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

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

Editorial Notes

THE Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held at 4.30 p.m. on Monday, 25th April, in the Lounge at Bloomsbury Central Church, London. The speaker will be one of our own younger Baptist scholars, the Rev. W. S. M. West, B.A., D.Theol., tutor at Regent's Park College, Oxford, whose articles in our pages have brought us expressions of appreciation. Attendance at these meetings appears to increase each year and we hope that again members and friends of the Society will be well represented. For their convenience, it is hoped to arrange for tea to be served at a small charge.

* * * *

Of the valuable and varied services rendered to our denomination by Baptist deaconesses, there is a growing recognition. During the 64 years' existence of the Order their functions have considerably changed. At first sisters of mercy visiting the homes of want and woe, they are often nowadays ministers in all but name. The story of the Deaconess Order from the beginning to the present day has recently been admirably told by Miss Doris M. Rose, O.B.E., who has herself interviewed and advised hundreds of young women who have offered themselves for this underpaid, exacting but spiritually fruitful service. The contents of this booklet (*Baptist Deaconesses* by Doris M. Rose, Carey Kingsgate Press, 2s. 6d.), which has four pages of excellent illustrations, form a useful contribution to our denominational history and deserve to be widely read. The record of the Deaconess Order is one of triumph over disadvantage. Not the least of the hindrances to effective and settled progress has been the changing location of training centres, yet another removal taking place in the near future. What Miss Rose has written will be of assistance to those who are concerned about the several problems relating to the Order which remain unsolved. Basic to all others is the question, "What is a deaconess?" Until the denomination has decided the answer to that problem the solution of the others is likely to wait. But, then, we are not yet of a mind as to what is a minister.

* * * *

What the Southern Baptists of the U.S.A. are doing to serve the cause of their denominational history is told in an issue of their *Quarterly Review* which recently came into our hands. Its office located at Nashville, Tennessee, and with a full-time secretary and staff, an allocation for 1955 of $26,000 and up-to-date equipment, the Historical Commission goes forward enthusiastically and

efficiently from achievement to achievement under the leadership of Dr. Norman W. Cox. In the Dargan-Carver Library 25,000 catalogued books, 50,000 volumes of pamphlets and periodicals are housed alongside a microfilm collection of Baptist historical materials to which 50,000 pages of microfilm are being added every month. By this means almost anything required by students doing research in the field of Baptist history can be made available. Last year saw the publication of the long-awaited first history of the Convention and now a Southern Baptist Encyclopaedia is projected and a contest is being promoted with awards each year for the best history of a church or association. Twenty-one state Historical Societies co-operate with the Commission. We rejoice with our friends in what Dr. Cox calls this "history renaissance" and look forward to meeting some of them at the appropriate sectional gathering during the Baptist World Congress in July.

* * * *

Ways and means of marking in 1962 the 300th anniversary of Nonconformity are being discussed by the Historical Societies of the Free Churches. A bibliography of the works on Nonconformity issued between 1660 and 1665 is planned. It is believed that some 400 of these have not been listed. A volume of a more popular nature, possibly in the form of a symposium, on the significance of 1662 is also contemplated. In these discussions the Baptist society is represented by Dr. E. A. Payne.

* * * *

Subscriptions to the Baptist Historical Society for 1955 which have not yet been paid should be remitted as soon as possible. New members are needed and will be welcomed. Donations to the Society's depleted funds would also be greatly appreciated. The burden would be considerably eased if, for instance, ten generous friends were to contribute £10 each. But smaller gifts, or increased subscriptions would also be gratefully accepted.

Is there Philosophy in the Old Testament?

