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

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

Some Recent Trends in the Theology of Baptism

(Concluded)

Baptism and the Gift of the Spirit

In addition to what has been said already, a third battleground for those who take up this question of baptism is the place to be accorded to the work of the Holy Spirit. Does a candidate for baptism receive the Holy Spirit at the same time as he is baptized, or does he receive it at a later stage and as a result of a separate ceremony? This, broadly speaking, is the question that confronts us today, and various attempts have been made to answer it. As in our consideration of the other two aspects of this problem, it is to the New Testament that we must turn first of all.

Here we find that there is no real unanimity among scholars once we go beyond the simple statement that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the new feature of Christian Baptism as compared with proselyte baptism and the baptism of John.[121] The passages usually cited in making this point include *Mark* i. 8, *Matt.* iii. 11, *Luke* iii. 16, *Acts* i. 5, xi. 15-16, xix. 1-7, but one glance at them soon gives rise to many doubts as to the precise relationship between baptism in water and the receiving of the Holy Spirit. In the case of Cornelius, for example, it is said that when Peter saw that the Gentiles had received the Holy Spirit, he said: "Can any man forbid the water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (*Acts* x. 44ff.). On the other hand, in the case of the Ephesian converts, we are told that they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit fell upon them subsequently (*Acts* xix. 1-7). These two examples will suffice to show us the difficulty that confronts any man who tries to argue for a set pattern in this matter of baptism and the gift of the Spirit in the early Church.

It is argued by Cullmann[122] that the gift of the Holy Spirit is closely connected with the forgiveness of sins and is, in fact, the fulfilment of it; further, he makes it clear that both elements are found together in Christian baptism. Then he goes on to show that the Church felt the need of adding to the act of immersion

[121] Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, p. 10. Even so, W. F. Flemington, (*The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 18f.) is not quite certain that such an interpretation does full justice to the baptism of John.

[122] *Op. cit.*, pp. 10-15. This same point is also established by J. Murray, *Christian Baptism*, p .8.

another act more specifically connected with the transmission of the Holy Spirit; this resulted in the importance attached to the laying on of hands, accompanied by the danger that the two acts would fall apart into two different sacraments. Cullmann maintains that in the primitive Church such a separation did not actually occur, though the baptismal stories in *Acts* (to which we have already referred) prove the danger to be ever present.

To this essential unity between baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament many others have recently borne witness,[123] some of them also drawing attention to the close connection between baptism and the gift of the Spirit not only in the *Acts* but also in Paul's teaching,[124] and it is not surprising that this view has found itself very much at home among Baptists..[125] Indeed it might appear at first sight that this doctrine of baptism and the Holy Spirit is essentially the doctrine which Baptists have maintained to this day, but further examination makes it clear that two words of warning ought to be uttered at this juncture: (*a*) the fluidity of practice which we have already noticed in *Acts* must keep us from arguing that we have preserved intact the New Testament pattern, since, as we have been bound to admit, no such clear-cut New Testament pattern is to be discerned. S. Bailey,[126] in fact, finds no fewer than eight different methods of administering baptism, the gift of the Spirit and the laying on of hands in *Acts* alone, thus making it difficult to accept Cullmann's statement that there the two acts of baptism and the gift of the Spirit are retained as one rite, and more difficult still to maintain that any one branch of the Church is following precisely New Testament lines; (*b*) except in close-membership churches, Baptists are often at a loss to determine the precise relationship between baptism and church membership, and too often baptism is dismissed as a personal matter between the

[123] H. G. Marsh, *The Origin and Significance of New Testament Baptism*, pp. 136ff; G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 45; J. R. Nelson, *The Realm of Redemption*, pp 45-47; S. Bailey, "Baptism and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," in *Theology*, vol. 49, (1946), pp. 11-14. *Baptism Today*, p. 15; A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Christian Initation*, pp. 19, 24f; *The Theology of Christian Initiation*, p. 10; K. Barth, (*The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*, p. 32) has a slight variation of this doctrine in that he believes baptism *shows* the candidate that *he has received* the gift of the Spirit. It will readily be perceived that this is very different from saying that in baptism he does actually receive it.

[124] W. F. Flemington, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 67-69, 110; G. W. H. Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 58. Nelson (*op. cit.*, pp. 128f) says it is the receiving of the Spirit that really gives meaning to baptism in the New Testament.

[125] H. W. Robinson, *Baptist Principles*, p. 13; R. C. Walton, *The Gathered Community*, p. 29.

[126] *Loc. cit.*; cf. Walton, *loc. cit.*, *The Theology of Christian Initiation*. p. 11; *Baptism Today*, p. 15.

believer and God; to be followed by application for membership to a local church. It is, however, made abundantly clear by Nelson[127] that if the Spirit is active in our baptism, then our baptism becomes essentially an act of the *ecclesia* and not simply a personal matter between us and God. For him, baptism, the gift of the Spirit and incorporation into the church must stand together, and this can hardly be over-emphasised in a day when there is a tendency to exalt one of the three at the expense of the other two.

Thus far it is difficult to see what cause there could be for disagreement, and how the interpretation of the New Testament could vary to any great extent, but we have seen already how Cullmann accounts for the practice of laying on of hands in the early church; that is, in order to give due importance to the receiving of the Holy Spirit. It is in this that the seeds of division are first to be found, for the church of the West was scarcely 300 years old when certain definite changes in practice had taken place. For a full account of what happened reference may be made to G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit.* Suffice it here simply to indicate the main developments.

Like many others, Lampe (p. 57) sees no reason to suppose that there was a distinction between Spirit and water baptism in the thought of the Apostle Paul, and maintains (p. 78) that there is little evidence for the belief that the laying on of hands was a regular ceremony in apostolic times. He does, nevertheless, admit (p. 93) that the New Testament theology of baptism implied the baptism of adults and that the rise of infant baptism changed the whole relationship between baptism and confirmation. In the second century, the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists have little to say about the doctrine of baptism in relation to the Spirit (p. 103), but towards the end of this century, with the increasing remoteness from the apostles and the consequent fading of the eschatological hope, there set in a tendency to identify Spirit-baptism with the laying on of hands of *Acts.* The West then took it all a stage further by separating baptism and confirmation so that it was gradually forgotten that the Holy Spirit was really received through "union with Christ" (p. 149ff). Hence the difficulty of deciding what happened in baptism and what happened in confirmation.

It is then precisely to this issue that many writers in recent years have turned their attention. Does a candidate for baptism receive the Holy Spirit when he is baptized, or when he is confirmed? If when he is baptized, then what is the significance of confirmation?

[127] *Op cit.*, pp. 45ff.

The modern discussion really began[128] towards the end of the last century when F. W. Puller and A. J. Mason distinguished between the regenerating activity of the Spirit in baptism and the reception of the indwelling Spirit in confirmation; they declared that in baptism we receive the gifts of grace, but in confirmation the Spirit Himself. For the theory in its more modern form we are indebted to Dom Gregory Dix, who declared that in the New Testament and the Fathers baptism is no more than a prelude to confirmation. It is not surprising that the reactions to such theories, even on the part of the Anglicans themselves, have varied a good deal, and the number of articles that have appeared in *Theology* alone bears some witness to the way in which "the ball has been tossed to and fro." Unfortunately it has not been found possible in the compass of this short paper to deal fully with them all.

It has, however, been strongly argued by A. E. J. Rawlinson[129] that confirmation is not to be regarded as the completion of baptism, as if there something were given which had previously been withheld, and he does not believe that a person baptized and unconfirmed has been improperly baptized. A. M. Ramsey[130] admits that in patristic teaching the unconfirmed have not received the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, but he also agrees with O. C. Quick[131] in the view that this can only apply where the two rites are held closely together. According to the Prayer Book, says Ramsey, baptism makes us members of Christ, and that is why many Anglicans will not agree that children have no share in the Holy Spirit. In support of the same point, though from a slightly different angle, we may cite the evidence of E. J. Bicknell[132] when he says that in the early Church baptism, unction and the laying on of hands formed a single sacrament and it is doubtful whether the last two can claim any higher authority than the custom of the Church. Perhaps the position of the majority of Anglicans is best summed up by the Archbishops' Commission on Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion[133] when they say that full Christian Initiation should be thought of as a process beginning with a request for baptism and concluding with the first com-

[128] For a fuller account of the controversy on this issue see Lampe, *op. cit.*, pp. viiff., J. R. S. Taylor, *Baptism in the Church,* pp 34ff, and F. C. Tindall, *Christian Initiation,* pp. 15ff.

[129] *Christian Initiation,* p. 27.

[130] "The Doctrine of Confirmation," in *Theology,* vol. 48, (1945), pp. 194ff.

[131] *The Christian Sacraments,* p. 184.

[132] *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England,* p. 477; cf. P .T. Forsyth, *The Church and the Sacraments,* p. 223.

[133] *The Theology of Christian Initiation,* p. 17; cf. Lampe, op. *cit.,* p. 322.

munion. Within this sequence, if a "point" of initiation must be sought, it is the moment of baptism.

If so much emphasis is to be given, however, to baptism, we might very well ask what precisely is the place to be filled by confirmation, and, when this question is asked, one senses a certain uneasiness among Anglican scholars, undoubtedly due to the wide separation which has taken place in the west between the two rites.[134] The answer which usually receives the strongest support is that in confirmation the candidate is strengthened and consecrated for the tasks and privileges which his church membership entails.[135] C. F. D. Moule[136] supports this view on the grounds that where it is not a matter of healing, the laying on of hands in the New Testament is usually a matter of spiritual strengthening for a task. Admittedly this comes as rather refreshing after reading of Anglo-Catholic scholars who wish to attribute a far greater importance to confirmation, but on reflection we still want to ask whether confirmation is really an essential rite or whether the Anglican Church is endeavouring to continue a practice which has really lost its meaning the moment it is separated from baptism.

In this connection the reply of R. H. Fuller[137] to A. M. Ramsey must be of real interest. Fuller says that since 1552 the Church of England has interpreted confirmation as a sacrament of growth but that, however comforting such an interpretation may be to Prayer Book Catholics, it is really quite untenable. Fuller maintains that, for an Anglican, baptism does what in the early Church was, and what in the orthodox Greek Church still is, held to be done by both baptism and confirmation together. After 1552, confirmation was intended to be a solemn act of intercession, but the Anglican reformers left a reference to the Holy Spirit in the intercessory prayer, and in the seventeenth century some scholars began to say that in confirmation the Holy Spirit was not only prayed for; He was bestowed. Since 1833, according to Fuller, it has been commonly taught that the confirmation service is a sacrament in which the Holy Spirit is conveyed, and in 1928 confirmation was held to be performed on the basis of *Acts* viii., whilst the baptismal service still maintained that the Spirit was given in baptism.

There can be no doubt that among Anglican theologians the

[134] One example of this is to be seen in S. Bailey, "Baptism and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," in *Theology*, vol. 49, (1946), pp. 13f.

[135] A. M. Ramsey, *loc. cit.*, pp. 197ff; cf. S. Bailey, *loc. cit.*, A. E. J. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 30ff.

[136] "Baptism with Water and the Holy Ghost," in *Theology*, vol. 48, (1945), p. 249.

[137] "Baptism and Confirmation," in *Theology*, vol. 49, (1946), pp. 114ff.

question of the place to be accorded to the Holy Spirit in regard to baptism and confirmation is a thorny problem, and one that sounds strangely remote to Baptist ears. Should it prove possible, however, to unravel the knot along the lines that Fuller has suggested, it would mean that we were not really so far apart as we sometimes think. Meanwhile we should content ourselves with a consideration of the part to be accorded to the Holy Spirit in our communion.

To do this it is important to distinguish between the kind of society which we have in the Baptist denomination and the kind of which the Church of England is a good example. P. Rowntree Clifford[138] has recently made this point by defining the Church in terms of two concentric circles; the inner one represents the fellowship of believers, and the outer one the household of God, or (to use a missionary term) the Christian community. In the case of churches of this latter type, baptism and the Holy Spirit are marks of a person's entry to the Christian community, and they are followed by confirmation, defined either as a service of intercession or as a service of spiritual strengthening, when they pass from the Christian community to the fellowship of believers. In the case of the other branches of the Christian church the process is reversed: their entry to the Christian community is marked by a service of dedication or of infant baptism, though a baptism which amounts to little more than intercession. Their subsequent entry to the fellowship of believers is then marked by baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Little more need be said to make it abundantly clear that this different conception of the Divine Society is the fundamental reason for the difference of approach. Thus from the Baptist point of view there is no question of the Holy Spirit being imparted to an infant, and it might therefore appear that our doctrine of the gift of the Spirit is crystal clear. Yet a moment's reflection will serve to convince us that it is not so. For us, the issue changes from one of baptism or confirmation to one of baptism or conversion.

If we argue that the Holy Spirit is imparted to a candidate at his baptism, then we lead ourselves into the dreadful problem of the unbaptized church member; we can scarcely go so far as to deny that he has received the Spirit in some way. Moreover, such a view is not really in keeping with Baptist history, for J. M. Ross[139] has pointed out that although there have been those who have agreed that baptism is a channel through which the Spirit is received, this appears to be quite a recent development. Indeed, with one exception, Ross has been unable to find any claim by a

[138] *The Mission of the Local Church*, pp. 54f.

[139] "The Theology of Baptism in Baptist History," in *The Baptist Quarterly*, vol. xv. (1953), p. 109.

Baptist earlier than 1925 that there is a bestowal of the Holy Spirit at baptism. The fact that a theory or belief is modern does not discountenance it though it ought to make us think twice before adopting it.

On the other hand, to argue that the Holy Spirit is imparted to a man at his conversion only serves to weaken further our emphasis on baptism and makes us want to ask what purpose it serves. It may, of course, be replied that by baptism we receive the Spirit in greater measure than before, though many will question whether we can discriminate between "quantities" of the Spirit in this way.

