.

After all, it is not easy to understand how a denomination which laid such stress on the authority of Christ and the New Testament could allow so many of the practices of the Early Church to become of no account in its sight, and follow the Catholic or Roman Church in its rejection of some of them. It may be that some Baptist not too strictly scriptural will rise at some future time, and in his desire for union enquire "If it is the Church of Rome which put an end to some of these practices, what have we to say against her altering the practice of administering baptism by immersion of both sexes, and especially in cold countries like Siberia, Greenland and North Canada?"

Here is a matter that requires our consideration. However, the Baptists have clung to the two ordinances which they adjudged permanent institutions in the New Testament and of greater importance than the rites mentioned; they believed that the washing of feet and the holy kiss, for instance, were incidental and pertained to Eastern countries; and that it was the Spirit of

Truth and not the whim of any church that turned them aside. They believed the time for observing Communion was a matter of church order and convenience, and that the laying on of hands might be regarded as a Jewish custom which could be observed or rejected without breaking the concord. They held that the heart of Christianity was in the two ordinances, and that they could not cease to be faithful to the ritualism they were accused of embracing; the ritualism which is essential to their interpretation of the religion of the New Testament. By now it is acknowledged by many without our ranks that we have much to say for our standpoint, and some have ventured the prophecy that the final conflict for the purity of the faith will lie between the Roman Catholics and the Baptists.

The controversies as to the meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo* have ceased, and hardly any of the commentators or lexicographers now doubt that believers' immersion was the practice of the Early Church. It is true that some have referred to the "Teaching of the Apostles" (a church directory probably pertaining to the first half of the second century) and the section in chapter 7, which speaks of pouring water on the baptized. We may as well give the quotation in full: "Thus shall ye baptise. Having first recited all these things (concerning 'the two Ways') baptise in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in living (running) water. But if thou hast not living water then baptise in other water, and if thou art not able in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, then pour water on the head thrice in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Kirsopp Lake has argued (in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*) that in face of such words we cannot be positive as to the mode practised by the Early Church, but all that can be safely based on this is that the pouring over the whole body was as near an approach to the primitive mode as was possible under certain circumstances, and that the pouring was also some kind of portrayal of the baptism or out-pouring of the Holy Spirit. And no argument for vicarious baptism as having Paul's authority behind it can be based on the reference to "baptism for the dead" in 1 Cor. xv. 29. Undoubtedly Tertullian was correct in saying that it refers to the act of living persons accepting baptism for the dead, and we find sacrificing for the dead in 2 Mac. (xii. 42, 43) and in Plato's *Republic* (ii. 364). But Paul's reference to a custom that was introduced probably from the Mystery Religions is no proof that he approved of it, any more than his statement that "they that be drunken are drunken in the night" proves that he commends drunkenness as Tertullian points out. It may be said without any hesitation that the custom

of the apostolic age was altogether in favour of baptism by immersion on profession of faith. Baptism was regarded, especially in the Gentile lands where the Mystery Religions suggested the analogy, as a symbol of a dying to an old life with Christ and the rising with Him to a new life. And there is little sign that any were baptised without personal faith even when mention is made of the baptism of families. All this is admitted by commentators and historians generally to-day, but another argument has been started and that, I believe, strikes rather directly at the root of our reliance as Baptists on the New Testament. Apart from the fact that we are sometimes spoken of as ritualists too enslaved to the letter, and a body of people that continue to practise a rite of Jewish origin, it is argued that our continued practice of immersion is founded on the tradition of the Early Church and Paul, rather than on a command of Christ in the Gospels. We are told that the great Commission found in the present conclusion of Mark's Gospel (Mark xvi. 16) and in Matt. xxviii. 19, did not come from the Lord Jesus. It is argued that if we are to believe the Book of Acts, the primitive Church baptised in the name of Jesus and not in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and that the controversy concerning the admission of the Gentiles could not have arisen if there already existed a command of Christ to preach the gospel to the whole world. It is true some have argued that the form of the Commission as given by Eusebius agrees with the custom in Acts, and suggested that the change from the name of Jesus to that of the Trinity was made in a later age; but the difficulty already mentioned is not thus overcome, viz., that Jesus after His resurrection had given a command to make disciples of all nations, and that the Church in Judea refused to conform to that positive command until Paul had his way in spite of them.

It may be claimed that the conclusion of Matthew's Gospel is in accord with the Spirit of Christ, but it is difficult to continue to believe that the great Commission is a word spoken by Him to His disciples after His resurrection from the grave and before His ascension. Besides, it is asserted to-day that Jesus Himself laid no stress on water-baptism during His ministry, and that it is doubtful whether all the disciples were baptised, not to speak of others who followed Him.

It is argued that even the baptism of Jesus Himself was more of a difficulty than anything else in the period when the Gospels were written. Why did He come to John and submit to a baptism of repentance? that was the difficulty. That, it is said, is the reason for amplifying Mark's simple record in Matthew's Gospel. These are the words of Mark, "And it came to pass in those days that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee

and was baptised of John in Jordan and straightway coming up out of the water He saw the heavens opened, etc." But in Matthew we have a protest on the part of John in the words, "But John forbade Him saying I have need to be baptised of Thee and comest Thou to me?" Then we have the reply of Jesus, "Suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," and after this, "Then he suffered Him"; intimating that there was no need of baptism for remission of sins on the part of the Sinless One. It is observed, though, that no comment that lays such clear emphasis on the moral perfection of Jesus is found in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" as quoted by Cyprian (*de Rebapt.* xvii) and Jerome (*contra Pelag.*, iii. 2). It is stated in an incomplete section of this Gospel that Jesus went not down with His father and mother unto John, but that He went later. And these are the important words, "But He said unto them, what sin have I done that I should go and be baptised by him? unless perhaps this thing itself which I have said is ignorance in Me." Though this Gospel comes from Ebionite circles—circles that denied the deity of Jesus—yet the quotation from it and the apologia in Matthew show that Christ's submission to a baptism of repentance was the occasion of much controversy during the first century and the beginning of the second.

At present some have another way of explaining the obedience of Jesus to John's baptism. According to the Gospels they say John's baptism is but a witness to another and better baptism, and the obedience of Jesus to John's baptism was only something necessary to His consecration to His public work. That is the meaning of "fulfilling all righteousness"; not a confession of sin or of repentance. Even in Mark's Gospel we have John witnessing, "I indeed have baptised you with water, but He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost." And in Matthew's Gospel we have a clearer declaration, "I indeed baptise you with water unto repentance, but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." John, in his Gospel, goes further and deletes the baptism of Jesus by the Baptist altogether. Let verses 26-34 of John i. be read to see how skilfully the witness of the other evangelists to the coming of the Greater One is used, and how he avoids stating that Jesus was baptised of John. Note verse 33, "And I knew Him not, but He that sent me to baptise with water the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending and remaining on Him the same is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost." But not a word of the baptism of Jesus. In view of this it is argued that the baptism of the Spirit is

the Christian baptism and the baptism of the canonical gospels. The early Quakers argued much to the same effect with the Baptists during the seventeenth century. They referred with a large measure of contempt to "Water-baptism," and contended that the baptism of the Spirit is the "one baptism" mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians. And it must be admitted that the Quakers persuaded many Baptists to follow them by the strength of their argument.

At present the Quakers and others maintain that this is the standpoint of the "spiritual Gospel," the Gospel of John. Attention is called to the statement in John iv. 1, that Jesus baptised, and then to the correction that follows, "Though Jesus Himself baptised not but His disciples," iv. 2. And it is maintained there is no other reference to baptism in the four Gospels, excepting the words of the Commission, unless a reference to it can be read into John xiii. 10. "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet" and if "of water" is retained in John iii. 5. There are Greek texts without the words "of water," and Kirsopp Lake argues for their omission as later Church additions. He remarks that the form of the words given by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 61) is, "For Christ said, Except ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Yet Odeberg argued strongly, quoting from Jewish and Gnostic writings, that "water" here meant "heavenly seed," or outflow from above or from God, and that the meaning of "born of water and of the Spirit" is "born from above." And W. F. Howard refers to the similarity between this and 1 John iii. 9, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin because he is born of God."

Later Quakers also plead that the two ordinances are only assigned a spiritual meaning in the Gospel of John. They maintain there is no command to continue the communion in the Synoptic Gospels nor any mention of its institution in the Gospel of John. The new commandment there is to love and serve one another. "This Lord's Supper," says Dr. Rufus Jones (*Studies in Mystical Religion*, p. 18), "calls for no visible elements, no consecrated priest. It calls only for a human heart conscious of its needs and ready to eat the Bread of God, on the one momentous condition of willing and loving what Christ wills and loves." The water of baptism and bread of the communion mean little in themselves. "We are dealing," he says, "with a process by which the believer takes into himself the Divine Life, and by an inward change makes it his own so that he has actually 'God abiding in him.' It is claimed that the author of the fourth Gospel was an early Quaker, a man who had outgrown the Jewish ordinances and ceremonies of the Early Church and

rested on their spiritual significance alone. There is no baptism but that of the Spirit, and it is not sacramentarianism that is found in John vi., but a protest against a pagan communion and a declaration in favour of a spiritual participation of the Lord Jesus, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing" (vi. 63).