THIS question, if not answered by a flat negative, is usually met with a half denial, by saying that in the Wisdom Literature we get the nearest *approach* to philosophy in the Old Testament. The approach, however, is generally admitted to be along the right road in that it is granted that philosophical ideas are not wanting in the Old Testament, but nevertheless there is no attempt to systematise them. Philosophy is thus regarded, as on the older view, as necessarily concerned with some pattern of thought. But if in this case we cannot speak of a philosophy of the Old Testament, can we with any more propriety speak of its theology? For there is no attempt in the Hebrew Scriptures to systematise its ideas of God. Whilst the underlying conception of monotheism unites the books of the Old Testament, a conspectus of its theology cannot be obtained until a definite attempt has been made to create some unity out of diverse theological ideas. Nevertheless, we do not speak of a "nearest approach" to theology in the Old Testament. Rather we regard these scriptures as the basis of any theology worthy of the name.

Perhaps there is a special reason for the readiness to speak of Old Testament theology, even though lacking a system. For in this realm Israel was a pioneer. Apart from monotheism no theology is possible, because polytheism cannot really conform to the rules of ethical, not to say philosophical, thought. If Greece be regarded as the home of philosophy, we remember how Plato in his *Republic* could not permit some of the stories of the deities (because of their unethical notions) to be told in the education of his guardians (Book III, 390). The same critical approach to the poets had already been made by Xenophanes. In Greece the study of philosophy was divorced from popular religion and may be said to have flourished in spite of its myths.

But even in the realm of philosophy was not Israel a pioneer with Greece? The beginnings of Greek philosophy can be traced to Miletus in the early sixth century B.C. As yet it was concerned with the physical world rather than with metaphysics, which comes into philosophy with Plato. But by the end of the sixth century Heracleitus of Ephesus was struggling with the idea of a creative Force, or Logos, the uncapricious source of an intelligible universe. Man had the opportunity to open his mind to the wisdom of the

Logos, yet this opportunity could be, and often was, rejected. Similarly, *Proverbs* sets forth Wisdom to be accepted, or rejected, by man (i. 20-33), but the date of the Hebraic offer is later. Although many of the proverbs in this book are no doubt much older than the Exile, the teaching on Wisdom is concentrated mainly in the first nine chapters, which are usually considered to be the latest part of the book. Oesterley dates this section about 250 B.C.[1] But to compensate for a delay of over three centuries, the conception of Wisdom in these chapters is infinitely superior to the Logos of Heracleitus.

This latter is not personal, although the idea of the Logos must border on personality when it is described as intelligent. In *Proverbs,* however, Wisdom is personified. In i. 20-33, and more especially in ix. 1-6, she is the counterpart of the "strange woman" and competes with her for the hearts of men. Both are to be found "in the streets" and "the broad places" (i. 20; vii. 12) and each invites the "simple one," "void of understanding," to accept her hospitality (vii. 7ff.; ix. 3 ff.). To the same context of ideas belong verses 6-9 in chapter iv. where Wisdom is to be "loved" and "embraced" if life is to be secure and successful.

In the autobiographical chapter viii. of the same book, we have a conception of Wisdom as a dynamic force before the creation of the physical world, and responsible under God for its existence (viii. 22-30).[2] She is also the inspiration of all that is right in the moral world (viii. 15-20) and is, indeed, the source of life itself (viii. 35). All this is reminiscent of the Stoic doctrine of Reason as a principle of life and action, but Wisdom here is a *spiritual* power, far superior to the Stoic semi-materialistic Logos. Now the Hebrew conception can hardly be later than the Greek in this case, and is most likely to be earlier. Zeno came to Athens about 320 B.C., but it is difficult to ascertain how much of later Stoicism goes back to the founder. Perhaps it is not without significance that Zeno's ancestry was partly Semitic.

In so far as it is legitimate to argue etymologically, philosophy must have originally meant "love of wisdom." Nowhere is wisdom made more attractive than in the pages of *Proverbs.* "I love them that love me; and those that seek me diligently shall find me" (viii. 17). But such an intimate commendation of Wisdom comes very near to making her not only a rival of the "strange woman," but even of Yahweh Himself, who is to be loved "with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." The

[1] Westminster Commentary. *The Book of Proverbs,* p. xiii.