In considering the question of the gift of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, we saw that it was very closely linked with the administration of baptism, though the two were not one act. We saw furthermore that no real difficulty was felt in the Church so long as baptism and the laying on of hands were kept closely together, and that the source of the problem really lay in the change over from adult to infant baptism. If this is so it surely means that we Baptists are best in a position to develop a clearer doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The fact that all other communions are in a state of disagreement only serves to enhance our opportunity.

Moreover, it would not be so much of an innovation as a return to what our earliest forefathers originally practised, but which was subsequently discarded. To maintain a clear doctrine of the gift of the Holy Spirit, in close agreement with the Church of the New Testament and the sub-apostolic age, it seems to the present writer that what we need is a separate rite, following baptism, in which we lay a fresh emphasis on the receiving of the Spirit. The most appropriate way would doubtless be prayer and laying on of hands that the Holy Spirit may be received, and this is precisely in line with what the Baptist Confession of 1660[140] lays down as a condition of membership. Doubtless it will be argued by some that this is really what happens when we receive members into the Church, but it should be remembered that there is nevertheless a distinct difference between the right hand of fellowship followed by prayer, and some specific act (whatever its form[141]) which

[140] Cf. E. A. Payne, *The Fellowship of Believers* (enlarged edition), p. 75. In a footnote, Dr. Payne points out how the laying on of hands was a subject of controversy from the earliest times, though there were some Baptist Churches who practised it until early in the 19th century. See also *The Proposed Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon*, pp. 13f, and E. A. Payne, "Baptists and the Laying on of Hands." *Baptist Quarterly*, vol. xv, p. 214.

[141] There will be many who are opposed to the idea of laying on of hands, but there is no reason why some other symbolic method, together with some brief words of explanation, should not be used.

makes it clear that the church as a body is making intercession for the Holy Spirit to fill the life of the new member. Such a rite would at least enable us to get a firmer grasp on, and a clearer conception of, the work of the Holy Spirit and His place in the lives of the members of the church. Moreover, in being faithful to one of our early Baptist Confessions and in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament we could hardly feel that we were forsaking those principles by which we have always stood.

Whether such a view would today commend itself to a sufficient number of our Baptist scholars, and how far their lead, if given, would be followed by our people we cannot estimate. Until then, we can but long for the day when our Baptist scholars and leaders give us a clear statement on the place of baptism in the life of the Church.

A. GILMORE.

Christian Deviations, by Horton Davies. (Philosophical Library, New York, $2.75; S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.)

The author, now Senior Lecturer in Church History at Mansfield and Regent's Park Colleges, Oxford, describes this little book as "a modest attempt at Christian Apologetics, a defence of the historic Christian faith by distinguishing it from those systems which imitate it and yet distort it by misrepresentation or unwarrantable addition to the essentials of Christian belief" (p. 7). He writes of Theosophy, Christian Science, Spiritism, Seventh-Day Adventism, Jehovah's Witnesses, the Mormons, British-Israel, Moral Re-Armament, Astrology and Open-Air Religion. Each chapter contains the basic facts about the movement or sect under consideration, quotations from authentic sources and a judicious and clear appraisement. The book will prove useful because the information it contains is not easy to come by and many of our contemporaries are caught by the missionary zeal of the devotees of some of these cults. Supporters of Moral Re-Armament have felt affronted at being classed as a Christian "deviation" and at finding Dr. Buchman in the same gallery as Mrs. Eddy, Mrs. Ellen White, Charles Taze Russell and Brigham Young, and though the author tries to disarm criticism in his preparatory note, it certainly seems unfortunate that he should have put the Oxford Groupers between the British-Israelites and the Astrologers and have described them as "the foe of the Christian Church" (p. 104). It is true that this last phrase is related to "their disinterestedness in doctrine," but there are many other movements associated more or less closely with "the great historic Communions of Christendom" (p. 7) which deserve a like or even more severe condemnation, if this is to be the criterion.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Johannes Elias Feisser and the Rise of the Netherlands Baptists

IN order to understand the "why, how and when" of the rise of the Baptist Denomination in the Netherlands,[1] it is necessary to sketch in a few words the political and religious background, of which the "Réveil"—the Awakening of the nineteenth century—is the most significant feature.[2]

After the Emperor Napoleon had been defeated at Leipzig, the House of Orange returned to the Low Lands: William I became the first king of both Holland and Belgium. The French influence on religious life in Holland had been tremendously great: rationalism and latitudinarism (opposition of theology with the help of Platonism against Deism, though in fact, both often went hand-in-hand) made the foundations of orthodox Christianity shake and the human mind had become extremely critical and liberal. The Réveil now was a reaction against this development: it was a strengthening of confessional consciousness, a representation of orthodoxy as expressed in the Confession of Dordrecht. Leaders of the Réveil were Willem Bilderdijk and Isäac da Costa, the latter having been formerly a believing Jew.

In the middle of the nineteenth century there were three main schools of theology: the Leiden school was modernistic and rationalistic; it maintained contact with men like Baur (Tübingen) and Wellhausen. Representatives of the Leiden school were J. H. Scholten and Abraham Kuenen.

The Groningen school was headed by Prof. Hofstede de Groot, an evangelically-minded man who preferred a "via media"; connected with the Groningen group were the "ethischen" and the followers of Prof. van Oosterzee of Utrecht. The Strict-Calvinists formed the third group; their leader was the well-known Abraham Kuyper, the first rector-magnificus of the Free University in Amsterdam. As the Dutch Reformed Church did not respond to the challenge of the Réveil, that is, since she did not do away with the "liberals" and because she did not attempt to re-establish

[1] A. A. Hardenberg, *The Rise of the Baptist Movement in Holland*, Hengelo/Ov., 1949, p.l. H. Jut in *European Baptists Today* (ed. J. D. Franks), Ruschlikon, 1952, p. 42.

[2] For this section I depended partly on Karl Heussi: *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte;* Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1949; pp. 498/499.

orthodoxy in life and doctrine, a separation occurred in the years 1834-36, when a Dutch Reformed pastor by the name of Hendrik de Cock founded a "Christelijke Afgescheiden Kerk" (Afscheiding, 1834).

The strongest political faction in the country was the Liberal Party, headed by such men as Jan Rudolf Thorbecke and Van Hall. Parliament passed a bill, by which religious instruction was taken from the Church and put into the hands of the State. The Dutch Reformed Church almost did not react! Thereupon the so-called "Schoolstrijd" (Kampf um die Schule) began: "the school back to the parents," was the slogan in those days and as a result Roman Catholics and Protestants founded confessional political parties. Leaders of the Protestants were Jhr. de Savornin Lohman and Abraham Kuyper; the outstanding representative of the Catholics was Dr. Schaepman. In 1880 the Strict-Calvinists, headed by Abraham Kuyper, founded in Amsterdam the Free University (Vrije Universiteit). Until that time the largest number of separatists was united in the Christelijke Afgescheiden Kerk of Hendrik de Cock. But since the Leiden and Groningen schools had the majority in the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church and the people had been influenced by the Réveil, new separations could not be prevented.

In 1886 Abraham Kuyper and his followers broke with the Dutch Reformed Church (called the "Doleantie" from *dolere* = to suffer) and six years later they united with the majority of the members of the Chr. Afgescheiden Kerk in the "Gereformeerde Kerken" (1892). Only a small minority remained in the Christelijke Afgescheiden Kerk; at present they are known as the "Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken." What now had the Baptists to do with the Réveil? Though this will become clear later, we can say already now that the Awakening has been a powerful and successful opponent of the liberalistic spirit, so characteristic of the nineteenth century. Those aroused by the Réveil for the most part formed the right wing of the Dutch Reformed Church; the majority of the separatists joined the Christelijke Afgescheiden Kerk (1834-36) or broke with the Dutch Reformed Church in 1886 (Doleantie; Abr. Kuyper). Only a small number of the "malcontents" decided for a free church; these men and women established the Vrije Evangelische Gemeenten in Nederland, or became members of the Baptist Church; Johannes Elias Feisser was one of them.

JOHANNES ELIAS FEISSER

Feisser was born on Dec. 10, 1805, the first son of Johannes Feisser and Anna Maria Bouer, at Winsum in the province of Groningen. The early years of his life the young Feisser spent

in Veendam, where his father had become city treasurer. On May 16, 1823, he was registered by the University of Groningen (via media!) as a student of theology, mainly by the influence of his grandmother. After having passed his proponents-exam before the Provinciaal Kerkbestuur van Friesland on May 3, 1827, Feisser went to Leiden, where he studied at the University. Influenced by his teacher, Prof. Th. A Clarisse of Groningen, he chose Church History as his main subject and on June 21, 1828, he became Doctor of Theology on a thesis, entitled: "De Vita Basilii Magni, Caesareae in Cappadocia Episcopi."[3] The first pastorate Feisser held was Miedum-Lekkum in Friesland; here he found a wife, Geertruide Elisabeth Barbara Orck, Baronesse van Heeckeren. Three years later he moved to Winschoten (1831), where he wrote his *Jezus Christus, of Lotgevallen en Lessen van den Zaligmaker der menschheid.*[4] Its purpose was "the spread of the pure knowledge of the Gospel and the genuine appetite for Christian virtue." Feisser rejects the existence of a personal Devil: *Matt.* vi. 13 he translates for example by "the evil one." In 1833 Feisser went to Franeker, "the Frisian Athens," as Wumkes calls it.[5] Here two of his children and his wife died, while one of Feisser's eyes did not function properly. This was too much for the poor man: he returned to Veendam, where his parents lived, and here it was that he found rest for his soul, and cure for his sorrow. On March 3, 1839, he became pastor of a small country church in Gasselter-Nijveen in the province of Drente; his entrance-sermon was on *Matt.* xiii. 18 and, with a burning desire to work for the advance of the Kingdom of God, Feisser began his work. Within a short time church life flourished as it rarely had done before.

Soon he discovered, however, "that there were not five true Christians here, not even ten acquainted with the right way of salvation."[6] But after having worked intensively for about two years, his preaching entered the hearts and the minds of the people. A small circle of faithful church members regularly assembled in Feisser's home and there they discussed on problems of the Christian faith. In order to reach the people outside the church, Feisser took his pen in his hand and wrote a pamphlet, entitled: *Het eene en altoos noodige,*[7] in which he shares his experiences

[3] Groningen, 1828. Feisser's Complete Works are in the Library of the Theological School of the Ger. Kerken in Ned., Kampen; catalogue pp. 239/40; Kampen, 1911.

[4] Publ. by W. van Boekeren, Groningen, 1832.

[5] G. A. Wumkes: *"De Opkomst en Vestiging van het Baptisme in Nederland"*; pub. A. J. Osinga, Sneek, 1912; p. 4.

[6] J. E. Feisser: *Getrouw Verhaal van mijne werkzaamheden en lotgevallen als dienaar des Heeren te G.N.;* Groningen, 1844; p. 3.

[7] Groningen, 1841.

with others. Then in autumn, 1841 he read Newman's *Cardiphonia;* this book made him see that a life "sola gratia" is a necessity for salvation. Formerly he had an optimistic conception of the human state, but now he wrote that "nothing good lives in man; his nature is thoroughly sinful, . . . hostile toward God, actively at work to do away with everything well-pleasing to God, to resist Him as long as is possible."[8] From now on he preached man's inability and God's sovereignty in the plan of salvation, making a sharp distinction between converted and unconverted. This led to the first conflict between the pastor and the board of deacons ("kerkeraad"). On Saturday afternoon, Nov. 27, 1842, the deacons together with the pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church of Gasselter-Nijveen, were assembled to appoint some new deacons. Unfortunately a man by the name of Hendrik Theeuwes was elected, whom Feisser could not accept "because he did not possess the characteristics of grace." Hendrik Reiling was the man he wanted, but the board of deacons decided that Theeuwes be elected. A second conflict between deacons and pastor took place on Wednesday, May 17, 1843, when Feisser required a decision from the board, by which some unfaithful members were to be forbidden to attend the Lord's Supper, "because of lack of right conceptions and opinions which a true Christian needs to have." Also this proposal could not be accepted by the board of deacons. These conflicts and struggles for a pure church made Feisser thirst after a "communio sanctorum." More and more serious became the controversy, because Feisser was not willing "to gain peace at the cost of the truth and the will of God." He sent a letter to the Classicaal Bestuur in Assen, asking to be released from his duty to administer infant baptism, because at the moment his conscience forbade him to do what he thought not to be right. In the same letter Feisser expressed the hope of having a true and apostolic church, as Paul described her in 1 *Cor.* xii. 12-30. Rejection and abolition of paedo-baptism would be the first requirement.

In the autumn of 1843 Feisser presented his views concerning baptism in a booklet, entitled: *Beknopte Aanwijzing van het ongeoorloofde in den Doop der kleine kinderen, benevens de weerlegging van de voornaamste gronden welke voor den kinderdoop bijgebragt worden,*[9] in which he gathers the scriptural, historical and ecclesiastical arguments against the practice of baptizing infants. On Sept. 24, 1843, Feisser refused to baptize the child of a disciplined member of the church and in spite of the summons of the Classicaal Bestuur in Assen, Feisser was not willing to baptize

[8] J. E. Feisser: *Waakt op! Gij die slaapt . . . Eene roepstem tot alle ware geloovigen en begeerigen in Nederland;* Groningen, 1843. pp. 26/27.
[9] Groningen, September, 1843.

infants or to distribute bread and wine to unbelievers. On Dec. 19, 1843, the Provinciaal Kerkbestuur dismissed him from his office and on January 1 this decision was announced in public. Now Feisser was without a church and without income; yet he was not discouraged, but in a tract on the Holy Spirit he wrote down burning words from a burning heart: *Die den Geest Christi niet heeft, die komt Hem niet toe! Eene noodige waarschuwing voor alle heilzoekende zielen onder de Afgescheidenen en Niet-Afgescheidenen in Nederland.*[10] In this writing he discussed the nature, the names and the work of the Holy Spirit; then he puts some questions: What does it mean not to have the Holy Spirit? What does it mean not to belong to the Lord Jesus? What does it mean to have that Spirit and to belong to that Lord?