This new exposition is a challenge to our standpoint as Baptists and our interpretation of the ordinances. What have we to say against it? I shall at present only outline a reply. Our argument is that the Early Church did not begin to baptise at Pentecost without having a reason or command for doing so. Jesus gave an important place to the mission of John the Baptist, otherwise, what is the meaning of his question, "the baptism of John was it from heaven or of man? Answer Me" (Mark xi. 30), and the conversation which follows. And however much Christian baptism was indebted to Judaism, or to the mystery religions, Paul saw a moral and spiritual significance in the rite and made baptism a visible medium by which those who obeyed should exhibit their new relationship to Christ and their new life in Him. It was not an empty ceremony but a visible and most effective symbol to show forth a change of condition and life. And it is doubtful whether the majority of seekers of Christ can afford to be without some definite and memorable sign such as baptism at the commencement of their religious career. A minister of another denomination testified that Baptists had a great advantage over Paedo-baptists because believers' baptism was a personal act, a public act of consecration on joining the Church.

Dean Inge says (*Contentio Veritatis*, 295, 296), after enquiring whether we should do away as far as possible with the visible and mechanical, "These questions have been answered in the affirmative by the Quakers who are perhaps for that reason the most consistent representatives of one type of contemplative mysticism. They agree with the Ebionites of the first century who taught that the Lord declared 'I am come to abolish sacrifices.' This is a type which has appeared several times in the history of Christianity. Some of the pantheistic mystics of the Middle Ages tried to dispense with sacraments . . . and their systems were short-lived. The historian must admit that non-sacramental Christianity has never been popular or successful. To many this will seem a sufficient refutation of it as a practical form of religion. If Christianity was intended to be an universal religion it must not dispense with rites which to many express the very ideas of religious worship. Why should we consider that a spiritual act is coarsened and spoilt by being translated into symbolic action? We have not (unless we are Quietists) the

same feeling about *language* which is also a symbolic or rather a conventional representation of ideas. It is no vulgarisation of the mysteries of grace to associate them with such trivial actions as washing and eating. A spiritual act is one which brings us into communion with God, not one that transports us out of correspondence with the things of time and space. Indeed, in most cases, the spiritual act is richer and more complete when it finds expression in some external symbolic action."

Lacking the outward signs, the Quakers have hitherto failed to appeal to any large body of people in any nation; and whatever might have been the attitude of the author (or last editor) of the Gospel of John toward the two ordinances there remain in the Gospel itself and in the first Epistle of John expressions which show that water-baptism had an abiding place in the Church. The words "of water and of the Spirit," whatever may be said, are found in all the major MSS., and in *Aleph* and some early translations they are found in John iii. 8 also. It was too late even for an evangelist to abolish baptism from the Church at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second. It would appear also that the symbolic meaning of the water and the blood from the side of Jesus (John xix. 34) is that the two ordinances have their essential meaning in His person. To the same effect are the words, "This is He that came by water and blood even Jesus Christ," (1 John v. 6). Though the Son of God came not by water alone it was not meant to signify that the water-baptism was not as real as His baptism of blood. The words of John iv. 2, do not necessarily mean that baptism was more to the mind of His disciples than to that of their Master. They may, as Bernard says, be but a correction of the saying of the Pharisees in iv. 1. They may also only mean that the Lord entrusted the administration of baptism to His ministers. There came a time when the task was entrusted by an apostle to others, Acts ii. 38, xi. 48, cf. 1 Cor. i. 17. The great Saviour submitted to the baptism of John so that He might consecrate Himself to His public ministry, and in devoting Himself to the chief purpose of His coming the same symbol of perfect consecration fills His mind.

He had another baptism to be baptised with and how was He straitened until it was accomplished. And He asked the Sons of Zebedee, "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with?"

In view of all these things it is difficult to believe that the one baptism was unimportant in His sight any more than the other.

We must leave the matter here with the suggestion that the final contest will lie between the interpretation of the Quakers

and that of the Baptists when all Protestants come truly to desire the union of the denominations. So we ought to be more convinced as to the strength of our position than we are now.

J. GWILI JENKINS.

ROGER SAWREY, commandant at Ayr in 1659, had bought Broughton Tower, on the Furness boundary of Lancashire and Cumberland. When there was danger of a rebellion in 1664, Sir Roger Bradshaigh of Wigan, a deputy-lieutenant, called out the trainbands. He ordered George Fell, junior, of Swarthmore Hall, to send one armed man, and also to take care that Sawrey did no harm. Fell's excuse was published in 1912; it implies that Sawrey was too far away for him to act. There is no evidence that he was intending to rise. The fear of a rising led, however, to the temporary Conventicle Act, forbidding all worship except at parish churches and their chapels.

LAURENCE CLAXTON, 1615-1667, was Baptist 1644, Seeker 1646, Ranter 1650, Muggletonian 1658. In 1660 he published his recantation, *The Lost Sheep Found*. No copy was collected by Thomason, but one has just been bought for the Friends' Library.

THE PARTICULAR BAPTIST FUND in February 1789 gave to Robert Hyde of Cloughfold in Lancashire the following books, which he joyfully catalogued in a note to John Stutterd of Colne, who would probably see what he might ask for. Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, in six volumes. Prideaux's *Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, in four volumes. Jennings' *Jewish Antiquities*, in two volumes, 1766. Watts's *Logick*. Watts on the *Mind*. Evan's *Sermons*, in two volumes, Samuel Stennett on the *Parable of the Sower*. Shaw's *Immanuel*, or a discovery of true religion. Mason's *Student and Pastor*; Mason's *Self-Knowledge* (John Mason, M.A., Dorking). Latimer's *Sermons*.

The Poet and the Preacher.

G. K. CHESTERTON, in his book on Browning, specifies as one of his characteristics, an ardent and headlong conventionality. A poet must, by the nature of things, be conventional. What Chesterton means by conventional we see from other remarks of his in the same chapter. "If a poet really had an original emotion, if, for example, a poet suddenly fell in love with the buffers of a railway train, it would take him considerably more time than his allotted three score years and ten to communicate his feelings." Whatever emotions the poet or preacher seeks to express with any hope of success, must be those which his audience shares with him and if they are not common to both, one is a member of a kingdom, the other cannot enter; so that the limitations of our knowing are to some extent of our own making. Not only is it true that as I am I see, but I can only know those things, the beginnings of which are in myself. If there be no kinship between me and the external objects, they can never become real to my consciousness. The man who declared that poetry was but a convenient way of talking nonsense, declared at the same time, that the spirit of the muses had never warmed and illumined the chambers of his soul.

But such an idea of poetry is not at all uncommon. To a great number the poet is a long-haired dreamer and idler, walking through this practical world with his head in the air, and while, to the great toiling numbers, "life is real," to him it is but a day dream, with neither reality nor earnestness in it. To such people poetry is a mere ornamentation of literature, something for effeminate young gentlemen, with no particular calling in life, to aspire after; something that might be taken out of our national possessions, and affect our national life and character no more than the taking away of brooch and earrings would affect the lady who wore them.

But many of those holding those ideas of poetry have similar ideas of preaching. To them the preacher is one of the necessary parts of society, it is the proper thing to have churches and with the church comes the preacher—but there is no practical utility in either him or the church, the only purpose they serve is that of the spire in Gothic architecture.

If such ideas be true, is it not strange that the poet and the preacher have held such a place in the world's life and history? Must it not be that the higher kingdoms of life and thought have not been entered by vast numbers of those around? Every age has had its great preachers; the listening ears have

heard trumpet voices burdened with messages from God, and the slopes of Parnassus have never been without the poets of song, who have sung to "many harps in diverse tones."

These men have been more than ornamental appendages and dreaming songsters. They have touched life at the springs and the influence has been cleansing and quickening. There have been exceptional periods when they have been the very soul of their age, and the powers and glory of kings and assemblies have paled before the presence and power of poet and preacher, whose names have grown more luminous with passing years, while the names of princes and monarchs have been as the stars of the night which the dawn has wiped out one by one.

For an illustration of this we cannot do better than turn to Italy and especially to Florence. In Dante and Savonarola, the poet and the preacher, you have the two most mighty personalities connected with that wonderful city; they were not merely the ornaments of the city, but the moulders of its life, the shapers of its constitution and, in the case of the latter especially, the fountain of its noblest impulses and efforts for freedom. Who will deny that the richest possession of that fair city at the present day, is the memory of those two great sons of God. How poverty stricken would be that period in Italian history without those two men, whose names are so great and renowned, notwithstanding the fact of the alleged greatness of the family of the Medici and other personalities striving for peace and influence.