[2] The translation "master workman" (viii, 30) is admittedly conjectural, but 'âmôn is only found here in the Old Testament, apart from a doubtful reading in *Jer.* ii, 15. The translation is based on the Versions and on *'amman* of *Cant.* vii, 2. (E.V.v.1) and is consonant with the context.

Wisdom writers, however, avoid any possibility of idolatry by making Wisdom Yahweh's Servant, to be honoured only as such. Love of God must come before love of wisdom, not only as a moral imperative, but also as a metaphysical necessity. "The fear of the LORD is the beginning (i.e. first principle, *tehillāh*) of wisdom" (*Prov.* ix. 10). Moreover, this truth is one of revelation only, as the magnificent chapter xxviii. of *Job* informs us. Wisdom "is hid from the eyes of all living" but "God understandeth the way thereof. . . . And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom."[3] For the Hebrews true philosophy was rooted in theology, with no real boundary separating "love of wisdom" from love of God.

Modern philisophy has been divided on the basis of its subject matter into five branches: metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, aesthetics and politics.[4] On four of these, the Old Testament has definite teaching, from seer or sage. With regard to the philosophical problem of Reality, we see at once how theology limits the scope of enquiry as well as helps in offering a solution. On this subject there was much room for speculation for the Greek, who left theology out of account; but for the Hebrew the ultimate Reality must be personal and spiritual, namely the One who had revealed Himself to successive generations from the time of the Patriarchs.

On the subject of the theory of knowledge, early Hebrew thought does justice to objective and subjective aspects of experience. Both the physical world, as apprehended by the five senses, and the inner world of man's personality, known to him through his thought, feelings and volition, are equally real and both are involved in historical events. Man is able, and required, to know himself as well as the world in which he lives.

The Book of Proverbs has been called "a text book on ethics." Again, there is no ethical system and the teaching is rather fragmentary. Some of it, indeed, is somewhat pedestrian, as when it descends to the level of table manners (xxiii. 1ff.). Yet it is possible to see the wood as well as the trees. The ethical principles behind the detailed instructions are those of the great pre-exilic prophets, who are ardently concerned that man should live in right relationships with God and with his fellow. "What doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" This is the basis of the "good life." Long before Kant taught the prime necessity of a good will, the Hebrew sage was instructing his pupils, "Keep thy

[3] This brings v. 28 into line with the preceding verses, although it may be taken to be a later addition to the chapter. Even so, the addition can have been made in the interests of the interpretation suggested.

[4] cp. C. E. M. Joad, *Philosophy* (E.U.P.) p. 23 ff.

heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life" (*Prov.* iv. 23).

The Old Testament has little direct teaching on the subject of aesthetics. There is one verse in *Ecclesiastes,* however, which may be quoted (iii. 11): "He hath made everything beautiful in its time." But this branch of philosophy is sometimes ignored by philosophers today. On the philosophy of politics the Hebrew Scriptures make a unique contribution. What is their conception of an ideal community? Once more, we see how impossible it was for the Hebrews to keep theology out of the realm of philosophy. Their ideal principle of life for the community was a theocracy, the people being under the rule of God. To the Western world, with its proud belief in democracy, this sounds strange and even idealistic, but it was a familiar, and as they believed, a practical doctrine for the Hebrews. Their political institutions, whenever they were true to the highest traditions, were based on the belief that God was their true King, and all men were primarily his subjects. If no nation of modern times has dared to practise this political theory, the Christian church has taken it over from Judaism. One verse from the New Testament will make this clear. "The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ" (*Rev.* xi. 15). This verse may easily have been borrowed, and enlarged in scope, from a Jewish apocalypse.

We have endeavoured to demonstrate that the Old Testament can correctly be said to include philosophy, the term being understood in its classic connotation. Today philosophy often has a wider meaning, namely that of "Weltanschauung," and in this sense the whole of the Old Testament may be said to be philosophical. This is the theme of a recent book by C. H. Patterson, who says[5]: "When we speak of the philosophy of the Old Testament, we have in mind the world view that is implied in the various writings which it contains." But the Wisdom books may be called "philosophical" even in the narrower and technical meaning, since they teach a philosophy which, though more or less unspeculative, is firmly based on sound principles, and capable, as *Proverbs* shows, of practical expression in every sphere of life.