But Feisser was not the only one who had a battle to fight. In Zutfen, in the province of Gelderland, a pastor had come into conflict with the board of deacons: this man was Ds. J. de Liefde, pastor of the Mennonite congregation. After his conversion, he preached Christ the Crucified, a folly to the Greeks, a stumbling-block to the Jews, both to the Doopsgezinden. But since the conflict began in 1843, others were attending the small Mennonite chapel, the majority of whom were faithful and believing members of the Dutch Reformed Church in Zutfen. Alongside with de Liefde worked Jacob Benjamin de Pinto, a Portuguese Jew from The Hague who after conversion became a member of the Dutch Reformed Church. Neither there, nor with the Afgescheidenen (1834; Hendr. de Cock) did he find what he wanted—a genuine Christian faith. But after having become friends with de Liefde, both men worked for a purified church. A declaration of war was sent to the Mennonites in the form of a booklet: *Gevaar! Gevaar! en geen Vrede! een woord tot de slapenden en in slaap gewiegden.*[11] Feisser, writing against infant baptism, aroused his attention, and in March, 1844 appeared de Liefde's *Niet de kinderdoop, maar de Doop der Bejaarden is het Bondszegel des Nieuwen Verbonds.*[12] Feisser in turn happened to read the pamphlet of de Liefde and so contact between the two men was made. In the summer of the year 1844 Feisser visited de Liefde in Zutfen and this was the beginning not only of a fruitful co-operation, but also the time when Feisser's writings were being read by Köbner and Oncken. A new period had come: the time of the rise of the Baptist denomination in the Netherlands!

EARLY LEADERS

In the autumn of 1844 the announcement of Feisser's dismissal

[10] Groningen, February, 1844.
[11] Zutfen, 1844.
[12] Zutfen, March, 1844.

reached Hamburg. Under the triumvirate Oncken, Köbner and Lehmann, the Baptist witness spread slowly but certainly, particularly in Oldenburg, Jeverland and Ost-Friesland, all in the N.W. of Germany. The movement found much sympathy and a large following. Feisser's booklets aroused Köbner's and Oncken's attention and interest.[13] Oncken sent Julius Köbner from Hamburg and A. F. Remmers from Jever to the Netherlands. In November, 1844 the two men arrived in Gasselter-Nijveen; they told Feisser about the Baptist work in Hamburg and district and this made such an impression on Feisser that he asked them to send him more information, books, pamphlets, etc. Answering a letter of Feisser, Köbner wrote from Hamburg on December 27, 1844: "O wie herrlich ist es denn, dass der Herr sich hier und da Häuflein seiner Geringen, deren Herzen Er gedemüthig that, sammelt, um ihnen sein Wort wieder, als ihres Fusses Leuchte, in die Hand zu geben. Er thut ihnen die Augen auf und schenkt ihrem Herzen Einfalt. Er führt sie nicht nach Dordrecht, und nicht nach Augsburg, sondern nach Jerusalem, wo er seinen Geist ausgoss und seine Gemeinde bildete. . . . Was Holland betrifft, so wollen wir freudig in die Zukunft blicken; denn mit der unverfälschten Wahrheit des Wortes Gottes, zu welcher der Heilige Geist seine Kraft geben wird, lassen sich grosse Dinge anfangen, und das Feld scheint in der That, wie Sie auch bemerken, weiss zur Ernte."[14]

About January 12, 1845 Feisser, accompanied by his friend Roelof Reiling visited de Liefde in Zutfen: they spent quite a bit of time in discussing the problem of baptism and, as de Liefde wrote in a letter to Köbner in Hamburg,[15] Feisser told many things about the Baptists in Hamburg and about the visit of Köbner and Remmers in Autumn, 1844. "How a man is rich, when he may spend a few hours with those who in Christ are of one heart and soul with him," de Liefde wrote to Feisser in a letter.[16]

That Feisser lived under unfavourable circumstances from the material point of view, we know from a letter which de Liefde wrote to Feisser on April 9, 1845. As a friend and brother de Liefde admonishes Feisser to make known unto God all his needs and troubles and to pray for divine aid. In the same letter de Liefde expresses the view that the Hamburg Baptists (he means Köbner, Oncken, etc.) seem not yet to be free from the Mosaic Law: "We must not be baptized, because the Lord commanded

[13] J. H. Rushbrooke: *The Baptist Movement in the Continent of Europe;* Kingsgate Press, London, 1923; p. 55.
[14] Cited by Wumkes, *op. cit.*; pp. 274ff.; more letters reprinted here.
[15] February 2, 1845
[16] February 2, 1845; De L. urges Feisser to buy a printing-press.

it (as the Hamburg brethren actually do), for we are free from the law. We must be baptized, because baptism is necessary for salvation, though God certainly 'per exceptionem' can save a believer who is not baptized." On April 11, 1845 Köbner wrote in a letter to Feisser that Oncken had invited him to come to Hamburg to get acquainted and to have a discussion. The cost of travel would be paid by the German brethren, if Feisser had no money. Consequently at the beginning of May, 1845, Feisser travelled to Hamburg, where he met both Oncken and Köbner. Oncken was soon convinced that they were dealing with a man whose faith was thoroughly evangelical, whose doctrine was purely Biblical. Köbner accompanied Feisser on his way home in order to found the first Baptist Church in Gasselter-Nijveen. On May 15, 1845 he baptized in a ditch Johannes Elias Feisser from Gasselter-Nijveen, Arend Speelman from Nieuwe Pekela, Roelof Reiling and his wife Geertruida Teissens, and the brothers Willem, Jannes and Hendrik Kruit, all of Gasselter-Nijveen. Great was their joy, and with a thankful heart Feisser wrote: "It seemed to us, as if we had entered through the right gate, of which Bunyan speaks in his *Pilgrim's Progress*, that we had not climbed over the wall, though this habit is already more than 1,000 years old."[17] Of this first Baptist congregation in the Netherlands, Feisser became the pastor, while Roelof Reiling was made a deacon. The next day Köbner and Feisser visited de Liefde and de Pinto in Zutfen, when Feisser insisted that both brethren should be baptized; he aroused the anger of de Liefde and de Pinto. The latter said that—though Feisser had been baptized and the congregation in Gasselter-Nijveen had been established—he did not yet see a church of Jesus Christ in the Netherlands.[18] In a letter, written on May 22, 1845, Feisser accuses the Zutfen leaders that, by being disobedient in the question of baptism, they had dishonoured God and His Word. De Liefde, who was very angry with Feisser, answered, "But you, when you came, were a baptizer from top to toe; you even wanted to speak about nothing else but baptism and baptizing. Indeed, you did not need to bear that name at all, you were Baptists from the skull of the head to the sole of the foot"[19]; de Pinto, however, repented and in a letter to Feisser he asked for pardon.[20]

Meanwhile Feisser and Köbner had left Zutfen and made their way to Amsterdam: there since 1840 a group of believers, belonging to various denominations, was studying the Bible for private instruction. When they discussed the question of baptism, they

[17] Cited by Wumkes, *op. cit.*; pp. 27-28.
[18] Cf. Wumkes, *op. cit.*; p. 60.
[19] May 25, 1845.
[20] May 24, 1845.

came to the conclusion that only believers should be baptized. The leader of this circle was Hendrik Gerardus Tekelenburg, with whom Feisser had entered into contact. In May, 1845, following their visit to the Zutfen group, Köbner and Feisser spent a few days with the brethren in Amsterdam.[21] But unlike as in Zutfen, the word was received by these brethren and Köbner baptized four of them, among them Tekelenburg.

Yet also in Zutfen Baptists made progress: de Liefde had withdrawn from Feisser and the Germans, but de Pinto was willing to maintain contact with the church in Gasselter-Nijveen. On June 24, 1845, three brethren were baptized. First de Pinto was baptized and thereupon he baptized the other two. Triumphantly he wrote to Feisser in one of his many letters: "Your sister-church shakes you the brother-hand, gives you the brother-kiss, be it from a distant place. The body of Jesus Christ lives still in our Netherlands. At the same moment it has been revealed in two places, and now through the grace of God, we walk in newness of life."[22] One more letter was sent to Feisser in the beginning of July, 1845: "If the works of Menno Simons happen to come in your hands, buy them, if you can, for they contain the profound and powerful expression of faith of a beloved brother. When reading them, I had to think of you constantly. And that is, because there exists a remarkable similarity between you: a great mildness, alongside with a cutting sharpness.[23]

Now de Liefde broke with de Pinto,[24] as he did with the Mennonite Church in Zutfen. For a short time he was pastor of the Apostolisch-Christelijk-Afgescheiden Gemeente, of which he was the founder.

Feisser had a battle to fight and he was often so discouraged that he asked himself: "Why in the world did I give up my pastorate to become leader of such a small group of people? Have I really done that which God wanted me to do?" But his friends encouraged him, urging him to go straight forward, without looking back. Oncken wrote: "Die Wahrheit . . . hat zu allen Zeiten dieselben Kämpfe zu bestehen gehabt, und in dem Kirchlich-orthodoxen Holland muss dies ganz besonders der Fall sein. Die Taufwahrheit greift so tief in das Wesen aller Staatskirchen und anderer Kirchengemeinschaften ein die den Apostolischen Standpunkt verlassen haben, dass wir nichts als den kräftigsten Widerstand erwarten dürfen."[25] In September, 1845, Oncken visited

[21] Rushbrooke: *op. cit.*; p. 58.
[22] June 26, 1845.
[23] Cited by Wumkes, *op. cit.*; pp. 333ff.
[24] Letter of De Pinto to Feisser, September 6, 1845.
[25] September 12, 1845.

Feisser and his family in Gasselter-Nijveen; then Feisser's second wife, Karsina Hovingh Wichers, was also baptized.

Feisser's health grew worse and finally he decided to go to the "Wasserheilanstalt" Geltschberg near Leitmeritz beyond Dresden, Germany, as de Liefde had advised him long before.[26] On May 15, 1846, exactly one year after the first Baptist Church had been established in the Netherlands, Feisser went to Hamburg, via Weener, Leer, Aurich and Jever; from there he travelled to Lewin near Dresden, where steam baths proved to be very helpful and curing. During the time of his absence, Roelof Reiling, and Hendrik and Johannes Kruit led the church in Gasselter-Nijveen. On July 20, 1846, Feisser was back again, though not yet cured completely.

Meanwhile de Pinto had baptized a number of persons, but the movement did not make much progress though: "The development among the believers in my presence, is very slow; yea with some there seems to be more progress backward than forward," he wrote to Feisser.[27] When in May, 1848 de Pinto went to The Hague, the small group could hardly maintain itself; some of the members went over to Mormonism, others became Darbists and in spite of the fact that Feisser travelled more than once to Zutfen he could not prevent the downfall of the Zutfen church.

In 1849 Feisser moved to Nieuwe Pekela, where he hoped to be able to do more.[28] There he and Arend Speelman meditated on the Word of God each Sunday morning. Feisser engaged in missionary work and soon a congregation was established. In September, 1850 Feisser went to Amsterdam, invited by Tekelenburg and other brethren to become the leader of the church there. Since the congregation lacked evangelistic zeal, Feisser went back to Nieuwe Pekela by the middle of October, 1850. The Amsterdam congregation was very much disturbed by the influence of the Darbists, especially in the years 1854-58. From 1861 Tekelenburg was again leader of the church and soon he drew up a confession of faith[29]; noteworthy is Art. 11 that forbids the taking of the oath on the ground of *Matt.* v. 34, 37 and *James* v. 12.

In April, 1863 Charles Haddon Spurgeon visited Holland,[30] but because of lack of time, he could not visit the brethren in Amsterdam; yet shortly after his return he wrote from England: "When you are faithful, you will be the salt of this country in the coming years. If all are eager in planting and promoting the Truth, your

[26] Letter of De Liefde to Feisser, April 13, 1845.
[27] In 1846/47; cf. Wumkes, *op. cit.*; p. 72.
[28] Rushbrooke, *op. cit.*; p. 55.
[29] *Proeve eener beknopte Belijdenis van Geloof;* cf. Wumkes, *op. cit.*; p. 93.
[30] Cf. Weekblad *De Christen,* no. 390, October 11, 1894.

number will certainly increase. Our brother Oncken in Germany may be an encouraging example to you. His success may inspire you to zeal and steadfastness."[31] With great joy Feisser came to read the letter. The tie with the Germans was no longer as strong as it was before: their confession of faith he could not approve of and he felt more attracted by English Baptists toward the end of his life[32]: "I do not think that the fellowship with them (the Germans) can be maintained in the end . . . they stand wholly on the 'Afgescheiden' (i.e. Calvinistic) point of view, as it is here in our country and they do not distinguish sufficiently between Old and New."[33]

Because of his weak health Feisser withdrew more and more in the last years of his life and on June 2, 1865, he died. That Baptists in Holland still do regard him as their spiritual father and distinguished pioneer no one can deny: his life and work were of great importance.

RELATIONS WITH ENGLAND AND GERMANY

The Baptists in the Netherlands have been called "a plant from their own soil," that is: their origin is essentially "Dutch."[34]

[34] Hardenberg, *op. cit.*; p. 5. Cf. also Wumkes, *op. cit.*; p. 1.