Some perhaps may be surprised that these two great offices of poet and preacher should be linked together, for there are no doubt many who see no relationship between the two. But we must admit that these two men have been brought into close relationship with one another; they have walked side by side in the march of the ages. Is it natural or accidental that they have been brought much together? Has it been affinity of soul that has drawn them and bound them, or merely external circumstances? Have they drawn their inspiration from the same fount, has it been in the same sphere that they have directed their energies, are those essential elements common to both, qualities of soul without which the poet can never become a great poet, nor a preacher a great preacher? It is out of a growing belief that such is the case that I have been led to write this essay.

The true preacher is the prophet of God. Without some of the prophetic element in him, without the insight of the seer, no man can hope to be a successful preacher. The part of human life which is of first interest and consideration to the preacher is that which makes possible a fellowship between the human and Divine. If there were no religious instinct in human

life, nothing but that which could be satisfied with the things of time and sense, there would be no need of the preacher. If men's relationships with God were right, the preacher would be superfluous, and if men were independent of God, the preacher would be an audacious intruder. The work of the preacher is essentially religious and spiritual. Is the work of the poet the same? If so, there must be some vital relationship between poetry and religion. Religion and music were cradled together. Can the same be said of religion and poetry? One thing that we are sure about is that many of the greatest poets, in the greatest of their poems, have been largely dependent for the framework of their poems upon the current theological ideas of their age; and while theology differs as much from religion as a treatise about life differs from life itself, we know that those who are interested in the forms in which men have expressed their thoughts and feelings about religion, must have some interest in that which is at the bottom of all their trowing, i.e., religion itself. There have been poets who have ignored religion, and religious people to whom poetry is obnoxious, but these facts prove nothing save the limitations of those concerned. In what does the poet find his interest, to what fields does he go for his themes? The whole range of existence, wherever the sensations, thoughts, feelings of man can travel, there the poet may be at his side, and find material for his faculties to work on. To the true poet there are no limitations. Every part of nature makes some appeal to him; every opening flower and every grey dawn; every stream and every star; but you will not surely shut him out from that human nature which presents the greatest variety and interest? Here he finds his richest themes; here his imaginative faculty is most stirred out of the mystery he encounters. But as soon as he becomes interested in the problems of life and destiny, he becomes interested in the problems of religion. So the truly great poet becomes the religious poet, and one is not surprised to find, as we constantly do, the highest forms of poetic art springing from the religious emotions and that religion and poetry are linked, not by mere accidental circumstances, but by affinities that are old and strong and deep and lasting. As one well qualified to speak on this subject has said: "The poetical and religious feeling join hands. They may not be indispensably necessary to one another. Indeed they are not. . . . Poetry may be lusty and strong, while quite indifferent to religion, but nevertheless, they cannot remain long sundered." Poetry has been glad to use the sublime elements of Religion to build up its most noble work; she has found in the deep religious problems of life her most invigorating food; she has reached her loftiest flights when religion has impelled

her wings. Nor is the benefit solely on one side. Poetry repays her debt, and religion finds in poetry her ally and evangelist. She has wrought some of her profoundest and most enduring impressings by the aid of poetry.

"A verse may find him who a sermon flies," and it is through the aid of poetry that religion has been able to rouse ardour and revive courage: and times without number the lonely heart of the exiled and weary warrior of the faith has been comforted and quickened by hearing one of the Songs of Zion.

It is needful, before proceeding further, to get some clear and definite idea of what poetry is. We must first of all get rid of the idea that it is simply rhyme and rhythm. These are aids to memory, and poetry will usually express itself in them. Rhythm is quite natural in times of intense feeling and passion. Language gains a certain rhythmic movement in all intense hours, and corresponds to the movements of the Soul. Intense anger and love give a certain eloquence to almost every man. So while rhyme and rhythm usually accompany poetry, they do not constitute it, nor are they essential to it. Poetry is the fittest human expression of the highest and strongest, deepest thoughts and feelings of which we are capable. Wordsworth calls it "the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge." Coleridge says, "it is the blossom and fragrancy of all human knowledge, human thoughts, human passions, emotions, language." Another has defined it "the fine wine that is served at the banquet of human life." All real poetry is truth, dressed in her wedding garments. Theodore Watts Dunton, than whom there is no higher authority on this subject, says "absolute poetry is the concrete and artistic expression of the human mind in emotional and rhythmical language." The only question regarding this definition is, as to the meaning Dunton attaches to the word—mind. If he gives to it a spiritual as well as intellectual meaning, then one is bound to admire the definition.

But, for the discovery of truth, do we not depend upon the intellectual faculties, and is poetry a child of the intellect? In the acquiring of knowledge, too much emphasis has been laid upon the intellectual faculties and too little upon the other parts of our being. There is a knowledge, say of nature which is gained simply by scientific processes, but the knowledge of nature thus gained may not be exhaustive; beauty is never seen by analysis, but by a faculty which groups together all the knowledge you have gained simply by the intellectual faculty. Principal Shairp tells us, "Imagination in its essence seems to be from the first intellect and feeling blended and interpenetrating each other. Thus it would seem that purely intellectual acts belong to the surface and outside of nature: as you pass inward

to the depths, the more vital places of the soul, the intellectual, the emotional, and the moral elements, are all equally at work; and this in virtue of their greater reality, their more essential truth, their nearer contact with the centre of things." There is no kind of discovery which is not accompanied by a certain quickening of our sensibilities, certain thrills which are usually of gladness. We never come into contact with reality or fact, even in relation to the physical world, without some experience of that thrill of our inner nature. When, however, we pass the surface, "and pass onward to the depths, the more vital places of the soul," and come with our whole being into contact with fact and reality at the centre and heart of things, how intense then must be those thrills! The highest poetry is the most fitting human expression of those thrills, those strange glows of emotion which mean souls cannot experience, but which great and noble souls often experience and without which there can be no poet. It matters not whether he be the poet of imagination whose production belongs to the romantic school, or the poet of nature, whose work is chiefly interpretative and descriptive narrative, or whether he be the poet of life, dealing with life in all its variety and relationships and thus belonging chiefly to the dramatic school, there must be that contact of the whole soul with great realities, "that real apprehension of truths as opposed to the merely notional assent to them," which becomes the genesis of that atmosphere and spirit out of which all true poetry is born.

Mr. W. Bagehote divides poetry into three classes—the pure—the ornate—the grotesque. In the school of pure poetry he places Wordsworth as the supreme illustration. The scenery and characters of Wordsworth's poetry could be seen by any one visiting the district Wordsworth loved so much and in which he lived so long. His characters were real more than ideal. He opened men's eyes to see the real around them, to which they had so long been blind, but which he had seen and had his soul thrilled with the vision. Under the second head he takes Tennyson as his illustration, and makes good use of "Enoch Arden." Enoch Arden is not the man you meet with in actual life, though in poetry he may hawk fish in the streets and go out as a common sailor upon the deep. The man you meet selling fish and the man you know who goes out as a common sailor upon the deep is of a much lower order than the Enoch Arden of Tennyson fame. The poet deals with the ideal more than the real, his poetry is more ornate than pure. Perhaps you may easily divine where he turns for his illustration of the grotesque. It is to Browning and Browning's "Caliban upon Setebos." In that poem, the poet makes Caliban's ideas of God

simply grotesque because of their crudeness in comparison with the revelation given in Christ. Caliban's God is a God made out of the crude thoughts and more crude feelings of a savage, and from such grotesqueness there is a rebound to the truth and reality about God as revealed in Christ.

But however many divisions of poetry we may make, we are always driven into that inner realm of fact and reality behind and beyond all visible appearances for its birth. "Whenever the soul comes into living contact with fact and truth, whenever it realises these with more than usual vividness, there arises a thrill of joy, a glow of emotion, and the expression of these is poetry." To the poet outward nature is but a garment, a spectacle, an appearance; but behind there is a great world of reality and in that world his soul finds its life and highest fellowship, and this and this alone, satisfies him: and his works are the literary expressions of his soul's experiences in that great world of living reality.

We now pass on to the consideration of another part of our subject, viz., What is Religion? Briefly by Religion I mean the sense of God, the Fountain of all life, with Whom human relationship is possible and unto Whom we are responsible. These two ideas of relationship and responsibility at once transfer the whole subject to the inner realms of life, and there the springs of religion and poetry cluster. There may be poetry of certain kinds which has no relationship with religion, but religious life which is intense cannot long do without song as a channel of expression. There has never been a great religious revival which has not been accompanied with music and poetry. Every true preacher must have something of the poet about him. Sometimes the two have been rolled into one and we have had our poet preachers, like Thomas Jones, of Swansea, and Robertson, of Irvine, and may we not put George Macdonald with them? great organ souls where heavenly music slumbered, which has often found release by the pressing sorrows of sinful men.