The newer philosophy, according to one writer, is more concerned with language as a vehicle of thought than with the subject matter. "The object of philosophy is the logical classification of thoughts."[6] The statements of these thoughts need not be statements of fact, they may be statements of belief. We have moved from the position of the logical positivists, for whom a statement could only be meaningful when checked by sense experience.

[5] *The Philosophy of the Old Testament* (New York, 1953) p. 20.

[6] Quoted by Basil Mitchell in *Modern Philosophy and Theology,* "The Socratic" (Oxford, 1952) p. 7.

Otherwise, religious experience could never be a subject of philosophical enquiry.

This modern aspect of philosophy has a certain foreshadowing in *Job*. Here we have a philosophical book in dialogue form, somewhat on the lines of Plato's *Republic*. The problem is the cause and nature of suffering, with special reference to Job's physical and, to some extent, mental and spiritual suffering. Job's friends argue about it inductively, taking the suffering as an effect, and seeking its cause. The ethical theory of the day made their argument easy. Suffering was no longer conceived as the action of an arbitrary Deity. He, indeed, sends suffering, wherever and whenever it comes. But He works on an ethical principle, by which suffering only comes as a consequence and punishment of sin. It is a simple matter then to prove that whoever suffers does so because of responsibility for some evil. The sin may be unconscious, but it is a fact nevertheless. The logic of the argument is, of course, fallible. A universal truth cannot be established upon particular examples, even if all these examples can be verified. And when Job protests his innocence of any sin sufficiently enormous, on the above theory, to account for his intense sufferings, the friends are really at a loss for a reply, and can only repeat the ethical principle, with minor variations. A further weakness in the friends' case is that an argument based on physical facts cannot prove a conclusion which is strictly outside the sphere of the physical world. Evil is a moral phenomenon and no amount of so-called physical consequences can prove its existence. The friends of Job, therefore, are not stating a fact, but only a belief, namely that behind all suffering one can detect the punishing hand of God. None of the arguments then, whether Job's or his contestants', can be described as soundly "philosophical" in the older sense of the word. The wider scope of its meaning, however, afforded by modern philosophy enables us still to call the book philosophical.

This is true especially of its conclusion, that is the poetic ending, not the prose epilogue which, with its nicely calculated material rewards, seems to be an anti-climax. The climax of the poem is reached in its last two verses where Job confesses: "I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes" (xlii. 5-6). Here we are in the realm, not of philosophical speculation, but of direct religious experience. Again we see how difficult it is to define the boundary between philosophy and theology. Job is now making a statement based on a higher experience than the sense experience which used to be the touchstone for verifying a philosophical statement. It is essentially a spiritual sense, which enables us to be aware of the "numinous," as Otto

would say, or, more simply, as Job says, "aware of God." "I had *heard* of thee . . . but now mine eye *seeth* thee."

Such a statement of religious experience comes within the purview of philosophy if its object is the logical classification of thoughts. But how can the philosopher, as such, deal with this kind of data? He must be something of a theologian as well, or, at any rate, he must be able to understand the kind of experience Job is talking about. For this, not only the book of Job, but the whole of the Old Testament will equip him. And surely whatever book makes a philosopher a better philosopher, deserves to be called "philosophical."

GEORGE FARR.

Index to Religious Periodical Literature, an Author and Subject Index to Periodical Literature, 1949-1952 including an Author Index to Book Reviews. Prepared by Libraries of the American Theological Library Association and compiled and edited by J. Stillson Judah with the assistance of Leslie Joan Ziegler. American Theological Library Association, 1953. (Distributed by The American Library Association, 50, East Huron Street, Chicago II, Illinois, ix, 220 pp. $5.00 paper, $6.00 cloth.)