We have already seen that men like Feisser and de Liefde had come to doubt the validity of infant baptism, indeed had done away with the practice, before they came into contact with the German Baptists. It has been noticed also that German Baptists were too "narrow" in life and doctrine for de Liefde. Feisser himself at the end of his life turned more and more from his German friends, whose confession of faith he could not approve of; he sympathised more with the Baptist tradition as found in America and England, where he found a spirit of freedom that seemed to be more in accordance with the teachings and practices of the New Testament. Yet, German influence cannot be denied; but Feisser was not the representative of the "German" school. German influence definitely entered the Northern Netherlands, when Peter Johannes de Neui came to Holland[35]; de Neui was a native of Ditzumerverlaat near Weener in Ost-Friesland, a few kilometres east from the Dutch border. He studied half a year in Hamburg, where Oncken and Köbner became his teachers and then went to Franeker in Friesland,[36] where he founded a Baptist

[31] Letter to Amsterdam; cited by Wumkes, *op. cit.*; p. 91.

[32] Cf. Wumkes, *op cit.*; p. 37.

[33] Letter to Tekelenburg in Oct./Nov., 1864; cited by Wumkes, *op cit.*; p. 37.

[35] A biographical sketch has been written by Wumkes in his *It Fryske Rêueil yn portretten*, Sneek, 1911; pp. 195ff.

[36] See on De Neui in Franeker: Wumkes, *op. cit.*; pp. 142ff.; chapter vi. "De opkomst der Franeker Gemeente."

church, thoroughly Calvinistic in doctrine. After the church had been firmly established, de Neui entered into contact with the brethren in Amsterdam with whom he wanted to be united. The Amsterdam church, however, wanted to wait, until de Neui had translated the German confession of faith that had already been accepted in Franeker. Also with Stadskanaal—now one of the biggest congregations in Holland, and more or less the direct result of Feisser's work in Gasselter-Nijveen—contact was made; ultimately de Neui hoped to unite Franeker, Stadskanaal and Amsterdam in the German Union.

De Neui found an opponent in Hendrikadius Zwaantinus Kloekers; he had been a missionary in Shanghai. Under the influence of English Baptists he was baptized (1858) and went to London. There he was appointed a missionary by the Baptist Missionary Society and sent back to China. After a few years he returned to Holland, where he became pastor of the Baptist Church in Stadskanaal in December, 1866. Kloekers now opposed the attempts by de Neui to bring Franeker, Amsterdam and Stadskanaal into the German "Bund," and seriously warned the brethren against the German Baptists' Calvinism and their doctrine of predestination, "as it has been established and accepted by the Reformed Fathers, following Calvin who in turn was a follower of Augustine. . . ."[37] He felt attracted more by American and English Baptists, where the doctrine of general or unlimited atonement had become "opinio communis" more than in Germany.[38]

On May 26, 1869, a conference of the Baptist churches of Amsterdam, Franeker and Stadskanaal was held in Franeker; the congregations of Hanswehrum and Ihren, both in Ost-Friesland, had also sent their representatives. Item 16 on the agenda was a proposal by these German churches: they asked the Dutch Baptists to approve of the German confession,[39] but Stadskanaal, represented by Kloekers, declared that, though they highly esteemed such men like Köbner and Oncken,[40] they wanted to remain independent. So Dutch Baptists refused to sign the German confession, while they did not become members of the "Bund"; only a kind of alliance was established, leaving, however the Baptists in Holland and in Germany entirely independent from one another.

Kloeker's heart's desire was fulfilled, when on January 26, 1881, in Foxhol the Union of Baptist Churches in the Netherlands was

[37] Weekblad *De Christen*, September 15, 1883.
[38] Cf. Wumkes, *op cit.*; pp. 172/173.
[39] *Glaubensbekenntnis und Constitution;* translated by De Neui into Dutch and published at Franeker, 1870.
[40] Cf. Wumkes, *op .cit.*; pp. 173/174.

founded.[41] The Union ultimately became a member of the German "Bund" for a time, though she kept her independence.[42] From that time on Dutch students have been partly educated in the Hamburg Predigerseminar. At present nearly half of the Dutch pastors received their education in Hamburg, the other half in Scandinavia, England, America, or at Dutch universities.

JAN A. BRANDSMA.

German Protestants Face the Social Question. Vol. 1. *The Conservative Phase,* 1815-1871, by William O. Shanahan. (University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, $6.75.)

This substantial volume of over 400 pages is the first part of a study which the author, an Associate Professor of History in a Roman Catholic University, hopes to carry forward to 1933. It is concerned with the revolt against Christianity which has occurred in Europe since the French Revolution and seeks to provide a detailed account of how German Protestantism reacted to the effects of industrialism. Clear, objective and well-documented, it will prove a useful reference book for those who would know more of the work and background of men like Johann Heinrich Wichern (1808-71), the founder of the *Rauhe Haus* and the Inner Mission, and Friedrich von Bodelschwingl (1831-1910), as well as of Wilhelm Weitling (1808-71), the most eminent German socialist prior to 1848. Full treatment of the Blumhardts, father and son, and of the influence of Bismarck, is reserved for later treatment. In the nineteenth century a tragic gulf developed between the churches and the continental proletariat, but it cannot be said that Lutheranism did not produce those who tried to make the religion of the state church more living, effective and relevant to changing social conditions. Why did they fail? The sequel to this volume and the author's conclusions will be awaited with interest.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

[41] Cf. Wumkes, *op. cit.*; p. 245.

[42] *Protokoll und Referate der* 15. *Bundes-Konferenz gehalten von den Abgeordneten der Deutschen Baptistengemeinden zu Hamburg-Eilbeck* (from 24/27 August, 1891); Hamburg, 1891; pp. 13/14.

John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism

(Continued)

THE journey from Zürich to London took the Hoopers and their party seven weeks. Their way lay through Basle and then down the Rhine to the sea. The party was joined at Basle by Martin Micron,[92] a Flemish physician, in exile on account of his Protestant beliefs and now bound for England. At Strasbourg Hooper found that Bucer was about to leave for an unknown destination—a refugee in the face of the Interim which the Emperor Charles V was forcing upon his empire. Although Hooper did not at that time know of Bucer's destination he soon discovered it, for Bucer[93] too was on his way to England. In Cologne the party came across Jan Utenhove who, like Micron, was an exile from Ghent on account of his faith. It was on this occasion that Hooper wrote to Bullinger commending Utenhove to him that he may "observe the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, which, as it is most simple among you, so is it most pure."[94] We shall meet Utenhove again in England.

As Hooper neared England the rumours of what was going on there reached him and the news did not please him. Peter Martyr[95] and Bernadino Ochino[96] were there, neither of whom it seemed were in line with the Zürich teaching to which Hooper hoped to convert England, although they were certainly not Lutherans as Hooper suggested.[97] Further news reached him that Bucer had now arrived in England but that John A'Lasco[98] was no longer there. This was a double blow, for Hooper had already been in conflict with Bucer about the doctrine of the Eucharist, whilst A'Lasco, who was at that time a Zwinglian, would have been a strong supporter. The prospect for Hooper in England was uncertain and as he neared his destination letters went to Bullinger and to Pellican[99] asking for copies of their writings and sermons. This request occurs in almost every letter that Hooper wrote to Zürich. He was concerned that if he was to fire the artillery in England the ammunition should be made in Zürich. It was a determined, if somewhat apprehensive, Hooper that landed in London on May 16th, 1549. The exile had come home and lost no time in setting about his mission.

V. HOOPER IN LONDON

His first experiences were scarcely encouraging. He carried a letter from Bullinger to Cranmer and delivered it to the Archbishop. The reception was cold. "He did not vouchsafe a single word either respecting yourself or your most godly church,"[100] wrote Hooper to Bullinger on May 31st. It was not to be wondered at, for Bucer had just arrived in England and was already at Cranmer's elbow. In addition Hooper had already become involved in a controversy over his claim that equal liberty of divorce should be allowed both to the man and woman on the occasion of adultery.[101]

The situation he found in English church practice did not help matters. Things were far indeed from Hooper's ideal. It is true that England under the leadership of the Duke of Somerset had moved a considerable way towards the institution of Protestant doctrine and practice in the years since the death of Henry VIII, but nothing like far enough for the Zürich sympathisers. On June 4th, 1549, Richard Hilles, the merchant, now in England wrote: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nurenberg churches and some of those in Saxony, for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites respecting the administration of the sacraments."[102] The 1549 Prayer Book had recently been published in which the eucharistic service carried the title "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass" and the instruction concerning the celebrating priest was "The priest that shall execute the Holy Ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration; that is to say, a white alb plain with a vestment or cope . . ." In addition, the Prayer Book instructed the priest to stand "afore the midst of the altar." The retention of the word 'mass,' the vestments, and the assumption of the existence of an altar would not be pleasing to the Zürich supporters. Hooper discovered also that the liberty of preaching was limited by the bishops, of whom by no means all were favourable towards the idea of reform in doctrine and practice and very few, if any, were inclined towards the more radical reforms desired by Hooper. But Hooper was not daunted. Before long he had got himself attached as a chaplain to the household of no less a person than the Duke of Somerset and if he could not preach, why then he would lecture. This is what he did, probably at St. Paul's Cross, and he did it with enthusiasm and success. He told Bullinger: "I myself too, as my slender abilities will allow me, having compassion upon the ignorance of my brethren, read a public lecture twice in the day to so numerous an audience that the church cannot contain them."[103]

It is clear that Hooper lectured on various books of the Bible and that his concern was that the people should hear the gospel—yet hear it "Zürich fashion." Martin Micron, who was of course a

strong supporter of Hooper, gives a picture of the English situation as seen from the point of view of the Zürich party.[104] The evangelical gospel is no more than an ember, the bishops are asleep, the nobility fight and the common people are corrupt. The Lord must send out faithful labourers into His vineyard. But John Hooper is there and seems to be fanning the ember of true doctrine into a blaze by his teaching. Writing to Pellican in Zürich, Micron said of Hooper's lectures: "But good God, what a concourse of people, how many lives have been changed . . ., many enemies of the gospel return to discretion. If the Lord God, in His great goodness, increases His Spirit in Hooper, I do not doubt but that he will be the future Zwingli of England." Hooper's mission had begun in earnest.

It is not surprising that he became involved in controversy. He was involved almost inevitably, in a clash with the Bishop of London, Edmund Bonner,[105] in whose diocese he was lecturing, and who viewed with horror the spread of reformed doctrine and practice in England. But the clash does not appear to have been instigated so much by Hooper's preaching as by Bonner's. The *Greyfriars' Chronicle* records that on Sept. 1st, 1549, Edmund Bonner preached at Paul's Cross and afterwards was accused before the Council by two people, a minister named William Latimer and John Hooper himself.[106] Martin Micron makes plain the basis of the accusation in a letter to Bullinger. "The Bishop of London preached on the 1st September at St. Paul's to a most numerous congregation, and maintained with all his might the corporal presence in the Lord's Supper, which Hooper had strenuously opposed in that day's lecture. The same bishop was ordered in his sermon to inform the people, that the king is no less to be obeyed as a boy, than if he were an old man, and that his decrees possessed the same authority. The bishop omitted to do this."[107] It appears that some of those in opposition to the Reformation during Edward VI's reign adopted the position that laws made during the minority of a king were invalid.[108] It is easy to imagine Hooper, knowing that Bonner was supposed to make this declaration, seizing the opportunity of its omission to gain influence with the authorities by calling attention to the fact. There can be little doubt that the majority of the Council welcomed the opportunity of silencing Bonner, and according to the *Greyfriars' Chronicle*, Cranmer was responsible for putting Hooper up to preach at St. Paul's Cross where "he spoke much against the Bishop of London."[109] By the end of September, 1549, Bonner was in prison and it is perhaps not surprising to find Micron recording that the Archbishop of Canterbury had become somewhat more favourably disposed towards Hooper.[110] The latter might clearly be a useful instrument in certain circumstances.

Hooper did not clash only with the Romanist sympathisers.

He complained that his lectures were disturbed by the Anabaptists who attended in large numbers. It is clear that these Anabaptists had a defective Christology which became known as Hoffmannite.[111] Hooper indicated that they denied altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh, and said also that they believed that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin. It is interesting to note that Hooper seems to have been very successful in dealing with these Anabaptists, for not only did he write a pamphlet against them but he also was sent down to Kent and Essex to deal with strong groups of Anabaptists there.[112] It is certain that Hooper's lectures were anything but orderly and quiet and it is recorded that one, Edward Underhill, became known as "Hooper's champion" on account of his defence of Hooper against "raylynge billis cast into the pulpitt."[113]

In the late autumn of 1549 Hooper's progress and safety became endangered by the fall from power of his patron the Duke of Somerset, who joined Bonner in prison. The man behind this change was the unscrupulous Earl of Warwick, later created Duke of Northumberland. For a brief period Hooper was uncertain which way this new Protector would jump. If it had been towards a reaction in favour of Romanist doctrine and men like Bonner were set free, then Hooper had no illusions as to what would happen. If Bonner is restored to his bishopric then, says Hooper, "I shall, I doubt not, be restored to my country and my father which is in heaven."[114] But although all lecturing and preaching was stopped temporarily, permission to continue was soon restored, and it became plain that Warwick was going to look with favour on the Protestant party and notably on extreme Protestants like Hooper.