There is one illusion in relation to the poet that needs shattering and applies almost equally to the preacher. It is that the poet depends almost simply upon one faculty for his power, as though his gift could be perfected by the development of one part of his nature which was quite separate from the rest. Francis Turner Palgrave, in one of his letters, wisely says, "The impression Turner made on me was that of great general ability and quickness. This confirms me in my general view of art, that it is less the product of a special artistic faculty than of a powerful or general nature expressing itself through paint or marble." In this respect Palgrave is at one with Goethe, for this was his idea of genius. Great poetry or great preaching

must spring from a great nature. It can never be that they are the work of a mean little man with one abnormal faculty; in each case it is the work of a great nature whose energies have been focussed into one channel. Chopin was constantly advising his pupils to study widely and beyond the range of their own profession. What sort of men were Browning, Tennyson and Wordsworth? Not small men with one abnormal faculty, but great men with ever widening sympathies and interests. The same has to be said of our Pulpit Princes. Nothing could injure them as men which did not injure them as poets and preachers. After the Edinburgh period of dissipation, Burns never sang as he had done before it. Burns had shrivelled as a man, he could not concentrate his mind the same; that period of dissipation marked the turning point in his career as a poet. Occasionally he relived some of his golden moments, but the fountain of song he felt was closing within him. As R.L.S. says, speaking of his life after the Edinburgh period, "He knew and knew bitterly that the best was out of him; he refused to make another volume, for he felt it would be a disappointment."

Now let us look at some of the qualifications of poet and preacher. The first of these is *intensity of realising power*, so that whatever is laid hold of becomes real and vital. The intensity and strength of this power settles the rank of both poet and preacher. This is not a power possessed exclusively by these men; the historian and novelist alike, are almost as dependent upon this power. What is to be made real and vital by either of them, must be a burning, living reality in their own souls, and this realising power of facts and truths of making the past throb with active life, of making imaginary men and women as vital and real as those we rub against in the midst of bustling days, depends not simply upon the intellectual faculty, but upon the intensity of the whole man. Such like apprehension makes a demand upon the highest and deepest and most vital within us.

No doubt this power is possessed in some measure by all men. No one, for instance, can read of the struggles in the past in this England of ours for civil and religious liberty, without entering into the past in some measure. But the man who is going to tell others of that past, and move and stir the souls of men, must enter into the past and re-live the old experiences; the men who made that past must be living to him; the truths which moved them must move him; he must enter into their battles and their struggles, the iron must enter his soul as it entered into theirs, and just in the degree he vitalises his knowledge and makes real the past, in that degree can he hope to move men by his word and his song. Without the possession of this intense realising power neither *Robinson Crusoe* nor *The*

Pilgrim's Progress would have ever been written or have possessed their undying interest. The poet and preacher must be men of intense and vivid soul. Wordsworth says of the poet—“He is distinguished from other men, not by any peculiar gifts, but by greater promptness and intensity in thinking and feeling those things which other men think and feel, and by a greater power of expressing such thoughts and feelings as are produced in him.”

It is this power which makes the poet into a creator and maker and gives to mortal man his immortality of influence. Robertson of Irvine, in his lecture on Poetry, says, “And yet there is a kind of life your poetic genius creates, and though not real life, it has a marvellous influence for good or evil in it. . . . Raphael is dead, but his Madonnas still live, shedding their wonderful beauty into the eyes of thousands; Dante is dead, but lovely Beatrice still lives, walking through heaven; Shakespeare is dead, but his Hamlet is still talking to the gravedigger and shall hold on and talk so long as there are graves to dig and sheeted dead to lay in them and thoughtful men to stand beside them and to wonder ‘in that sleep of death what dreams may come.’” But why are not these creatures dead? Because the men who created them, possessed in an eminent degree this intensity of realising power. To whichever branch of poetry we may turn, whether the romantic, the descriptive, or the dramatic; we find that those who have succeeded the best are those who possessed this power to the greatest extent.

To show that what applies to the poet applies also to the preacher will surely be unnecessary. It must be self-evident out of our own experience. Just as we have realised the truth as it is in Christ, have we felt its power and glory and become equipped for making others feel and realise the same. The preacher must realise the Divine presence and in so far as he does he will make others realise it. One who does not possess this power cannot become a great religious force, but he whose intensity of realising power is such that the things of the spirit world are to him the greatest of all realities, and can create in others the same feelings, has got the one great lever to move men's souls.

Another quality which must be held in common by poet and preacher is that of *intense sympathy*. Without it the higher forms of knowledge are never acquired. We all know of natures who draw themselves within themselves in the presence of those whose love and sympathy they do not possess. He who goes forth in a search for the knowledge of men, but leaves behind him the mystic powers of love and sympathy, goes out attempting

to open locked doors for which he has no key. The same applies to the study of nature. To begin with, the scientist and the poet are both observers and there is a certain kind of knowledge which can only be gained by close attention to details. But there is a mystic side of nature with which the scientist as scientist has no concern. His concern is with details for their own sake, but to the poet the full knowledge of details is not the end. From the synthesis of all these details and the outgoing of his sympathy, there is that thrill of joy from the new vision of beauty which is generative of all true poetry. The botanist and poet are both observers of flowers, but for different ends. The end of the poet "is to see and express the loveliness that is in the flower, not only of beauty and form, but the sentiment which so to speak, looks out from it and which is meant to awaken in us an answering emotion." It is the poet's privilege, not only to describe the outward image, but to draw out some of the many meanings that lie hid in it and so render them as to win response from his fellow men. All our highest knowledge of men and nature is gained by sympathy and love, or to use the more recognised term, by intuition. We have sometimes heard and read a great deal about an individual, and perhaps read some of his books, and we have come to think we know the man. Then at last we have met the man and he was very different from anything we had imagined; but after a few minutes we have come away conscious of this; that our souls have met and now we know the man in a fuller and deeper sense. Our sympathy and love have unlocked the doors of life's inner sanctuary and the life lived within has grown clear.

If in these lower realms sympathy is so essential in the acquirement of knowledge, must it not be more so in acquiring the richest knowledge of the spiritual Kingdom. And this is the knowledge to enrich the soul of the preacher and qualify him for his life's work. Without this intense sympathy there may be a rhymester and a man who stands in a pulpit, but no poet and no preacher.

The next common feature of the two is that both poet and preacher *deal with things that are primal*. Both work in the same inner realm of human life; behind and beyond the material, the passing show of things; with those elements in life that are permanent; with love and hope and hunger and sorrow. The influence of both poetry and religion upon the life upon the surface depends upon, and is determined by, their influence in the minor sanctuaries of life. Both influence life upon the surface by influencing life beneath the surface, and colour and sweeten the streams by what they pour in at the springs.

Again the influence of both depends largely upon the *faculty of expression*, for while poetry is very far from being simply a matter of rhyme, and preaching a matter of the tongue and the lips, the power and influence of both are very largely crippled if the faculties of expression are very imperfect. Great as Browning may be as a poet, his influence and power would have been very much extended if he had had the same faculty of expression as his great contemporary. But it is very doubtful if he ever laboured as Tennyson did with this part of his work. Browning was more interested in the thought than the expression, but Tennyson was interested in both. And while Browning rushed as far as possible from the standard of some, who look upon form as everything, as though literature was the art of having *nothing* to say but saying it gracefully, it is a matter to be regretted that more attention was not paid to this part of his work.

It is tenaciously held by some that the intense emotion of the poet and faculty of expression, come into existence at the same time, and if there be not an exceptional faculty of expression there can be no poet; and that the poet differs from other men in this, that he can musically express what others have also felt but which has before been struggling for expression at dumb lips. Wordsworth maintained that there were many men endowed with highest gifts, the vision and the faculty divine, yet wanting the accomplishment of verse. But without the verse they are but dumb poets, which is as great a contradiction of terms as a dumb preacher.

Even though it may be truthfully said that no great preacher was ever made in an elocutionary class, it might be said that there was never a great preacher who did not possess, or who was altogether neglectful of the power and art of elocution. One of the first essentials of a great preacher is the capacity to feel the grandeur of great truths. Having this capacity, he is never without theme, for there are always great truths needing to be uttered, and he must feel the inward compulsion of uttering them, but if his message stumbles at the threshold, and this faculty of expression is one he does not possess nor seeks to cultivate, he cannot hope to be effective.

The poet and preacher are among God's best gifts to any generation, and we must not forget that.

Each new age must its new thought, in new words tell,
And the grand primary heart tones in new music swell,
And in grander theologies must the higher truth be shown,
But unchanged in all changes God's heart and our own.

MORTON GLEDHILL.

The Baptists in Poland.