An index by author and subject, with cross references, to thirty-one scholarly periodicals not included in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature,* or the *International Index to Periodicals,* in the fields of Bible, Theology, Church History, and related disciplines, covering the years 1949-1952, together with an index to book reviews, appearing in these periodicals. The resources indexed may be suggested by the following: 83 entries found under Dead Sea Scrolls, 41 under Church and State, 27 under Lord's Supper, 15 under Karl Barth, 27 under Reinhold Niebuhr, 55 under Communism, 32 under the World Council of Churches, and 15 under Missions (plus 19 cross references to related topics). The *Index locates* critical reviews for approximately 2,000 books, viz., nine titles by Oscar Cullmann are covered by 21 reviews, and seven titles by H. H. Rowley are covered by 30 reviews, etc. It is expected that succeeding volumes of the *Index* will be issued in the future.

The periodicals reviewed are:

Anglican Theological Review.
Baptist Quarterly.
Biblica.
Biblical Archaeologist.
Catholic Biblical Quarterly.
Christianity and Crisis.
Church Quarterly Review.
Congregational Quarterly.
Crozer Quarterly.
Interpretation.
Jewish Quarterly Review.
Journal of Bible and Religion.
Journal of Cuneiform Studies.
Journal of Near East Studies.
Journal of Pastoral Care.
Journal of Religious Thought.
Journal of Theological Studies.
Lutheran Quarterly.
Modern Churchman.
Muslim World.
Palestine Exploration Quarterly.
Review and Expositor.
Revue Biblique.
Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse.
Scottish Journal of Theology.
Social Action.
Studia Theologica.
Syria.
Theologische Rundschau.
Theology Today.
Vetus Testamentum.

Warwick Baptist Church

IT is just over 100 years ago since the last historical sketch of Castle Hill Baptist Church, Warwick, was written by an anonymous author. An attempt is here made to do something of a similar nature. The Baptist Church at Warwick is fortunate in the possession of records going back to the year 1697, though previous accounts of proceedings, if any were made, have unfortunately been lost, either by careless indifference or, as is more likely, in the great fire of Warwick in 1694. Thus the only ideas we have concerning the origin and early growth of the church are by inference from documents and circumstances of a later date than 1640—the year in which it is considered the Baptists of the town and neighbourhood formed themselves into an organised body for the purpose of worship. It has been suggested that the first Warwick Baptists were linked in some way with the church at Coventry formed in 1626, though proof of this is not available.

Described in the Church Book "as a small handful of the dust of Zion," Baptists of Warwick met first for worship in a house in Castle Street belonging to Thomas Hurd, who left it, together with some other property, a piece of ground and a quantity of silver plate, to the church, which still benefits from the bequest. Thomas Hurd was born at Barford, and early came and settled in Warwick. He was by trade a tailor and wool merchant, and by conviction a Baptist. Having gathered others of like mind about him, secret meetings for worship were held in his house at a time when all who refused to accept the doctrines of the established Church were being bitterly persecuted. When the Act of Indulgence was passed in 1672 (which allowed Nonconformists to register certain private houses as places of worship) Hurd registered his house. For the first time the church was able to meet without fear of interference, but this liberty was short lived, for three years later the Act was withdrawn. A persistent tradition in the church that the second Lord Brooke, Robert Greville, and his man-servant worshipped with the little company, seems to confirm the early date of the church's existence, for this good man was killed at the seige of Lichfield in March, 1643. The previous year he published a little book entitled *A Discourse opening the Nature of that Episcopacy which is exercised in England,* and from this it is manifest that he accepted Congregational principles, though his views on baptism are not known.

The first authentic record we now have of this church is in the

history of the Midland (now West Midland) Baptist Association formed in Warwick in 1655 during the Protectorship of Oliver Cromwell. This does not throw any light on the history of the formation of the church, but it does suggest that in that year the local Baptist community was of considerable importance and influence. Daniel King was the pastor and, it is generally assumed, the leading figure in the formation of the Association. In 1651 he attended the meeting of representatives of thirty Midland Congregations of General Baptists, and is noted as pastor of Coventry. In the same year he wrote a book which he dedicated to some churches with which he had been connected, including that at Warwick. By 1656 Daniel King was replaced as minister by Nathaniel Alsop, though the duration of his ministry is not known.