By the end of the year 1549, seven months after his arrival from Zürich, Hooper's influence in high places had increased greatly. He can claim that Cranmer "is now very friendly towards myself" and that there are now "more favourers of God's word in his majesty's Council who with activity and courage defend the cause of Christ."[115] It is interesting to discover Hooper reporting that Cranmer now had some articles of religion to which he required all preachers and lecturers in divinity to subscribe. Whether these articles were a first draft of the 42 articles which were to appear three years later is a matter of conjecture. They may well have been, especially as we shall see, when Hooper produced some articles for his diocese in Gloucester in 1550 he anticipated several of the 42. The article which dealt with the Lord's Supper was reckoned by Hooper to be satisfactory. As far as Cranmer's personal opinion is concerned Hooper can go so far as to say that "now as I hope, Master Bullinger and Canterbury entertain the same opinions."[116] Whether Hooper was right or not is very difficult to say, for even today, four hundred years later, the

question as to Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist is still being actively argued. In addition to Cranmer, Hooper has by personal contacts discovered that there are six or seven other bishops who "comprehend the doctrine of Christ as far as it relates to the Lord's Supper, with as much clearness and piety as one could desire."[117] So far so good. But Hooper has his eyes on no less a figure than the young king, Edward VI. The time was ripe for influence to be brought to bear directly on the king and how better than by the dedication of a book to him by Bullinger. This suggestion Hooper passed on to his Zürich friend.[118]

THE SERMONS ON JONAH

On the afternoon of February 5th, 1550, as Hooper was writing a letter to Bullinger, a summons came for him from the Archbishop of Canterbury. When Hooper returned after the interview and took up his pen to continue his letter it was with great excitement that he told his friend that he had been ordered by Cranmer, in the name of the king and Council, to preach before the king once a week during Lent.[119] It was the practice to have a sermon preached at court each Wednesday and Friday during Lent. Hooper had been chosen to preach on Wednesdays and Ponet on Fridays. Here was the opportunity for which Hooper must have been waiting, and it was one which he seized with both hands to further his mission. He took for his subject the book of Jonah because, he told Bullinger, "it will enable me freely to touch upon the duties of individuals."[120] These sermons on *Jonah*,[121] although trying the patience of the reader with their numerous digressions, deserve to be studied. They contain in summary form Hooper's manifesto for the reformation of England according to the Zürich practices. As Latimer had done before him, so Hooper attacked the social and economic evils of his age, but his chief concern was to present to his influential congregation his ideal of the reformed church in England. There can be little doubt but that the seven sermons preached before the king contain the heart of Hooper's beliefs and that what he preached to the king and his court was the same message that he had preached to the crowds of London citizens at Paul's Cross. It is not possible here to quote extensively from his sermons, but it is worth recalling and illustrating once again how faithfully Hooper had learnt the theological lessons of Zürich.

The authority for doctrine and practice is the Bible.

> "And this note, Christian reader, that the prophet calleth false and vain religion vanity. So judge thou of every religion that is not contained within the Word of God, to be nothing else than vanity, from whencesoever it cometh."

"For Christ was and is wisdom of the father, and the apostles had received the Holy Ghost that brought them into all truth: therefore it must needs follow, their doings and ministration to be most perfect, holy and religious."[122]

The task of the Christian man is to keep his side of the covenant.

"But what thing, after the right judgment of the Scripture, chiefly pleaseth God? Obedience: that is to say, when every man in his state and his vocation doth the thing he is commanded to do; as it is written 1 Samuel 13 'I desire obedience, and not sacrifice'."[123]

As for the comments of the sermons on the Lord's Supper—they are legion. Hooper must have strained the patience of his hearers by his interminable discussions on the phrase "this is my body." It was in these sermons that Hooper made his demand for a simple form of administration of the Lord's Supper with the congregation sitting around the simple table.

These points we have noted in detail earlier, but certainly the pronouncement in these sermons which caused most stir and had the most immediate and far-reaching consequences was his attack on an oath and on vestments. These had been prescribed in the Ordinal published in 1549 by the authority of the bishops. Hooper said:

"I happened to see of late a certain book for the making of deacons, priests and bishops, wherein is required an oath by saints; whereat I did not a little wonder. . . . I am led to think it to be the fault of the corrector in the printing, for two causes: one is, because in the oath for the bishop is no mention made of any saints; the other cause is, that in the same book the minister must confess, at the receiving of his vocaion, that the book of God, the Holy Scripture, to be perfect and sufficient for the salvation of man, yet do I much marvel that in the same book it is appointed, that he that will be admitted to the ministry of God's word or his sacraments, must come in white vestments; which seemeth to repugn plainly with the former doctrine that confessed the only Word of God to be sufficient. And sure I am, they have not in the Word of God, that thus a minister should be apparelled, nor yet in the primitive and best church."[124]

The immediate result of this sermon was a summons to Hooper to appear before the Council. Cranmer reprimanded him severely for his censure of the oath. It was not in fact a printer's error, but may quite possibly have been an oversight on the part of the compilers. Nevertheless the Ordinal was issued with the authority of the bishops and any challenge to any part of the book constituted a challenge to their authority. There was a long argument between Hooper and the bishops. This was but a prelude of things to come. It was an indication of the different points of view taken by Hooper and by the bishops. Hooper's idea of reformation was uncompromising and absolute—only the doctrine and practice recorded in the Word of God were permissible.

OTHER INFLUENCES SUPPORTING HOOPER

(*a*) *Henry Bullinger.* Although Bullinger never visited England—indeed it seems he scarcely left Zürich during his whole lifetime—he carried on a considerable correspondence with Englishmen and with foreigners in England from the early 1540s until his death in 1575. During the reign of Edward VI Bullinger was in close touch with Peter Martyr, the Regius Professor at Oxford and with a group of Swiss students studying in that university and acting as his " personal representatives " in England. He also corresponded with Richard Cox, tutor to the king and Chancellor of Oxford University. Bullinger's contact with the ill-fated Lady Jane Grey is well known and her letters to him, written in perfect handwriting, may still be seen in the Zürich Library. He also knew her father, the Marquis of Dorset, later Duke of Suffolk, and dedicated his fifth Decade of sermons to him.

We have already noted Hooper's request that Bullinger should dedicate a book to Edward VI. Bullinger obeyed with a dedication of his third and fourth Decades of sermons to the king. When the young king came to read the dedication at the beginning of the third series of Decades he would find that the theme of the dedication was familiar and was one which he had certainly heard many times before from Hooper and others.

> " I dare boldly avow, that those kings shall flourish and be in happy case which wholly give and submit themselves and their kingdom to Jesus Christ . . . acknowledging him to be the mightiest prince and monarch of all, and themselves his vassals, subjects and servants; which, finally, do not follow in all their affairs their own mind and judgment, the laws of men that are contrary to God's commandments . . . but do both themselves follow the very laws of the mightiest king and eternal monarch, and also cause them to be followed throughout all their kingdom reforming both themselves and all theirs by the rule of God's holy word."[125]

The king received this book favourably and another of Bullinger's correspondents, Bartholomew Traheron, informed him that the king " both loves you and acknowledges the religion of Christ to be exceedingly well established among you."[126] Before the year 1550 was out these sermons had been translated into English.[127]

Encouraged by this favourable reception, Bullinger followed up with a still more explicit statement in the dedication of the fourth Decade of his sermons to Edward. He wrote :

> " neither are they worthy to be heard, who think that the canonical scriptures are not plain enough, full enough, or sufficient enough, to minister a perfect platform of reformation. . . . Proceed, therefore, proceed, most holy king to imitate the most godly princes and the infallible rule of the holy scripture. Proceed, I say, without staying for man's authority, by the most true and absolute instrument of truth, the book of God's most holy word, to reform the Church of Christ in England."[128]

Thus was the weight of Bullinger's personal influence thrown into the scale in the support of Hooper and his mission.

(*b*) *The Strangers' Church.* The second influence was a group of foreign exiles in London. The leader, and the most influential of this group, was John A'Lasco who returned to England in the summer of 1550 and who is known to have had "a high regard" for Zürich.[129] With A'Lasco were Martin Micron, Jan Utenhove and Richard Vauville. The members of this group were all strong and consistent supporters of Hooper and in return sought his help. A'Lasco's desire was to be able to establish a foreigner's church in London. A letter is preserved from A'Lasco to Utenhove asking him to arrange for a meeting with Hooper, seemingly to discuss matters connected with the founding of such a church.[130] There is a postscript from Hooper added to the original letter accepting the invitation to this meeting. That Hooper would help them if he could was to be expected. His connections with the would-be leaders of the Strangers' Church were closer than is sometimes realised. Martin Micron was very friendly with the Hoopers and lived with them in London from the time of their arrival together in May, 1549 until the autumn of 1550. Jan Utenhove had also lived for a time with the Hooper family and Richard Vauville had married Anne Hooper's maid Joanna. Hooper was of course known to John A'Lasco and although there is no evidence of close personal friendship before this meeting in London, it is clear that they found each other kindred spirits. Then again, apart from his personal connections with these leaders who desired to gain a charter for the Strangers' Church, Hooper would, of course, also find a theological kinship. These men all were sympathetic towards the teaching and the practice of Hooper's beloved Zürich church, and no doubt Hooper saw that if a church could be set up in London which showed in practice the ideas which he had been preaching so vigorously for the last year, then the authorities could scarcely fail to be impressed. Hooper saw in the Strangers' Church and its ministers a very real ally in his mission.

When this application for a charter came to the Council in July, 1550, Hooper's influence on the Council was fairly strong and, as Cranmer also seems to have favoured the project, the charter for the church was issued on July 24th.[131] This charter gave permission to them to institute a pure ministry of the Word and sacraments according to the apostolic form—and more remarkable still, this Strangers' Church was to be exempt from all jurisdiction of the bishops. It is not surprising that some of the bishops, notably Ridley, Bishop of London, in whose diocese the church lay, objected to the plan. Ridley himself tended towards extremes in reform. When he had been Bishop of Rochester he had made a name for himself as one who replaced altars by tables. On his translation

to London in April, 1550, to replace the imprisoned Bonner he continued this work. Hooper had welcomed him as an ally although claiming that the replacement of altars in London had begun before Ridley's arrival.[132] But now this same Ridley was objecting to two challenges to his episcopal authority. Both these challenges were connected with Hooper. One was this charter for the Stranggers' Church with Hooper in the background. The other was the vestment controversy in which Hooper played the leading rôle. It was not until Ridley could see success in his resistance to the challenge of the latter that the difficulties in the way of A'Lasco's Strangers' Church were finally removed.

THE VESTMENT CONTROVERSY

No essay on Hooper can be complete without some treatment of the Vestment Controversy. It was in this controversy that the ultimate logic of Hooper's principles was first clearly seen, and we, looking back, can discern that it was clearly a portent of things to come in English church history.

It is not our purpose to write a full history of the controversy, which dragged on for nearly a year. We are concerned simply to give an outline of the events and to indicate Hooper's principles in acting as he did. The first move which led to this controversy came as a direct result of the sermons preached by Hooper before the king in Lent. At the end of these sermons, at Easter, the Council, acting on behalf of the king, offered the bishopric of Gloucester to Hooper. Hooper refused this office "on many accounts" but chiefly on account of the "impious oath" which the bishop was compelled to take at his installation, and of the "Aaronic vestments" which the bishops had to wear not only when administering the sacraments, but also at public worship.[133]

The oath to which Hooper objected was that of the king's supremacy—not that he objected to the oath of supremacy as such—but his objection was that the oath ended "so help me God, all saints and the holy evangelist."[134] This oath, prescribed by the Ordinal of 1549, which was issued by the episcopal authority, had already involved Hooper in a clash with Cranmer as we have seen. Hooper now flatly refused to swear by saints.

Hooper, in addition, objected to wearing all forms of clerical vestment. The vestments to which he objected were those then in use in England.[135] These were, for the priest or deacon officiating at services other than mass, a loose white gown or surplice. When officiating at mass, however, they replaced the surplice by a tighter fitting alb and over this they put a gown with a cross embroidered on the back. For wear outside the church the priest or deacon usually wore a black gown and a four-cornered hat. Bishops wore a scarlet overgown called a Chimere with white linen sleeves and

underneath it, instead of the surplice, a white garment called a rochet.

These two objections of Hooper's reached the ears of the king and on May 15th, 1550, Hooper was called before the Council to state why he should refuse this call to a bishopric. The ensuing discussion in the Council centred on vestments. There was a long and stormy debate on the matter in which Hooper was strongly supported by the Duke of Somerset, lately released from custody. Eventually it was agreed that the matter of vestments was one of indifference and the inference seems to have been that it was up to each individual to decide whether they should be worn or not.[136] This point of view was carried in the Council chiefly, it seems, by the Duke of Somerset's influence and against the wishes of almost all the bishops.[137] Nevertheless, it was carried, Hooper's point was made and he was to be "freed from all defilement of superstition,"[138] as he himself puts it, in his acceptance of the bishopric. The Council book records simply "at Grenewiche the XVth Maye 1550. Mr. Hoper was constituted busshop of Gloucester."[139] Thus Hooper was now a bishop, at least on paper. There was natural rejoicing among his supporters and the news was passed to Bullinger in Zürich, who noted the fact of Hooper's appointment in his diary[140] and passed on the good news to his friends. On July 11th, for example, Bullinger wrote to his friend Matthew Erbius that Hooper had been made Bishop of Gloucester and that "great things are expected from him."[141]

On July 3rd the patent for the bishopric was issued recording "grant to John Hoper, professor of theology, of the bishopric of Gloucester."[142] Hooper appeared before the king and Council on July 20th for confirmation of the grant, and the question of the oath of supremacy rose again. It is reported that the king seeing that the oath required the recipient to swear by saints, "became much excited" and said, "what wickedness is here, Hooper?" Hooper re-emphasised his arguments that a man should swear by God alone and convinced the king, who struck out the offending clause with his own pen.[143] King Edward's own personal journal records for July 20th "Houper was made bishop of Gloucestre."[144] Once again it seemed that Hooper's problems were settled, but he was still a bishop on paper only. The secular authorities had allowed his objections, but the bishops had by no means accepted the matter as settled.