TO the average stranger observing our denominational life in Poland, the principles and the faith of the Baptists appear as a new heresy, and a recent departure from the ancestral faith of the people. Not many are such who know that already in the sixteenth century there had been in Poland a people who held and practised some of the tenets for which our denomination has always stood. The principle of the baptism of believers by immersion was, in the second part of the sixteenth century, an outstanding issue among the Polish reformers. As early as the year of 1562, tracts in support of immersion were published in Poland. There is reliable and trustworthy information in the old polemical writings produced by the Reformation, that some of the adherents of the evangelical movement, who preferred to call themselves "Polish brethren," practised adult baptism, by immersion, in Cracow, already in 1570, which is about seventy years before the baptism of believers by immersion, was introduced in the Baptist churches in England.

The antipedobaptist movement had, for the most part, found its way to Poland from Moravia, by way of Hungary, and chiefly through the instrumentality of the Anabaptist refugees who sought in Poland a safe place in which to live and witness to the principles of their faith. Poland in the sixteenth century had been well known all over Europe as a country that was hospitable to new religious movements. This freedom of the danger of the inquisitorial persecution, attracted to Poland many religious preachers and thinkers from abroad. Some of the outstanding evangelical leaders of those days, like Andrew Lubieniecki, John Niemojewski, Martin Czechowicz, and many others, had openly held and practised the principle of the Church consisting of members who had confessed their faith and were baptised by immersion. How deeply was the Baptist position, regarding the mode of administering the rite of baptism, imbedded in the minds of the Polish dissenters, is shown by the fact that, as early as the year of 1577, there was published in Poland a translation of the New Testament, and in this translation the Polish equivalent of the word "immersion" was used to denote baptism.

Unfortunately, after the Catholic reaction had gained strength, stern and rigid laws against all Antipedobaptists were enacted and enforced. The Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, whose

bearing on the affairs of the Polish kingdom towards the middle of the seventeenth century had become decidedly strong, prevailed on the Jesuit-king, John Casimir, to banish from the country all adherents of the Antipedobaptist teaching. The king's order had been rigidly enforced, and by July 10th, 1660, those of the Polish evangelicals who had refused to renounce their connections with the Antipedobaptists, and unite with the Church of Rome, were forcefully led across the border of the country, to banishment. Some of them went to Hungary, others emigrated to Prussia, still others went to Holland, and even to England, carrying everywhere with them their stern conviction rather to perish than to become traitors to what they believed to be the true teaching of Christ and His apostles. Dr. A. H. Newman writes :

“The Polish anti-trinitarian Antipedobaptist movement is of great importance to Baptist history. From this party the English General Baptists derived much of their impulse, by it they have been greatly influenced, and between it and them there has always been a close affinity, from it through the Rhynsburgers, or Collegiants, of Holland, the Particular Baptists of England seem to have derived their immersion (1641), having already come to the conviction that immersion and immersion only is the New Testament baptism.”¹

The beginning of the Baptist churches in Poland, of our time, has had, however, no organic connection with the Antipedobaptists of the Reformation time in Poland. It does not carry us back beyond the year of 1858. On November 28th, in that year, a group of German settlers, nine in number, confessed their faith and were immersed. They were the nucleus of the first church that was soon to be organised. During the next ten years that followed the number of Baptists in Poland had reached one thousand. This was in no small measure due to the tireless and unfaltering missionary work of the missionary preachers, some of whom came to Poland from Germany. Very much of the pioneer work had been done by G. F. Alf, who was among the first converts. The first church was organised on August 4th, 1861, in the village of Adamov, with brother Alf as the first pastor.

From that time on, the number of the Baptist churches and missions in Poland has been growing steadily. The membership in the early churches was composed, almost exclusively, of the German farmers who settled in Poland, but sincerity of their faith, and earnestness of their lives, could not pass without affecting their Polish neighbours. Of course, the State, as well as the churches supported by it, opposed the Baptists bitterly.

¹ *History of Anti-pedobaptism*, p. 339.

But in spite of all persecution, the number of converts increased. Baptismal services were held frequently. As there were no chapels built, baptisms were held, for the most part, in the open, and it was not at all unusual to see the entire Baptist company being marched by the Russian police, from the river bank straight to prison. In many such cases the police had acted upon the instigation of the Lutheran, as well as Catholic, and Orthodox clergy.

While, at first, the Baptists, being themselves German, gained new converts chiefly from the people of their own nationality, those of them who knew Polish, carried the Gospel message to the Poles as well as to other peoples in Poland, whose language they could speak. In that way, as time went on, in some German churches, Polish, Bohemian, and Russian congregations were gathered.

The first distinctly Slavic church in Poland was organised in the year of 1872, in the village of Zelov, near Lodz, with Carl Jersak as the first pastor. This church still exists, and is regarded as the mother church of the Slavic Baptists in Poland.

Toward the year of 1922, Polish churches were organised in Warsaw and Lodz, and new mission stations were opened in many other places. However, the scarcity of trained preachers, as well as the lack of other means to take advantage of the opportunities that were open, were the unavoidable obstacles on the road of faster expansion.

Until the year of 1922, all Baptist work in Poland, both Slavic and German, was regarded, at least officially, as belonging to the Union of German churches. But for reasons racial as well as linguistic, the Slavic churches and missions organised, in 1922, a separate body under the name of the "Union of Slavic Baptists in Poland." The Union has incorporated Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, White-Russian, and Bohemian churches and missions. The lines of demarcation, within this Union, are based on the language spoken. Each group is trying to minister and preach to the people of its own tongue, but total exclusiveness is not practised, and there is much intermixture, as well as co-operation, among the various churches and individuals. The Baptists in Poland are known for their aptitude to submerge their differences to the extent that enables them to work and pray together as brethren and believers in Christ as their common Lord.

The growth of the Slavic group of the Baptists in Poland has been remarkable. In the year of 1922, when the Slavic Union was organised, there were ten churches and missions, with 936 members. After ten years the statistics for 1932, show seventy-three churches and missions, and 5,479 members. This has also been true of the German churches. Having started in 1858 with

one church and forty-four members, their reports for the year of 1932 show thirty-eight churches, and 7,574 members. These figures include only members received through baptism, leaving aside those who are under the pastoral care of our churches, but are not regularly accepted as members.²

In recent years the growth of the German churches has somewhat slowed down. The statistics for 1932 give 318 as the total number of baptisms in German speaking churches, while the Slavic Union reported for the same year 644 baptisms. It is hoped that this lessened growth of the German work is but temporary. It may be a breathing space before bigger achievements. It is in no small measure due to the fact that our German brethren are ministering almost entirely to their German speaking constituencies, and do not preach in Polish, except on very rare occasions. This naturally confines the scope of their appeal only to those who understand German.

But what of the future? Have we, as Baptists, really a chance in Poland? Will the investment of funds in helping the Baptist work in Poland, as well as the attention given to it, bring the expected results?

The question is inseparably connected with the question of the future of evangelical Christianity in general. In the light of the past progress of our churches and missions, there can be no doubt that evangelical Christianity and the Baptist approach to it, will continue to find increasingly larger place in the religious and spiritual life of the people in Poland. The ancestral beliefs, as well as the traditional modes of living, are being gradually weakened by the sheer forces of progress and education, even in the far-away villages. It is not too much to claim that no evangelical denomination has a better chance in Poland, than ours. To what extent it is true may be shown by the fact that, in some parts of the country, Baptist churches have been organised spontaneously, simply as the result of the hunger of the people for something that brings them closer to God, and satisfies the deeper yearnings of their souls. There is a degree of evidence that the people in Poland are approaching the period in their history which is sure to call for vastly more than the Roman Church can offer to satisfy man's search for spiritual realities. How soon it will come, is now difficult to predict, but the handwriting on the wall is already visible.

The future of a young denomination, in a country like Poland, at least during the plastic period of the beginning, depends very largely on the quality of leadership. For well

²The church statistics, both Slavic and German, give 25,786 as the number of those who are under the pastoral care of the churches. This gives 11,802 for the Slavic churches, and 13,984 for the German group.

grounded reasons, ministerial education is the most serious one among the problems connected with the growth of our Baptist churches in Poland. We cannot hope to have strong and vigorous churches, and to extend the sphere of our spiritual influence on the life of the people, unless we have leaders that are well prepared, spiritually as well as mentally, for the work of preaching the Way of Life to men, in these days that present many opportunities but also many demands.

To meet this particular end, a Theological Seminary has been conducted in the city of Lodz, which is the centre of the textile industry in Poland. The school was started in 1923, as a joint undertaking of the two groups of Baptists, the Slavic and the German. But since 1930, the school has been divided into two branches, one for the German students, and the other for the students speaking Slavic languages. It is planned to move the school to Warsaw, where it would be more centrally located, and where educational advantages are doubtless much better, and more abundant in opportunities for the future growth.