In the year 1670 Mr. James Cooke (the elder) became pastor. He was a surgeon of considerable repute, and published a book on surgery, a copy of which is one of the treasured possessions of the Warwick church. He lived in Jury Street, and was appointed physician to the Earl of Warwick and his family, from whom, he acknowledges in his book, he received much kindness. He died in 1688, and was buried at St. Mary's, Warwick. Evidence of the fact that Mr. James Cooke had charge of the church is afforded by the will of Thomas Hurd made in 1681. The year 1688 marked the beginning of a period of religious freedom under the Protestant Prince William of Orange and his wife, Mary. At this time began the ministry of the Rev. Paul Frewin (one of the 2,000 Puritan clergy evicted from their livings by the Act of Uniformity in 1662) from Kempley, in Gloucestershire, who is described in the Church Book as "an exceedingly good preacher and a popular man."

The coming of Benjamin Bowyer in 1695 marked a real step forward in the Baptist witness at Warwick. He is described as a gentleman of considerable means residing in the Stone House. During his ministry, about the year 1700, the first Baptist Meeting House was built in the town, so that, after more than fifty years, the little church had at last a home of its own where it was possible to meet freely for worship and communion. He died in 1702, and was buried in the Vineyard Garden, near to the spot where Thomas Hurd had earlier been laid to rest. Under the will of Thomas Hurd the garden subsequently became the property of the church, and is part of the ground on which the present building now stands. Castle Hill was at this time called "Back Hills," and it was by the latter name that the church was known until the last century. During the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Bowyer, the oversight was taken by Samuel Dunckley, an architect and stonemason, who carved the handsome doorway in St. Mary's Church leading into the Beauchamp Chapel, and helped to rebuild the tower of the church after it was damaged in the fire of Warwick. A young

preacher named John Morgan came from Wales in 1703, and, according to an entry in the burial register of St. Nicholas' Church, died the day after! The Church Book, however, says that he died a week later.

A physician by the name of Philip James, M.D., was the next minister of the church. His ministry commenced in 1705 and continued for five years. During this period the singing of hymns was first introduced into the church, these hymns to be composed by the minister to suit the subject of his sermon. In deference to some who objected to singing in the house of God it was resolved that the singing should only take place after the evening lecture, an interval being allowed for those wishing to leave.

After this, and until the Rev. Edward Munford became the minister in 1723, there is considerable uncertainty as to the ministerial oversight of the church. As far as can be ascertained from the Church Book, it would appear that the Rev. John Jarvis was in charge, for his name invariably heads the lists of signatures with which the records of business transacted at Church Meetings are concluded. His name disappears after the Church Meeting held on June 8th, 1721, and that of Edward Munford first appears in connection with the meeting of June 19th, 1723. Serious differences arose between Mr. Munford and certain members of the church, and it was agreed that the pastorate should be terminated. Here it may be mentioned in passing that Church Meetings at this time, and for many years to follow, were mainly for discipline.

A NEW MEETING HOUSE

Nothing much is known of the next two men in pastoral charge—Job Burt from 1734 till his death in 1739, and Isaac Woodman, who was minister for six years from 1740. However, it was during the ministry of Isaac Woodman that the old meeting house was found to be too small, and accordingly was demolished to make room for a larger chapel, built on the same site, with a substantial minister's house adjoining. Pictures of this meeting house are in existence, from which it is seen to have been a commodious square building with a gallery round three sides, an elevated pulpit, and comfortable pews.