The Earl of Warwick wrote to Cranmer on July 23rd on behalf of the king and Council. In this letter Warwick indicated that Hooper should be consecrated without the use of the oath.[145] Hooper himself took this letter to Cranmer. Cranmer presumably accepted the matter of the oath but on the question of vestments he referred Hooper to Ridley who would be responsible for the

actual consecration. Ridley refused to use any other form of consecration than that which had been prescribed by Parliament, i.e. that in the Ordinal of 1549, which stated that the elected bishop should wear a surplice and cope. In other words he refused to allow the authority of a ceremony put out by the bishops to be overruled by the objections of one man. Hooper therefore returned to the Council with this news and on July 30th obtained definite permission from them to be consecrated "without any superstition."[146] A letter was therefore sent on August 5th to Cranmer and the bishops giving them permission to omit certain of the ceremonies of the consecration which were against Hooper's conscience.[147] Once again Ridley refused. He did more than refuse, he went himself to the Council and said that it was true that vestments were matters indifferent, but added therefore they could be retained and demanded by the Church without any harm to anybody. This was a different interpretation of the conception of "things indifferent" than had earlier been agreed upon by the Council. It would appear that they decided on May 15th that if a thing was "indifferent" it could be left to each individual's conscience to decide whether to use it or not. Ridley's arguments turned the Council against Hooper who, when he came to the Council shortly afterwards, found that they would not listen to his arguments. He therefore requested to be allowed to put his arguments in writing. This request was granted.

During the month of September the point of view of the bishops became clear. They refused to depart in the slightest from the form of consecration prescribed. They were in an awkward position, for as Peter Martyr pointed out when he wrote to Bullinger later, it was very difficult for the bishops to have the prescribed use of vestments, put forward by their authority and by that of Parliament and which had been used for more than a year, now described as ungodly.[148] The bishops reiterated that vestments were things indifferent and that therefore it rests with the authorities to decide whether such things should be used in the church or not.

The bishops were trying to force Hooper to submit to their ceremonies and such an attitude brought out Hooper's opposition. He referred everything to apostolic ceremonies. He denied that vestments were matters of indifference, for they obscured the dignity of Christ's priesthood and nurtured superstition.[149] Hooper wrote during September to Warwick to this effect but Warwick by now had gone over to the bishops' side and replied that the king must be obeyed in matters of indifference. Warwick added that one must avoid placing a stumbling block in the way of the weak, just as Paul did when he made a vow and was shorn, and when he circumcised Timothy.[150]

The issue was thus clear. The bishops said that vestments were

things indifferent and on such matters the authorities must decide. Nominally these were the king and magistrates, but actually they merely enforced the decisions of the ecclesiastical, i.e. episcopal authority. Hooper now denied that vestments were things indifferent and took his stand firmly on the principle that only the practices of the primitive church as reflected in the Bible should be followed.

In this fixed frame of mind, and at the height of the controversy, Hooper submitted to the Council a statement on October 3rd. This statement has recently come to light.[151] The manuscript which has been found is not complete but there is enough to show Hooper's main emphases. It must, however, be said immediately that from the point of view of logic the document is very poor. Ridley, who was told to answer it, had no difficulty at all in pointing out the errors of logic and even contradictions, which appear. Undoubtedly Hooper wrote in the heat of the controversy and when tempers are aroused logic tends to get lost.

The manuscript bears the heading "from the book of Hooper to the king's counsellors, produced by him, 3rd October, 1550, against the use of vestments which the Anglican church uses in the sacred ministry."[152] Then comes Hooper's main thesis which is as follows:

> "There is nothing to be had in use in the church which has not either its authority from the expressed Word of God, or else is of itself, a thing indifferent, which thing when used, profits nothing and when omitted does no harm.
> "The particular vestments in the ministry do not have the Word of God unless they are ordained, nor are they, of themselves, things indifferent. Therefore they ought not to be in use."[153]

This absolute appeal to Scripture is what we should expect of Hooper. From the point of view of a strict appeal to Scripture he is quite right, that vestments are not ordained in the Word of God. Hooper's difficulties, however, began when he tried to define what he meant by "things indifferent." He continues his argument:

> "The first part of the argument is so clearly true that it needs no proof. Concerning the second part, I would point out that by nature . . . all things indifferent ought, of necessity, to have these four conditions and properties, otherwise they are not indifferent."[154]

In laying down the four conditions for "things indifferent," Hooper clearly had in mind that he was going on to show that vestments could not comply with these conditions. What Hooper however succeeded in doing was to produce four conditions which were not consistent with each other and which made it just about impossible for any practice to fall into the category of a "thing indifferent." Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that his four conditions, taken together are valueless as a definition of a "thing indifferent," when

taken separately they provide further interesting and clear evidence of the direction in which Hooper's teaching was leading him. After he had stated his four conditions, Hooper then added further expansion to each point, relating these points to the question of vestments in particular. For the sake of clarity, however, as the original document is confused in the extreme, we will mention each point in turn together with Hooper's expanded explanation of it. The contradictory nature of the conditions, both among themselves and also for the main thesis given above, will be self-evident and need not again be remarked upon.

(*a*) *The First Condition.*

> "Things indifferent ought to have their origins and foundation in the Word of God for what cannot be proved from the Word of God is not from faith, for faith is from the hearing of the Word of God (Romans 10). Indeed what is not from faith cannot be something indifferent, but, as the Scripture says, truly is sin (Romans 14)."[155]

In this condition Hooper strikes once again at the roots of any idea of practices being allowed in the church which are not vouched for in the Word. Traditional usage which has grown up in the church through the years cannot be allowed of itself to sanction any practice in the church. There must be a complete break with all tradition which had grown up in medieval times, even in things indifferent, and an unconditional return to the apostolic practice.

In his application of this condition to vestments Hooper suggests that the only mention of vestments in the Word is confined to the Aaronic priesthood, the ceremonies and practices of which are shown in the apostolic writings to be only types and shadowy figures. Hooper returns to this point in his second condition.[156]

Hooper further tells the Council that people who claim vestments as "things indifferent"

> "ought to show us from these books (i.e. the apostolic writings) why and when some . . . particular vestments ought to be employed in the ministry, for the adornment of the minister himself or the preservation of dignity or for some distinction whereby the minister should be separated from the people, just as formerly it was ordered by the Lord in the ministry of the Aaronic priests. But the statutes, books, and decrees of the apostles and evangelists make no mention of this fact."[157]

This application provides evidence, which may be confirmed from the rest of Hooper's writings,[158] of Hooper's view of the ministry. The minister does not belong to a "priestly caste" and therefore he should not wear vestments as if he were a priest. Further, the task of the minister is to serve the people in the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments, thus it is not right that the minister should dress himself up in special vestments in an attempt to make his office one of superiority. The Aaronic

priesthood was separated from the people by its priestly office, and thus priests wore special clothes to indicate this separation. A Christian minister, however, Hooper implies, should not be thus separated from the people, he is one of them, his task is a functional one. When a man becomes a minister there is no question of his being transferred to a different class in the church, he is simply a believer who is performing the function of a minister.

Therefore, Hooper concludes, as the writings of the apostles and evangelists make no mention of the use of vestments in the apostolic church, vestments lack the first condition of a " thing indifferent " and cannot be reckoned as such.

At the end of his statement on this first condition Hooper supports his case with quotations from church history.[159] Two quotations are taken from Polydore Vergil's *De Inventoribus Librum.* Speaking concerning vestments Polydore says, " From whencesoever these things may have originated they altogether refer to Hebrew rather than apostolic institutions."[160] Hooper returns to this quotation later. The second quotation is: " At the beginning of the rising church the priests, when about to conduct divine worship, were not accustomed to put on any additional garment."[161] Concerning this appeal to the practice of the early church, Ridley, in his reply to Hooper, denied the validity of the principle that " it is not lawful, because they (the early church) did it not."[162] Ridley suggested that this doctrine was " the very mother and wellspring of many both old and new schisms,"[163] because the result of such teaching was a failure to consider " the diversity of times concerning the external ecclesiastical polity, or the true liberty of the Christian religion in external rites and ceremonies."[164] Ridley saw the situation clearly. It was exactly this difference of principle which separated him from Hooper, and which, in the reign of Elizabeth I caused some of the Puritans to refuse to conform to the English church. Ridley and the other bishops could not possibly come to agreement with Hooper for the two parties started from different pre-suppositions. Hooper's pre-supposition was the authority of the Bible only, Ridley's was the authority of the Bible together with the freedom of the Church to institute external rites and ceremonies as the " diversity of the times "demanded.

(*b*) *The Second Condition.* The second condition that Hooper demands of a " thing indifferent " is that it should not be compulsory but " that it may be left free for us to use or not to use according as it will seem expedient or inexpedient to the conscience of the user."[165] Having said this, Hooper returns to his favourite theme and defines what is compulsory saying, " those things which are commanded by God are of a necessity always to be obeyed and those things which are prohibited must always of necessity be avoided and shunned.[166] He then adds a note concerning exegesis :

> "But not only what is ordered or prohibited by the spoken Word of God, but even all knowledge of the divine will which can necessarily be deduced and assembled from the collation and comparison of the scriptures amongst themselves, has power and nature of the divine will, whether as a command or as a prohibition, provided it agrees with the nature and symmetry of the faith and Scripture."[167]

It is of interest to note that as an example of this Hooper cites infant baptism which is commanded "not indeed by spoken words but by the collation of the Scriptures among themselves."[168] Obviously this condition and the first, which stated that "things indifferent" must have their origin in Scripture, can scarcely stand together. If all in the Scripture is bound to be followed as God's will, there can be no room at all for the category of a "thing indifferent."

In the application of the second condition to vestments Hooper says "vestments lack the second mark and condition of 'things indifferent.' What is prohibited by God can in no way be indifferent as we pointed out above."[169] He refers to *Galatians* ii. 18, "For if I build up again those things which I destroyed, I proved myself a transgressor." On the basis of this text Hooper suggests that whoever tries to reinstitute things fulfilled in Christ transgresses the will of the Lord. He goes on to say that the priesthood of Aaron is clearly abolished in the priesthood of Christ (*Hebrews* vii,-10). The rites, vestments, etc. of the Aaronic priesthood were abrogated. This priesthood pointed to Christ yet to come. Now Christ had come and "those shadows of the Aaronic priesthood cannot consist together with the priesthood of Christ."[170] Hence the quotation from Polydore, to which Hooper refers back, that vestments refer to Hebrew rather than apostolic institution. If the Aaronic priesthood cannot consist with the priesthood of Christ "much less (can) that Popish priesthood which even by the testimony of their own books has been derived either from Aaron or from the Gentiles."[171]

(*c*) *The Third Condition.* The third requirement for "things indifferent" is that they "ought to have a manifest and open utility known in the church, lest they seem to be received in vain or thrust in by fraud and craft into the church."[172] Hooper takes the opportunity to warn civil magistrates and ministers of the church against bringing into the church anything which will not contribute to the building up of that church. Unfortunately, Hooper's expansion of this third condition is missing in the manuscript, but it is possible from Ridley's reply to gather something of what Hooper wrote.

Hooper apparently suggested that vestments were not "things indifferent" as they had no definite use in the church. He then reiterated the suggestion that anyway each person should be allowed to judge on the matter. Ridley's reply says "the church hath received these vestments by lawful authority, and with an agreeable consent, for causes to them seem to be godly. . . . If every

subject shall be a judge, what profiteth or not profiteth, what order then shall follow?"[173] Hooper next seems to have gone on and objected again to ministers wearing vestments on the grounds that it separated him from the people. A minister should not be known by his outer garments and Hooper apparently went so far as to protest against the distinction implied in the words "clergy" and "laity." In support of this Hooper probably quoted 1 *Peter* ii. 9, "But ye are . . . a royal priesthood," and explicitly stated his belief in the literal priesthood of all believers. Ridley's reply is as follows:

> "I do . . . count it no more an inconvenience that some be called, men of the clergy, and some, men of the laity, than in the university, that some be called 'scholars' and some 'men of the town' although indeed they both dwell within one town. But St. Peter calleth all men priests. What then, I pray you, will you thereof gather, that all men must have priests apparel, or one kind of apparel?"[174]

This reply of Ridley's at this point evaded the issue. Hooper had claimed that all believers were priests and that therefore those believers who were called to exercise the function of the ministry should not be distinguished from their fellow believers by outward vestments. Hooper's point was that the practice should be that ministers should wear their normal clothing in their ministry. To suggest, as Ridley does, that the implication of Hooper's argument was that all men should wear the same clothes was to miss the point. The remainder of Hooper's expansion is too obscure to be reconstructed with any certainty from Ridley's reply.

(*d*) *The Fourth Condition.* The fourth and last condition which Hooper stated for a "thing indifferent" is that it "ought to be instituted in the church with a kind of apostolic and evangelical lenity and freedom, not by a kind of violent tyranny."[175] Anything that has been tyrannically enforced and abused ceases to be a "thing indifferent." Once again the expansion of this condition in which Hooper applies it to vestments in particular is still missing, but Ridley's reply can give some idea of what Hooper said. The logical application of this condition obviously is that the appointed vestments in use in the English church were not instituted by apostolic lenity but by tyranny; therefore they were not "things indifferent." This would have been a frontal attack upon the whole system of ecclesiastical and civil authority in the English church. Apparently Hooper did not, in fact, draw this logical conclusion from his fourth condition. But if he did not explicitly draw this conclusion, Ridley rightly felt that this attack was implicit in Hooper's fourth condition. Ridley replied:

> "I pray you, who hath appointed now and instituted our vestments in the church of England; and who have established them? Hath not the Archbishop with his company of learned men thereunto appointed by the king, his highness, and his majesty's Council appointed them? Hath not the king, his majesty, and whole Parliament

> established them? If then this fourth note had been followed as it was proposed, what would have followed after, the wise may perceive. And though it follow not in words, yet it is evident what followeth in meaning."[176]

It was clear to Ridley that in Hooper's challenge to the authority of the church on the question of vestments there lay the seeds of a far greater challenge. Ridley and the English bishops fiercely and successfully resisted Hooper's challenge but it inevitably came again in Elizabeth I's reign with greater force, and then it could not be beaten off.