The poverty, which still obtains in the rural districts of Eastern Poland, where the majority of our churches are located, presents a problem along different lines. In the incipient stage of the work, our brethren could gather for worship in small rooms. Often-times, an austere, one-room peasant's dwelling was the only available "hall," where a small group of our Baptist brethren could meet. But since those days, these small groups, in many a place, have grown into large congregations, which can no longer meet in stuffy and crowded rooms, without coming in collision with the government laws regulating the construction of buildings used for public meetings. For such reasons, the need of chapels and churches, for the people that are already with us, is pressing itself to the front more and more. It taxes the resources of our brethren much above their financial ability. It is encouraging that in many places, small and modest chapels have been built without much outside help. Those who were too poor to give money, gave their work. The brethren in Poland are not lacking in willingness to support their churches and work, but they are poor, particularly in the rural districts. The situation becomes much harder where churches, aside from carrying the burden of the cost of church building, have also to support their missionary pastors. There are, however, no indications that such hardships react destructively on the growth of the work. They call for self-sacrifice and endurance that are needed in Christian work everywhere.

To be a Baptist still means sometimes to be exposed to intolerance and ostracism at the hands of the Romish clergy, even though the government in Poland is just and tolerant toward

the Baptists. The brethren, however, are willing to work for Christ's kingdom and train themselves in patient endurance and pioneering trials that the Gospel might be preached and men freed from the bondage of sin and from ignorance of the truth.

M. S. LESIK.

The Monastery of Sinai.

IN the sixth century, a new dynasty at Constantinople rent the Church of the East permanently, by a change of policy to conciliate Rome. The whole of the Christians of Syria and Egypt stood in the old ways, and nicknamed the few adherents of the Greek Established Church, "King's Men." They were very contemptuous of the official hierarchy sent from Constantinople, but they had a struggle to maintain their own organisation. In Syria there arose an indefatigable worker, who ranged from the Caucasus and the Bosphorus to Alexandria, owning one garment and one rug, both cut out of a horse-cloth, from which a surname was coined for him; his memory is enshrined in the name of his church to-day, the Jacobites. On the Arabian frontier, King Hareth was won, but in the desert most of the Bedawy remained pagan.

Justinian had far-reaching plans to extend and consolidate the empire. Among them he decided to plant a colony of Greek monks just where Syrians and Copts and Arabs met, in the peninsula of Sinai, hallowed by long associations. As the situation was dangerous, it was strongly fortified, and fifty monks were placed to live under the rule of Basil. Since it was intended as a centre of propaganda for the Established Church, yet Greek was not a popular language anywhere near, a library was founded which became rich in other tongues. Of Coptic manuscripts there were very few, but besides a wealth of Syriac and Arabic, there came to be some of the Caucasus, and later on of the Slavic tongue.

Justinian endowed the place, and others followed his example. Moreover daughter-houses were founded to feed it, on the plan afterwards adopted at Cluny. They came to be scattered in Egypt, Syria, Cyprus, Crete, Greece, Asia Minor, Constantinople, and up into Russia, so that the Abbot became a great potentate.

With the rise of Islam, all opportunity of doing missionary work ended, whether among the pagans or the Moslems or the national churches of Egypt and Syria; and the Greek language died out in the neighbourhood. The monastery existed, far away from any others of the same faith and order; it was under the nominal jurisdiction of the Greek patriarch of Alexandria or of Jerusalem; but both dignitaries tended to abandon their posts.

In the sixteenth century it took a new lease of life, founding a school of learning in Crete. One of the most famous students there was Cyril Lukar, known to Englishmen as a Calvinist, who gave to our king the famous Greek Bible known as the Codex Alexandrinus. His family has another interest for Baptists, as Mark Lukar re-introduced baptism by immersion, both in England and America. The Abbot of the Sinai Convent was promoted to be an archbishop, and for 150 years he has been independent of all control, once the patriarch of Jerusalem has consecrated him. Apparently the monks form the whole of his flock; and they are content to be waited on by Moslems for whom a mosque has been built within the convent. The peninsula has at most 6,000 wandering Arabs. The archbishop lives at Cairo, in a daughter-house.

W. T. WHITLEY.

The Centenary Life of Carey.

IN 1923, when my *Life of Carey* was published, I really thought that I had hived for my readers the worth-while honey from all the discoverable British and American and Indian Carey-flowers. Since then, however, I have lighted upon many other such flowers, and even whole banks of flowers, which have yielded fresh combsful of honey. So I count myself fortunate and blest that in this centenary year, in a revised and enriched "Carey," I am to share with you all this added store of sweet and serviceable treasure.

One of the former best heather-banks for the biography had been *Ward's Diary* for his first eleven Serampore years, a set of folio MSS. in the Mission House. But no one remembered that the House possessed a different version of this *Diary* in four little volumes. When I came on this and examined it, it proved to be *the original*, and for Ward's own private keeping, whilst the other was what of it he himself copied, or got copied, to send periodically to Andrew Fuller for such use as his prudence

saw fit. But the undiminished, unreserved original was treasure indeed. Here was the day by day life of the community registered in immediate frankness; Ward's judgments of people and events unconcealed; Ward, at least once, violently antagonising the policy of Carey and Marshman, but later constrained by the logic of facts to agree: snapshots of Carey and Marshman in days of grave crisis, yet touched with humour; more told than before of Lady Rumohr, Carey's second wife; more naked facts than before about the frowardness of the first Indian converts, even Krishna Pal, for example, shown in open fierce rebellion, and then returning for splendid service, etc., etc. The four volumes in their small script were a great find.

In the same safe secret place lay a *Diary of Carey's own* for his first two testing Bengal years, which I had supposed had long since perished, with its only traces in the portions published in the Society's early Periodical Accounts. But here again was the original, and the very things aforesaid withheld have worth for biography now.

I have had another important surprise. I was familiar with the typed copies of Carey's many letters to Ryland from the field, which Furnival St. possesses, and I took it for granted that they completely reproduced the originals in College Street Vestry, Northampton. But on recent investigation I found many things in the originals which I had never seen before, and I had to spend two full days hiving this considerable new treasure. One wholly new letter—the briefest of them all—is like a flash of forked lightning. Carey lashes the man who had once baptised him, and who had for thirty years been his revered and loved colleague, for a wrong done to Marshman! What "a spirit of steel!"

Other memorable days found me in Aberystwyth at the call of our alert F. G. Hastings there, whose summary of its documents of the *Isaac Mann Collection* in the National Library of Wales, with Dr. Whitley's omniscient annotations, has kept enriching this *Quarterly* for two years. I had never come upon a flower-bank of such varied attraction: letters from Carey and the whole circle of his Indian colleagues and converts and friends, from John Thomas and Ward and "Serampore," from Carey's Felix and Marshman's John and Benjamin, from Chamberlain and Chater, from Eustace Carey, Lawson and Yates, from Ignatius Fernandez, Adoniram Judson and Des Granges, and from even Krishna Pal, Carapeit Aratoon and Krishna Prasad. Besides, more letters, many more, from nearly all the Mission's leaders in the Home Base—Fuller and Sutcliff, the Rylands and Samuel Pearce, Crabtree and Fawcett, Rippon and the Robert Halls, Beddome and Booth, Saffery and Steadman and Stennett, Medley and Webster Morris, Timothy Thomas and John Foster! All

these friends of Carey's sprang into life again for me in the new Library in those days. They sufficed to convince me that I should have to venture an enriched edition of my book. You may be sure I brought back with me a swiftly-filled honeycomb.

But this last summer I had a still more romantic experience—not a summons to a library to consult old-time documents, but an invitation to make the acquaintance of a living person who stood closer to the immortal pioneers than any one I had ever met since the death of my own father, a Mrs. Constance Rowe, a *grand-daughter*, not great-grand-daughter, of the Marshmans, and not frail and forgetful, as I feared to find her, but vital and keen. She has made real for me her illustrious father, John Clark Marshman, the great historian of "Serampore," and of India, and succeeded in securing for me loans of important Marshman documents—the portions of *Hannah Marshman's Diary* I had not before been permitted to see; also a considerable packet of her letters to her husband and children, besides a few of Marshman's out of the midst of an agonising grief, and not least Rachel Marshman's unfinished yet valuable *Memoir of the Mission*. Another rich flower-bank to explore and exploit!

I plead guilty for not having examined long ago the great volume in Furnival Street containing the autograph letters of Fountain and Brunson, of Chamberlain and Robinson and Rowe, the younger "Serampore" contemporaries of Carey. But I have extracted this treasure now, and their comments, phrases, side-lights and stories have proved very enriching, especially one of Rowe's about a dauntless Hindustani woman, a convert of Krishna Pal's. And I have been very glad to make the fuller acquaintance of Fountain, the first lay-helper of Carey, who, rather than not get to him, went steerage, and steerage in those days!