The next minister was a man of considerable ability bearing a name well known and much honoured in Baptist circles. This was John Collett Ryland who is said to have rebuked William Carey when the latter was pressing the case for foreign missions at a ministers' conference. Coming to Warwick in 1746 he was ordained four years later, and then continued in the pastorate till 1759 when he left for Northampton. He had been a member of the Baptist Church at Bourton-on-the-Water of which Benjamin Beddome was pastor. During his ministry in Warwick he lived in St. Mary's

vicarage, which he rented from Dr. Tate, the incumbent. Some complained to Dr. Tate for having let his house to an Anabaptist teacher. "What would you have me do?" he replied, "I have brought the man as near to the Church as I can, but I cannot force him to enter it." It was in the vicarage that he founded a boys' school which greatly prospered, and probably formed the basis for the larger and better known schools later founded by him in Northampton and finally in London. Here his son, John, was born, who later became principal of Bristol Baptist College, and a joint founder of the Baptist Missionary Society. Mr. Ryland effectively built up the work at Warwick, and wrote much of real spiritual worth in the Church Book.

For the next five years the church was without a minister until the Rev. John Knight accepted the pastorate. He was followed by the Rev. Joseph Stennett, member of a distinguished Baptist family of the 18th century. He left Warwick in 1779, and after a period of four years was succeeded by the Rev. Peter Reece who laboured in the town amongst the Baptists with considerable success for twelve years. He revived the church which had evidently been much reduced since the departure of J. C. Ryland. Mr. Reece died on June 11th, 1795. Then came Mr. John Wilson who was ordained at Warwick on June 1st, 1796, but he resigned after a ministry lasting two-and-a-half years because of dissatisfaction with his preaching among the members. For a time the church depended on supplies, the most frequent of these being the Rev. Edward Mabbutt. Just at the end of the century, on July 2nd, 1799, a Sunday School "for the instruction of poor children" was opened under the direction of Mr. John Mills.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

At the turn of the century the connection with the Association seems to have been broken, and was not restored till, almost 100 years later, the Association was asked to exercise control. The century was a sad period for the church. There were times of brightness, but these were followed by periods of strife and division, which left a legacy of bitterness and effectively prevented much brotherly cohesion. Ministers were thus discouraged, short pastorates were common, and membership declined.

There is an absence of church records during the ministry of the Rev. William Read from 1803 to 1818. Troublous times were undoubtedly experienced, and Mr. Read was involved in some legal trouble. But from 1819, when the Rev. Evan Herbert of Boddicot, near Banbury, became minister, church records were kept. He found the church in a shocking condition and, in his own words, "reduced to a very few, without discipline or records and the congregation fled, so much so, that the writer of this had not only

to lead the singing, but to preach to the walls and empty pews." He came to bring revival, and succeeded in a certain degree. But he became involved in controversy with the Unitarian minister and left in 1821.

The next minister was the Rev. John Ham, who settled in 1823. He had been minister at Wolverhampton, and was supplying at Crewkerne in Somerset. He stayed till 1825, when the difficulty of the church's finding his stipend caused him to resign. He went to Newhall Street, Birmingham. There was no minister till 1826. Often the church had no supply, and seemed near to disbanding. Several members attached themselves to the Independents (Congregationalists), and it is quite likely that the church would have closed but for the timely help of the Rev. Francis Franklin, probably the ablest minister in the Queen's Road, Coventry, succession to that date. In passing it may be mentioned that his daughters ran a school where George Eliot was a pupil. Mr. Franklin recommended the Rev. John Lincoln to the pastorate at Warwick. During the first year all went well, and seven members were added. After thirteen months Mr. Lincoln decided to count the communicants and make a membership roll. There were thirteen men and the same number of women. Presently a violent quarrel broke out between Mr. Lincoln and some of the members. In various ways the minister was slighted till he could stand it no longer. In 1834 he left Warwick for London, taking all the church books with him. They were later recovered by the good offices of a man named Horton.