The expansion of the fourth condition which Hooper, in fact, made, as Ridley said, little agreed with the fourth condition. To his statement concerning the tyrannical imposition of "things indifferent" Hooper merely added: "I dare as well defend the altar stones, holy bread and holy water, yea and images too, with as good authority as they defend vestments."[177] To this statement Ridley simply replied "This man putteth no difference between 'adiaphora vera' and 'pseudo diaphora' as all other men do that write upon the matter."[178]

In addition to the four conditions and their expansions Hooper added three further dangerous points addressed chiefly to the magistrates. The first point was probably the most dangerous. Hooper said,

> "that (authority) which pertains to the civil state our controversy does not touch. And so I would not willingly wish the state of this our controversy to be turned from the ecclesiastical state to the civil by anyone, which our opponents for the most part do; every one of them does not willingly suffer the cause to be examined and decided in their own ecclesiastical council, but power and aid are begged from the civil authority and from magistrates."[179]

Hooper was daring to infer in a statement to the King's Council that the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate did not extend to authority in the church. This must have savoured very much of Anabaptism and no doubt helped to strengthen opposition against him.[180] It was dangerous talk indeed in the England of 1550.

The second point Hooper made was to warn the magistrates against those who were venturing to persuade them of the value of vestments. As Ridley said in his reply, this was an attack on all those ministers "that do allow and approve the order of the Book of Common Prayer."[181] Hooper did not mince his words but called them dreamers who wished to retain "the shows of vestments in the church . . . for the purpose of preserving utility, decorum and rank in the ministry."[182] He warns the magistrates that the result will be "an ensuing scorn of the magistrates and the greatest lessening of their authority in civil administration and government."[183] Hooper continues the attack on the support of the vestments,

> "O children of this world wiser in your generations than the children of light (St. Luke 16: 8), you who can persuade the magistrates so easily that adversaries are friends, and friends adversaries, and (persuade them) . . . to protect, to sustain, to embellish and defend your superstitious and blind church . . . more than the perfect and enlightened church of the apostles."[184]

Such an attack can hardly have helped Hooper's cause, but it represents an impassioned plea to the Council for a more thorough reformation and a return to the simplicity and perfection of the apostolic church.

Hooper's third point is that he will maintain his position unto death. He challenges his opponents to take up their cause and to uphold it in the sacred volume of the Bible, because, he says, "the book is both yours and mine, your judge and mine."[185] He goes on to say that he will be willing to be punished by death,

> "if I do not prove my cause to be good and your cause to be bad, either according to the example of the church of the apostles, or the church of anyone else which, in this our age, is administered according to the Word of God."

Hooper no doubt had in mind to point to the Zürich church as an example of the latter.[186]

These then are the main points of the document which Hooper submitted to the Council on October 3rd, 1550. That it is confused, illogical, repetitive and contradictory when considered as a whole is undeniable. Nevertheless, in its individual clauses which argue for the absolute authority of the Bible in all matters, a return to the simplicity of the apostolic church, the freedom of judgment for the individual, the literal interpretation of the priesthood of all believers, and even for the freedom of the church from magisterial control, added evidence is provided that in the Vestment Controversy between Hooper and the English episcopal bench there can be seen many of the seeds of English Puritanism.

As a result of Hooper's document to the Council, Ridley was sent for by the Council on October 6th, and sharply told this controversy had gone far enough and should cease. Ridley asked permission to put in writing his point of view in answer to Hooper's document. This permission was granted[187] and Ridley went away to reply to Hooper.

In the meantime Hooper was attempting to rally support to his cause. A'Lasco and the Strangers' Church were on his side. That he knew. In fact A'Lasco wrote a letter, probably about this time, to Cranmer mentioning two points.[188] The first point contained an argument for the abolition of kneeling at the Lord's Supper, the second point argued for the abolition of vestments. Hooper sought also the support of Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer. On October 17th he wrote to both these men and sent the letter by

a messenger first to Martyr in Oxford and then to Bucer in Cambridge. In his letter to Bucer Hooper said: "You will understand from this dispatch the cause which has involved me in strife. I entreat you to be good enough to give it a single perusal and if you find anything amiss, I pray you to point it out to me by letter"[189] Hooper waited anxiously in London for their replies.

On October 19th Ridley came to the Council with his reply to Hooper's submission of October 3rd. Hooper was also present and there was a violent scene between the two men. Hooper was refused a copy of Ridley's reply. But he remained stedfast in his opposition to "all relics of popery."[190]

About a month later Hooper received the replies from Martyr and Bucer.[191] Neither of these two would take his side. Both agreed that it would be a good thing if the church was restored to the apostolic simplicity but they also both agreed that vestments were not a matter worth disputing about, for as Martyr wrote: "If we would first suffer the gospel to be spread abroad and to take deep root, perhaps men would better and more easily be persuaded to take away these outward garments."[192] From these replies it is clear that Hooper had used very much the same basic arguments in his dispatch to Martyr and Bucer as he had in his submission to the Council of October 3rd. So by the end of November Hooper found himself opposed by everyone of note except A'Lasco. But he remained firm.

Soon Hooper's troubles increased, for the Council, by now no doubt thoroughly convinced by Ridley that Hooper was in the wrong, commanded him "to keep his house, unless it were to go to the bishop of Canterbury, Ely, London or Lincoln, for counsel or satisfaction of his conscience . . . and neither to preach nor read (i.e. expound the scripture) till he had further licence from the Council."[193] The date of this command is not known but it was probably about the beginning of December. Soon after this Hooper wrote a brief and pathetic letter to Bullinger indicating the danger he was in and remarking that only A'Lasco stood by him.[194] Hooper further increased the danger of the situation by writing and publishing *A Godly Confession and Protestacion of the Christian Faith made and set furth by Jhon Hooper.*[195] In this confession there is a lengthy statement of his views on magistrates and repudiation of the views of the Anabaptists. This was no doubt a result of accusations made against him on account of the extreme views he gave in his submission of October 3rd. The dedication of the confession was to the king and is dated December 20th. It is perhaps some indication of the interest which the controversy had aroused that two editions of his confession were published in the last ten days of 1550.

Hooper had asked for trouble by this act of publication, and

he got it. The entry for January 13th, 1551, in the Acts of the Privy Council records,[196] "This day Mr. Hooper, bishop-elect of Gloucester, appeared before the Council touching his old matter of denial to wear such apparel as other bishops." As Hooper had failed to keep his house as ordered, and as he had published his *Godly Confession* and as he was stedfast in the matter of not wearing the bishop's vestments "he was now committed to the bishop of Canterbury's custody, either there to be reformed or further to be punished as the obstinacy of his case requireth."

In spite of attempts by Peter Martyr to dissuade him Hooper remained firm in his stand. The Council were thus faced with the question what to do next. Cranmer reported to them that Hooper was immovable. They therefore decided upon drastic action. The entry for January 27th, 1551 records,[197] "Upon a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, that Mr. Hooper cannot be brought to any conformity and coveteth to prescribe orders and necessary laws of his head, it was agreed he should be committed to the Fleet." On the same day a letter was sent from the Council to the warden of the Fleet Prison to receive the said Mr. Hooper and to keep him from conference of any person saving the ministers of that house."[198]

So at the end of January, 1551 Hooper found himself in prison. His imprisonment only lasted just over a fortnight. On February 15th he wrote a letter of surrender to Cranmer. It was a complete and sudden capitulation. The possibility of the arrival of letters from Switzerland influencing this decision suddenly to abandon his position cannot be ruled out.[199] To this must be added another influence, and one which has been almost entirely ignored by writers on the Vestment Controversy. This influence lies in the fact that the next step the authorities probably intended to take was to put Hooper to death. Evidence for this is found in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. It is, however, only to be found in the Latin edition of his work published in Basle in 1559 and did not come through into the more accessible English translation of Foxe's book. In the 1559 edition Foxe wrote of Hooper's capitulation,

> "Thus ended this theological quarrel in the victory of the bishops, Hooper being forced to recant; or, to say the least, being constrained to appear once in public attired after the manner of the other bishops; which, unless he had done, there are those who think the bishops would have endeavoured to take away his life; for his servant told me the Duke of Suffolk sent word to Hooper, who was not ignorant of what they were doing."[200]

This was written only some eight years after the events, and, as the context indicates, Foxe's informant was Hooper's own servant. There seems thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the report.

In his letter to Cranmer Hooper wrote,

> "I now acknowledge the liberty of the sons of God in all external things: which I affirm and believe, neither that they are impious in

> themselves, nor that any use of them is impious in itself, only the abuse, which can be pernicious to all of those who use them superstitiously or otherwise evilly . . . together with Dr. Bucer, Dr. Martyr and all godly and learned men."[201]

Hooper adds that his motive for this surrender is not "dissimulation, or fear, or any other motive, than for the church."[202] This was indeed a change of heart. Hooper now agreed that vestments were not in themselves impious and that therefore they could be used in the church. Only when they were used in connection with false and superstitious doctrines were vestments evil.

Hooper was faced with the choice of spending his life in prison —perhaps even of being put to death—or of capitulating and being allowed to continue his work for the kingdom of God. As Foxe says, "What was Hooper to do? The matter itself was not really worthy of death."[203] Hooper gave in, and was received back into the friendship of the bishops and authorities. He was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester on March 8th. It was, however, conceded to him that he should wear the prescribed vestments only at his consecration, or when preaching before the king, or in his cathedral, or in any other public place. On all other occasions he should dress as he wished.[204]

Hooper's protest against vestments was not just the whim of a stubborn man; it was far more than that. It called for a more thorough reformation according to the Word of God, a clearer break with the medieval Roman traditions and a practical recognition of the theory of the priesthood of all believers. It was a conscious effort on Hooper's part to fulfil his mission and bring the English church into line with the Swiss church he had come to love. In this connection it should not be forgotten that this same Swiss church was, as Knappen says, "The one continental protestant group which gave signs of rising above national limitations to something of the power . . . of its medieval predecessor." Hooper's challenge "was an appeal from the narrowing Erastianism of England to something better."[205] Hooper did not succeed and that was the end of the Vestment Controversy—for the moment. The bishops and their authority had apparently won a resounding victory. But this same challenge, first presented to the English episcopal authority by Hooper, was taken up by others in the reign of Elizabeth I, and then it had far reaching and lasting results in English Puritanism.

(To be concluded)

NOTES.

[92] For Micron (1523-59) see J. H. Gerretsen, *Micronius*, Nijmegen, 1895.

[93] For Bucer's influence in England see C. H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation in England*, Cambridge, 1926, C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*, Blackwells, 1946, and A. E. Harvey, *Bucer in England*, Marburg dissertation, 1906.

[94] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 42; E.T. p. 36; O.L. 1 p. 56. For Utenhove see F. Pijper, *Jan Utenhove Zijn Leven en Ziyne Werken*, 1883.

[95] Pietro Martyr Vermigli (1500-63) accepted the invitation to become Regius Professor of Theology at Oxford in 1547. He remained in England until 1553 and then returned to Strasbourg until 1556 when he moved to Zürich.

[96] Bernadino Ochino (1487-1565) was an ex Franciscan who came to England in 1548 remaining until 1553 when he returned to Zürich.

[97] Z.S.A. E. 11 369: 6/7; E.T. p. 36; O.L. 1, p. 57.

[98] For A'Lasco see H. Dalton, *John A'Lasco*, 1881; A. Kuyper, *Joannis A'Lasco Opera* (2 Vol.), 1886; K. Hein, *Die Sakraments Lehre des J. A'Lasco* 1904.

[99] S.C. S. 70: 5; E T. p. 39; O.L. 2, p. 622, and S.C. S. 70: 1.

[100] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 422; E.T. p. 41; O.L. 1, p. 64.

[101] Hooper's teaching on divorce may be found in E. Wr. p. 380 fol.

[102] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 418; E.T. p. 175; O.L. 1, p. 266.

[103] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 458; E.T. p. 42; O.L. 1, p. 65.

[104] S.C. S. 70: 136.

[105] See Strype *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, Vol. I (Oxford, 1840), p. 269 fol.

[106] *Chronicle of the Greyfriars of London*, ed. J. G. Nichols, London, 1852, published Camden Society, p. 63.

[107] S.C. 71: 98; E.T. p. 363; O.L. 2, p. 557.

[108] See *Latimer's Sermons*, Parker Society Edition, p. 118.

[109] *Chronicle of Greyfriars, op. cit*, p. 63.

[110] S.C. 71: 98; E.T. p. 363; O.L. 2, p. 557.

[111] For a summary of the views of Melchior Hoffmann see Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Von Himmlischen Fleisch Christi*, Tübingen, 1951.

[112] Pamphlet entitled *A Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ that he took his humanity in and of the Blessed Virgin*, is in L. Wr., pp. 1-18. Also Z.S.A. E. II 369: 14/15; E.T. p. 56; O.L. 1, p. 88.

[113] *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation*, ed. J. G. Nichols, London, 1859, Camden Society. Strype records a verdict concerning Hooper's preaching as recorded by a contemporary: "After Hooper began to preach in London . . . he was so admired by the people, that they held him for a prophet, nay they looked upon him as some deity." *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Vol. II, 1, p. 66. Oxford, 1822.

[114] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 420; E.T. p. 44; O.L. 1, p. 70.

[115] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 457; E.T. p. 46; O.L. 1, p. 71.