I have lighted on my luckiest flowers in unlikeliest places. Who would have guessed that in the Kew Gardens Library I should find a copy of Marshman's *Samachar Darpan*, his bi-weekly Bengali and English newspaper-sheet for the second day after Carey's death, with the account of his last illness, and a striking testimony to his influence on the Bengali language and literature? Or that in the same unexpected place I should get, over the signature of the Hon. and Rev. Wm. Herbert—for fifteen years a botanical correspondent and friend of Carey's—a story never whispered before in any Carey-circle, which must have come from Carey himself, which yet is the most poignant and unforgettable demonstration of Carey's poverty and loneliness and distress in his Calcutta early months?

But I also found in Kew Library that day, by the exceeding helpfulness of the librarian, treasure that befitted the place, and

such as I had coveted and striven to discover there long since, but in vain: botanical letters of Carey's. I had thought that, perhaps his last two hundred letters to Dr. Wallich, the Superintendent of Calcutta's Botanic, had found their way thither. Not so, however; but in their stead there were seven considerable letters of Carey to Dr. W. J. Hooker, the Regius Professor of Botany in Glasgow University, letters which declared themselves at a glance as only a portion of an intimate personal and botanical correspondence between enthusiasts, who had evidently long exchanged gifts. The letters did more, however, than enrich me of themselves. They put me on the track of other discoveries—in Liverpool, of all places! And now I know that for twenty years Carey and William Roscoe, the founder of Liverpool's "Botanic," and John Shepherd, its brilliant first Curator, were in continuous communication and exchange of treasures, and that in 1825 the Committee of Liverpool's Garden acclaimed Carey and his friend Nathaniel Wallich as their princeliest and faithfulest benefactors from the East. Then this discovery of the far-reaching range of Carey's botanical service received further corroboration in books I examined one exciting day in the Burlington House library of the Linnaean Society. Gladstone was once asked whether, in his Eton days, a boy who "swotted" was despised. "Not if he was good at something else," he thoughtfully answered. And we all like our zealots to be many-sided, our Livingstones and Grenfells and Schweitzers! We have all always known Carey's love for his own garden, and I took keen delight in my Life of him to show, beyond what had been told before, how close and continuous was his co-operation with botanists of Bengal. But I never knew till now how, despite his crowded days, he contrived to keep in constant beneficent touch with *British* botanists and horticulturists. The new facts will certainly compel a larger measure of the man.

Not that this keenly-pursued hobby lay aside from his missionary and linguistic labours. Indeed, it was integral with his main purpose. He lived to share with all possible peoples the best in every sphere which he knew—the best plants and flowers, the best grains and fruit, the best knowledge and literature, the best revelation and inspiration.

S. PEARCE CAREY.

Calendar of Letters, 1742-1831.

(Continued from page 46)

144. 1819. Aug. 5.

From WILLIAM WARD (at Cheltenham) to ISAAC MANN (Bradford).

Declines an invitation to Bradford because he is recuperating, but mentions that there are many in the North that he must see before returning—viz. Steadman, Greenwood (Hull), Ewood Hall, Gildersom and Hull. Gives an account of the present relations between the Socy. and Serampur, in which he is at present negotiating. "It is difficult to meet so many opinions; some are for giving the Socy. a pernicious power over Serampur, and others for yielding nothing. I am attempting a middle course, for neither extreme will do." "The healing work is difficult; I will not, however, yet despair." He states that he expects soon documents from Serampur, "which will retain all that Serampur must have, and give to the Socy. all that it should desire. Serampur must have undisturbed occupancy of the premises, the power of disbursing its own funds, and of choosing its own companions in labour. The Socy. must have the power of interposing if things go wrong, and the reversion of all the property. This, my dear bro., is my plan." He hopes this arrangement will appease the "junior brethren"—for "it was the hope of becoming Serampur, and of alienating the Socy. from Serampur, that has made the younger brethren act in the ungenerous and cruel manner they have." Ward goes on to call it "a hard case" when Marshman has contributed £3,000 a year, Carey £1,000 a year, and Ward "that sum or more"—"to be branded as rogues by servants of the very Socy. with whom we have been acting. . . . But our work is with our God."

145. 1819. Sep. 15.

From JOS. FENN (Church Missy. to the Syrian Churches) to WM. BEDDOME (London).

A brief note stating inability to meet a Dr. Gregory.

146. 1819. Nov. 3.

From JOHN RYLAND to KITCHING.

Mr. Vaughan has applied through Mr. Dyer "for a missionary to instruct his negroes, as poor Moses Baker is

getting old and infirm." The Committee propose sending K. for six months. Advises respect and tact towards both Moses Baker and Mr. Vaughan. The latter is averse to the negroes learning to *write*, but R. feels it vitally necessary that they must learn to *read*. Coultart will bring further instructions. R. states that a nephew of V.'s—son of a Presbyterian minister in America, has called on R. and is settling at Falmouth (Jamaica). States Steadman is well, but Yorkshire is "in a very perturbed state, and Infidelity is rapidly increasing."

147. 1820. Feb. 5.

From I. BIRT (Birmingham) to B. LEPARD (London).

Re Mr. Muckley. B. knows little of him, but that he failed in trade some years ago. But the Church dealt kindly with him, and in a subsequent conversation, B. was more satisfied than he anticipated, in his explanation. "I should be sorry to hear that his application to the Fund proved unsuccessful."

[William Muckley was pastor at Burslem 1806, and in 1837 : as Mann was at Burslem in 1812, this suggests the date of Muckley's misfortune.]

148. 1821. Mar. 27.

From ROBERT HALL (junr.) to I. MANN (Shipley).

Concerning his own publications, Hall sees no reason why he should forego his own printer, and so turns down Mann's proposal to go to another printer ("Mr. Carlill?")—although "it is not on your own account you make the proposal."

149. 1821 (? date torn). Jul. 14.

From THOMAS BALDWIN (Boston) to JOSIAH WEST (Student, Brown Univ., Providence, U.S.A.).

A letter about finishing his college course. He wants permission to go to Ireland, and then to return to Providence, although his father has written Baldwin that he wishes him to finish at Dublin. Baldwin advises him, either way, to see the President, and get an honourable dismissal. Commends Dr. Jans to him as a faithful friend.

[John West had been at Soham, Carlton, Wantage and Waterford. It is not clear why he sent Josiah to Rhode Island; and Josiah made no mark on returning.]

150. 1821. Jul. 23.

From J. H. HINTON (Reading) to I. MANN (Bermondsey).

A letter meeting two charges that Mann has levelled at H. (i) His dialect, and (ii) His spirit. Re his dialect—"Your

complaint is that I *use* a peculiar phraseology." H. defends himself by saying that he must use terms best adapted to convey his meaning. "May I not put in a plea for liberty of speech?" Re his *spirit*—he has been charged with 'dictation,' 'vituperation,' 'scolding,' 'flogging' and 'lashing' my brethren." H. replies that the charge makes him "more afflicted, by my consciousness, not of guilt, but of innocence." "Moreover, the points in which I am reproved are those in which I have taken a deliberate and prayerful aim at usefulness." He defends himself by saying that the most displeasing parts of his speech most powerfully produce a spirit of self-abasement, and he has adequate testimony that that which might have offended some has been a blessing to others, and actually submits to M. extracts of such letters (but not given in these documents) "which will explain themselves."

151. 1824. Jul. 14.

From WM. WINTERBOTHAM (Horsley) to I. MANN (Shipley).

W. had heard privately of his appointment to preach to the students at Bradford on Aug. 4—but the official notification from Mr. Rawson was so long that it only reached him "yesterday." In the meantime he surmised that the Socy. had changed their minds, and he "had engaged himself out for the whole of August" and therefore regretted that he could not come to Bradford.

N.B.: A note in other handwriting, at the top of the letter, says, "author of History of America. Imprisoned for preaching two sermons four years and fined £200."

152. 1825. Mar. 28.

From J. FOSTER (Stapleton, Bristol) to JOHN DYER (Fenchurch St.).

In declining an invitation to take a service in London on account of ill-health and much work, F. blames Ryland for not having replied to a previous letter from Dyer in *unequivocal* terms that it was *impossible*, and thus causing D. to write again on the same project.

(To be Continued)

George Holden of Cranleigh.

RIGHT reverend; one of a great company of those who have won to themselves a good degree, and in the adversities and experiences of strenuous lives been led to know Him Whom to know is life eternal.

Such was George Holden; born about 1800, the child of humble parents, poverty and hard work were his early lot. He came under spiritual influences and became attached to old-fashioned Independents and Huntingtonians who lived in his district. He had become a workman in the building trade, and in a few years by diligence, entered into business for himself at Cranleigh, a country village, where he married and settled down.

Schools and "means of grace" were non-existent in many villages, and the light into which he had been brought prompted efforts for the moral and spiritual well-being of his neighbours, many of whom were very ignorant and superstitious. By converse, by example, and soon by meetings, he began a ministry that extended into the surrounding district. God had opened a way for him both in providence and grace, and to the God of his life a sacrifice of praise and service continually went up.

By his second marriage he became my uncle and I knew him well in his later years, and none who knew him could forget him. His ancient stately figure was attired in the Georgian fashion—knee-breeches and stockings with cloth gaiters; a long waistcoat with watch-guard and seal hanging below; a square-collared tail-coat, white neckcloth, and a low-crowned silk hat.

Clean-shaven and silver-haired, he was a striking personality wherever he went on his numerous journeys. At home his patriarchal grace and wisdom shone out. In business, which his two sons then shared with him, his diligence, experience, and good judgment were manifest, and yet withal he filled an important place in the ministry and was recognised as a leader amongst the churches and people of his order.

The first time I heard him was in a shed that had been opened for Gospel-preaching. Soon after I, then a boy, was his guest, and his companion one memorable Sunday. Rising betimes, he conducted worship with his little household—wife, servant, and guest. Soon after nine o'clock his gig was brought

round, a large old Bible placed on the floor, and he drove some nine miles to the county town, improving the occasion as the pony walked up the hills by perusing a chapter he was meditating on.

Arriving at the town, he put up the pony and proceeded to an ancient meeting-house under the shadow of a more ancient castle, and at 10.30 commenced the service, concluding about noon. Driving home, after dinner and a short rest he was ready for the afternoon meeting at a chapel built at his own cost in his own garden, where, to a full audience of his neighbours, he again ministered. Then tea, and soon after five o'clock he left home to walk three miles to a village where, in another humble chapel, he conducted the evening service. He preached a Latimer-like sermon, extempore and full of homely references that appealed to the crowded congregation of village folk.

Toward the close some hymn came to his mind as expressing the thought of his text, so he quoted one verse :

When God makes up His last account
Of natives in His holy mount,
'Twill be an honour to appear
As one new-born or nourished there.

Then, turning to the rustic choir, said : " We'll have that hymn to close with ; you singers can be finding it. It begins, ' God in His earthly temple-lays.' " So the service closed and the worshippers slowly dispersed, and as the setting sun of that Sunday evening gleamed across the widespread Weald, the old preacher trudged homeward with one who still lives to remember that day.

Two or three times a year he made a visitation to a number of places where he was known and esteemed. These visits were almost episcopal, and, as he travelled, his venerable looks and quaint garb made him very like a bishop in official clerical costume. The most important of these journeys was each autumn, when, for nearly two months, he visited towns in the Midlands and North, preaching each Sunday and many week-evenings in various chapels, and conducting family prayer or exhortation at the houses of his worthy hosts, which were thrown open for all who liked to attend. A titled lady of some note in those days welcomed him to her and her husband's mansion and arranged meetings.

When past middle age an unexpected event happened, the good man came to see believers' baptism, and quietly joined those who practised it. He was not fond of argument and the change did not affect his life-long friendships nor extensive ministry.

His strong memory and gift of profitable conversation made him a charming guest. Some of the recollections of his God-

directed life would be thought fanciful now-a-days. But from a man of such sound practical mind they were singular answers to prayer—not mere fairy tales. One was as follows, given almost in his own words:—

“Years ago, when I was beginning to get on in business, I and others were asked to contract for the restoration of E—— Church. Being near, the job would have just suited me, and I went very carefully into the matter. The architect had specified rather extensive cutting away to be done as he might direct. Having had experience of these ancient buildings, I felt this might be dangerous to the structure, and a night or two before the tenders went in I dreamt I was at the church, the scaffolding up, and work in full progress. Some extensive cutting away was being done by the architect’s orders to one of the piers that carried the tower and spire, and whilst I was watching, the pier collapsed, the tower and spire fell, turning completely over, as generally happens in such cases, and the iron vane-rod was deeply embedded in one of the graves. All was so clear and vivid, that in sending in my tender I made it subject to some assurance as to the clause noticed.

“My tender being the lowest, I was summoned to see the architect, with whom I discussed the clause, saying, ‘Suppose in carrying out your orders to cut away, even if my knowledge and experience convinces me it is dangerous, an accident happens, am I to bear the loss?’ The architect courteously assured me it was so, and firmly refused to modify the condition. I therefore declined the job, which was soon entrusted to another builder.

“Weeks passed, and one summer morning, between five and six o’clock, as I was dressing, one of my men, who lived at that village, came into my garden. I felt sure there was something unusual. He called to me at the open window: ‘Master, there has been an accident at E—— Church; the steeple’s fallen—toppled right over.’

“‘Yes,’ said I; ‘and I’ll tell you where the point struck. It is by that grave near the path.’ My warning dream had come true. Some dangerous cutting away had been done, causing building and builder to be half ruined. I saw the gracious hand of God who had preserved me from that calamity.”

His devoted wife did her best by gathering the village children on Sundays and week-day mornings to learn reading and memorise Scripture and hymns, by visiting poor villagers, and providing material help in needy cases.

The good man made full proof of his ministry and laboured on till advanced years limited and ended his strenuous career.

The village cause he founded still lives. The chapel in his

garden is now superseded by one in the main road, and the various activities of a ministry happily maintained.

He walked the dark world in the mild
 Still guidance of the Light;
 In tearful tenderness a child,
 A strong man in the right.
 With weary hand yet steadfast will,
 In old age as in youth,
 The Master found him sowing still
 The good seed of His truth.

T. R. HOOPER.

WILLIAM HARTLEY was a yeoman of Bucks, who in 1649 published on the right of laymen to preach. He preached at Buckingham, *Good News to All People*, and published it in 1650. Next year he again upheld the usefulness of private persons preaching, sounding the passing-bell of the prerogative priest. This was too much for Richard Carpenter of Aylesbury, who opposed him. Carpenter also wrote a scurrilous account of a formal debate on baptism he had with John Gibbs, minister of Newport Pagnel. Hartley therefore published in 1652 "*Infant-baptism none a Christ's. And the vanity thereof discovered; together with the equity and necessity of dipping or baptizing believers. Calculated on purpose to undeceive the people from the sophistry of Mr. Carpenter, &c.*" The pamphlet is severely logical, and ramifies to say that unbaptized infants are saved, that there is no such thing as "original sin" as commonly understood (what Smyth had said a generation earlier), that scripture declares a son is not answerable for his father's sin, that cleansing is not by baptism, but by the blood of Christ. He is scathing on the "tyth-coats of the black regiment," and notes that on the very day when Carpenter opposed in the afternoon the sermon by Gibbs in the morning, he was deprived of his benefice. (Carpenter's later career was most erratic.) Hartley was appointed Parish Register at Stony Stratford in 1653; in 1657 he sold land there for the Baptist Church. He died in March 1697/8, an apothecary, and Gibbs published his funeral sermon. The pamphlet of 1652 attracted the attention of George Fox, and the only copy known has just been discovered in a volume of tracts in Fox's library, at Friends' House. Entry 91-649 in the Baptist Bibliography should be re-numbered 66-652.

Reviews.

The Private Letter Books of Joseph Collet. With Introduction and Notes by H. H. Dodwell, M.A. And Appendices on Family History by Clara E. Collet. 246 pages, 10s. 6d. (Longmans.)

What a treat! The letters to family and friends, ranging over nine years, from Sumatra and Madras, in the days of Anne and George. The East India Company beginning to change from a society of traders, to a governing body; this lies in the background, and even Collet would have been surprised at the future of his company. How a man of enterprise and probity could restore order, regain the respect of native rulers, develop trade, and acquire a great fortune. A merchant-governor keeping in close touch with European theological thought, and with English ecclesiastical policy; deciding that his wealth was sufficient, and that his duty was to return and enter parliament. And more humorous than usual, a staunch Baptist superintending the public worship of the Church of England, turning out the garrison for a weekly church parade to escort the Governor to church! The book is excellently edited and well produced. Next quarter we hope to tell part of the story at length.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review for October tells how Mennonites went to America. In 1681 William Penn took 40,000 square miles there to satisfy a debt of £16,000 to his father; he advertised in Holland and Germany for settlers. Many applications were made, and in 1683, thirty-three Germans from Crefeld in the Rhine Valley left Gravesend and planted Germantown. Most of these were Mennonites, who not only obtained a new start in life, but were assured of religious liberty. Other groups came from Hamburg and the Palatinate. There was hesitation about baptizing and observing the Lord's Supper, as they had no bishop, and none would come from Europe. They did ordain preachers, then deacons, and in 1708 entered on full church life. From this little seed has spread the cluster, in two great groups and six small; they maintain thirteen schools and colleges, with 1,673 students enrolled. The German strain is still quite strong, though for sixty years there have been some publications in English. The Mennonites are quite distinct from the Dunkards, or German Baptists, who began emigrating to Pennsylvania in 1719; as also from the Baptists of Oncken's vintage, who trace from 1834.