[116] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 12/13; E.T. p. 48; O.L. 1, p. 77.

[117] Z.S.A. E. II 343: 457; E.T. p. 46; O.L. 1, p. 72.

[118] *Ibid.*

[119] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 12/13; E.T. p. 48; O.L. 1, p. 75.

[120] *Ibid.*

[121] E.Wr. pp. 431-560.

[122] *Ibid*, pp. 500 and 534.

[123] *Ibid*, p. 503.

[124] *Ibid*, p. 479.

[125] The Decades of Sermons were first translated into English in their entirety in 1577 with two further editions in 1584 and 1587. They were

again published by the Parker Society in four volumes in the years 1849-1852, a volume each year. This is the translation to which reference is given in these notes. The present reference is Dec., Vol. II, p. 5.

[126] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 19; E.T. p. 214; O.L. 1, p. 324.

[127] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 205; E.T. p. 274; O.L. 2, p. 415.

[128] Dec., Vol. III, p. 122.

[129] Z.S.A. E. II 338: 1486/87.

[130] Letter in *Ecclesiae Londino Batavae Archivum,* Vol. II, p. 29.

[131] For a full history of this church see J. Lindeboom, *Austin Friars. History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London,* 1550-1950. The Hague, 1950.

[132] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 92; E.T. p. 50; O.L. 2, p. 79.

[133] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 14/15; E.T. p. 55; O.L. 1, p. 87.

[134] *The Two Liturgies with other Documents set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward the Sixth,* ed. Kettley. Parker Society, Cambridge, 1844, p. 169.

[135] For further details of the English Vestments see T. A. Lacey, *The Ecclesiastical Habit in England,* Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, IV (1896-1900), pp. 126-134. N. F. Robinson, *The Black Chimere of Anglican Prelates,* pp. 180-220 in the same volume.

[136] See letters of J. R. Stumph in Z.S.A. E. II 335/2149; E.T. p. 308; O.L. 2, p. 466; and S.C. S. 72: 217.

[137] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 94; E.T. p. 270; O.L. 2, p. 410.

[138] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 14/15; E.T. p. 56; O.L. 1, p. 87.

[139] Acts of the Privy Council of England, Vol. III (ed. J. R. Dasent), p. 31.

[140] Bullinger's Diarium, *op. cit,* p. 38, line 10.

[141] S.C. S. 73: 4.

[142] Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Vol. III, p. 174.

[143] See letters Z.S.A. E. II 369: 205; E.T. p. 274; O.L. 2, 416; and Z.S.A. E. II 369: 93; E.T. p. 368, O.L. 2, p. 566, from John Ab Ulmis and Micron to Bullinger.

[144] *Literary Remains of King Edward VI.* (ed. J. G. Nichols), Camden Society, p. 414.

[145] Letter in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op cit,* Vol. VI, p. 641.

[146] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 93; E.T. p. 368; O.L. 2, p. 567.

[147] Letter in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op cit,* Vol. VI, p. 640.

[148] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 98; E.T. p. 321; O.L. 2, p. 487.

[149] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 87; E.T. p. 371; O.L. 2, p. 571.

[150] *Ibid.*

[151] The manuscript is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, reference (New College 343, folios 16-17 verso). The Latin was published by Dr. Hopf in *Journal of Theological Studies,* Vol. XLIV, July-October, 1943, pp. 194-99. We shall give the reference to the J.T.S. with page and line number, the title reference is J.T.S., p. 196, lines 15-18.

[152] *Ibid.*

[153] *Ibid,* lines 19-25.

[154] *Ibid,* lines 26-29.

[155] *Ibid,* lines 31-35.

[156] *Ibid,* p. 198, line 24.

[157] *Ibid,* lines 26-32.

[158] See original Thesis, p. 139 fol.

[159] J.T.S., p. 198, line 35. The manuscript gives only two citations but from Ridley's reply to Hooper (published in *Writings of Bradford,* Vol. II, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1853, pp. 373-385, hereafter *Bradford,* Vol. II) it appears that Hooper gave four citations. See Bradford, Vol. II, p. 383.

[160] Polyd. Vergil, *de inventoribus rerum Lib.* IV, cap. vii, Basileae 1570, p. 325 fol.
[161] *Ibid,* Lib. VI, cap. xii, p. 534.
[162] *Bradford,* Vol. II, p. 381.
[163] *Ibid.*
[164] *Ibid,* p. 382. Ridley suggests that this savours of Anabaptist teaching.
[165] J.T.S., p. 197, lines 1-2.
[166] *Ibid,* lines 4-6.
[167] *Ibid,* lines 7-12.
[168] *Ibid,* lines 13-14.
[169] J.T.S., p. 198, lines 37-38.
[170] *Ibid,* line 43.
[171] *Ibid,* line 44, and p. 199, lines 1-2.
[172] J.T.S., p. 197, lines 19-21.
[173] *Bradford,* Vol. II, p. 386.
[174] *Ibid.*
[175] J.T.S., p. 197, lines 28-30.
[176] *Bradford,* Vol. II, pp. 387-8. It is interesting to note the seventeenth century historian Fuller on the Vestment Controversy. He writes: "In a word all those arguments, which later ages have more amply enlarged, more clearly explained, more cunningly improved, more violently enforced, were then and there first solidly propounded, and solemnly set down on both sides: posterity in this matter having discovered no new mine, but only refined what formerly was found out in this controversy." Fuller, T., *The Church History of England,* ed. J. Nichols, 1868, Vol. II, p. 377.
[177] *Bradford,* Vol. II, p. 388.
[178] *Ibid.*
[179] J.T.S., p. 197, lines 39-43.
[180] It is not surprising that Hooper was called an Anabaptist by some of his opponents. Evidence of this may be found in the *Calender of letters between England and Spain,* Vol. 10, pp. 261, 254, 591, and 593.
[181] *Bradford,* Vol. II, p. 379.
[182] J.T.S., p. 197, lines 46-47 and p. 198, line 1.
[183] *Ibid,* p. 198, lines 1-3.
[184] *Ibid,* lines 3-9.
[185] *Ibid,* lines 12-13.
[186] *Ibid,* lines 13-16. This appeal to the "best Reformed Churches" of the sixteenth century as an example to be followed became typical of Puritanism. See M. N. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism,* Chicago, 1939, p. 363.
[187] *Acts of the Privy Council,* Vol. III, ed. J. R. Dasent, p. 136.
[188] Kuyper, A., *A'Lasco Opera,* Vol. II, letter 79, p. 655 fol. The letter is undated but internal evidence points to a date when the Vestment Controversy was at its height.
[189] Gorham, G. C., *Gleanings of a few scattered ears during the period of the Reformation in England,* London, 1857, p. 185. Latin in L.Wr., p. XIV.
[190] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 87; E.T. p. 373; O.L. 2, p. 573.
[191] Letters in Gorham, *op cit,* Martyr's, p. 187 fol. Bucer's, p. 200 fol. A Latin copy of the former is in the Zürich archives, Z.S.A. E. II 359: 3021/3 and the Latin of the latter is in *Scripta Anglicana fere omnia a Conr. Huberto collecta,* Basle, 1577, p. 705 fol.
[192] Strype, J., *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer,* Vol. I, Oxford, 1840, p. 304, where quotations from Martyr's reply are given. It is also clear that there was correspondence between Bucer, Martyr and A'Lasco about Hooper's situation. This correspondence is gradually coming to light. See Hopf, C., *Martin Bucer,* Oxford, 1946, p. 147 fol.
[193] *Acts of the Privy Council,* Vol. III, ed. Dasent, p. 191.

[194] A mystery surrounds this letter; for a discussion and solution of it see the original Thesis, p. 70 and note 276. The letter may be found embedded in the postscript in E.T. p. 60 and O.L. 1, p. 95 of another letter. Original is Z.S.A. E. II 369: 28.

[195] In L.Wr., pp. 64-92.

[196] *Acts of the Privy Council, op cit,* p. 191.

[197] *Ibid,* p. 199.

[198] *Ibid.*

[199] Calvin had certainly written to Hooper suggesting that he should not go to such lengths in his opposition. Unfortunately we do not know the date of this letter. It is only mentioned in a letter from Calvin to Bullinger dated March 4th, 1551. We cannot be certain that this letter which Calvin tells Bullinger he has written "recently" to Hooper reached England before February 15th. See *Corpus Reformatorum,* Vol. XIV, p. 74, and G. C. Gorham, *op cit,* p. 241. It is definite that Bullinger wrote to Hooper in the middle of January, 1551. This letter passed through Strasbourg on January 19th (see letter of Burcher to Bullinger dated January 21st, S.C. S. 74: 40; E.T. p. 438; O.L. 2, p. 676) and thus might be expected to arrive in London about the middle of February. The letter is not extant but may well have contained advice to capitulate and to get on with the work of a bishopric.

[200] Foxe, J., *Rerum in ecclesia gestarum . . . commentarii,* Basle, 1559, p. 280.

[201] Gorham, *op cit,* p. 233 fol. Latin in L.Wr., p. XV.

[202] *Ibid.*

[203] Foxe, J., *Rerum in ecclesia gestarum . . . commentarii, op cit,* p. 280.

[204] Reported in Burnet, G., *History of the Reformation,* ed. Pocock, 7 Vols., Oxford, 1865. Vol. II, p. 286.

[205] Knappen, *op cit,* p. 84.

W. MORRIS S. WEST.

Sing With The Understanding, by G. R. Balleine. (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.)

To the stream of books on hymns now flowing from the presses this publication adds one which may warmly be commended to members of congregations and those who conduct worship. The author takes forty-one well-known hymns, tells their stories and expounds their meaning. One of the tasks he has set himself is to unravel obscurities—such as "Each sweet Ebenezer," the "sons" which are borne away by time's "everlasting stream," the "anointing Spirit," the "sevenfold gifts"—which must puzzle the majority of worshippers. In this, Mr. Balleine has rendered a valuable service. Indeed the whole book, which is based on thorough knowledge and most interesting to read, successfully fulfils the author's purpose and, if used rightly and widely, will contribute to more intelligent and worshipful congregational singing.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Reviews

The Symbols of Religious Faith, by Ben Kimpel. (Philosophical Library, New York, $3.75.)

This volume by the Professor of Philosophy at Drew University in New Jersey is sub-titled, "A Preface to an Understanding of the Nature of Religion." As his contribution toward such an understanding the author undertakes an examination of religious symbols, i.e. those man-made devices which direct attention to a reality other than themselves. Professor Kimpel defines religion as dependence upon an ultimate transcendent reality and he points out that the tendency to devise means by which men are referred to this reality is universal. Of this fact he gives a wealth of illustration drawn from the religions of the world and of the ages. He comments upon the weakness of men in so often trusting the symbol rather than the reality to which it refers and shows that one test of a true religious faith is whether it trusts in the reality rather than the symbol. One interesting passage is devoted to expressing and explaining disagreement with Otto. This is a book for the student of philosophy and comparative religion, and he will find it a wide-ranging, informative and useful analysis of what is a significant, universal phenomenon.

Manners and Morals of the 1920's, by Mary P. Thaman. (Bookman Associates, New York, $3.75.)

Here is a highly interesting and informative study of the reaction of religious journals and magazines in the U.S.A. to the social phenomena of a decade which was characterised by new technical developments, material prosperity, moral decline and intellectual confusion. What Dr. Thaman has done is to collect and arrange the opinions of the American religious press on a wide variety of that decade's features—from bobbed hair to suicides and from smoking by women to the breakdown of home and marriage. Baptist periodicals occupy a prominent place. Sometimes, on reading some of the quotations from editorial thunderings one feels a certain sympathy with the Jewish paper which ironically commented, "With the ultimate abolition of Dancing, the Movies, the Theatre, and Baseball, we shall reach Nirvana. Maybe, however, we shall be permitted, if we do it very gently, to tweedle our thumbs." Nevertheless, by this study Dr. Thaman has made a useful contribution to the social history of her country, showing that in the 1920's manners and morals were in a state of

flux, that religious opinion was alert to what was happening and, in their journals, gave a picture of their day to future generations. One feels the book would have gained in value had the final chapter, "Concluding Comments," been extended to draw out more in the way of general conclusions. All the same this is an enjoyable, instructive and significant piece of work.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

William Roby, 1766-1830, by W. Gordon Robinson. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.)

"And who," enquired a former Patriarch of Constantinople, "is the Archbishop of Canterbury?" A Baptist might with more justification ask, "Who was William Roby?" He was born near Wigan in 1766, became a leading figure in the Nonconformist life of Lancashire, and took a considerable part in its recovery from the decay which afflicted religion in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. He was a minister of versatile gifts, of inexhaustible energy, and was interested in everything that concerned human life. In addition to building a strong church in Manchester, and inspiring the formation of others and of Sunday schools, he was a pioneer in ministerial education in the county, a founder member of the London Missionary Society, the editor of a widely used hymn-book, and the promoter of Association life in Lancashire. It is certainly time that the story of William Roby's achievements was told, and Dr. Robinson, Principal of the Lancashire Independent College, has told it well in this readable book, part of the fruit of scholarly researches which brought him a Ph.D.

JOHN O. BARRETT.

The Servant of Jehovah, by David Baron. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 8s. 6d.)

The publishers have issued a new edition of this book first published in 1922. It is a review of some of the ancient and modern Jewish and Christian interpretations of Isaiah 53, followed by an exposition of the text of the chapter. Every book which helps the Christian public to understand something of the meaning and the mystery of the Servant of Second Isaiah is to be welcomed, especially when it is written so reverently as this work. Nevertheless the book now appears as it did in 1922, and so takes no account of the vast work which has been done and published on The Servant since then. The publishers have not been well advised in issuing without revision what could have been so useful a book.

G. HENTON DAVIES.