It was about this time that the Leamington Church was formed by some of the members of Castle Hill who resided there. During the next ministry, that of the Rev. H. Campbell, the chapel was repaired and the front stuccoed. The date of the repair (1840) was put on the front of the chapel. Mr. Campbell resigned after some questionable conduct in 1841. The Rev. J. T. Bannister from Coventry supplied for a year and three months. Then the Rev. Thos. Nash from Netherton, Dudley, became pastor in 1843. He had the interior and exterior of the chapel coloured, and changed the date on the front to 1640. Early in Mr. Nash's ministry the chapel was enlarged to twice the size, and various other structural alterations made. In 1854 there were about forty members. Good progress was made, but gains were offset by losses through death and removal. There were about forty scholars in the Sunday School. Mr. Nash resigned in 1856.

He was followed by the Rev. T. Aston Binns of Birmingham in 1857, the membership being twenty-eight. Open membership was considered, deferred, and finally adopted on 14th November, 1859. Mrs. Binns's health necessitated the pastor's resignation in 1864. Next came the ministry of the Rev. Frank Overbury, during which

a rebuilding scheme was initiated. The present chapel is the result. It was opened in the year 1866. Then in 1872 open membership was abolished, but the pioneers were vindicated in 1930 by the adoption of this principle. Mr. Overbury had a successful ministry, but resigned on account of age in 1873. Mr. C. H. Thomas, the next minister, was a student of Pastor's (now Spurgeon's) College. He had a happy and successful ministry, but left in 1879 to become secretary of the College.

The next period of ministry lasted only three years. It was that of the Rev. Daniel Jennings who came from Long Crendon, Bucks. His resignation was brought about through ill-health. Conditions must have deteriorated for he advised dependence on supplies to avoid the expense of a pastor. The church did not heed the advice, however, and successfully invited the Rev. T. Napoleon Smith, a Spurgeon's man, in January, 1884. He resigned in the following September. By this time the membership was 48. The Rev. John Hutchinson of Westminster came in 1885, but was asked to resign in 1888 and left accordingly. The difficulty of supporting a minister seems to have been the main factor.

Then the Association took charge of the church and installed the Rev. H. W. Meadow of Wolston in 1890. This arrangement continued until 1899, when the future of the pastorate was decided by vote of the Church Meeting, and Mr. Meadow did not get a sufficiently large majority. Thus he had to resign after very faithful labour. About this time men of initiative among the members began to appear, and the Church Books were well kept and not left to the minister's care.

THE PRESENT CENTURY

The turn of the century saw a new ministry beginning at Castle Hill, that of Mr. J. Bryan Marshall, a student of Spurgeon's College. He seems to have done well, and additions to the membership were numerous. There were 57 names on the Roll at the annual meeting in September, 1901. His resignation was accepted at a members' meeting on April 20th, 1903. He was contemplating marriage to a member of the church, and there seems to have been difficulty also in regard to an increase in stipend (then at £110 p.a.) which he had requested. The ministry closed at the end of June, 1903. Later that year the Rev. C. E. Palmer came to preach, and was subsequently invited to accept the pastorate. He did so and began his ministry in April, 1904. In the same year the church adopted the use of the individual Communion Cup. During Mr. Palmer's ministry an extensive renovation scheme (first mooted in 1902) was put in hand. Its purpose was to meet the demands of a growing church, and to constitute a useful and permanent memorial of the 250th Anniversary of the founding of the West Midland Baptist

Association. It included the installation of electric light, a new heating system, a new pulpit (Bromwich Memorial), new choir stalls, new organ, and decoration of the church and school-room. The work was carried through, and the church re-opened for worship on 1st July, 1906. An appeal for financial help with this scheme of renovation was sent to all the churches of the West Midland Baptist Association, which celebrated its 250th Anniversary in 1905. This was marked by special meetings in Warwick. The new organ was formally opened on September 27th, 1906, when F. Heddon Bond, M.A., F.R.C.O., organist of Dale Street, Leamington Spa, gave a recital. Mr. Palmer tendered his resignation to Castle Hill on receiving an invitation to another church. He was pressed by means of a petition to re-consider his decision, but he did not do so, and closed his Warwick ministry at the end of September, 1910.

The next minister was a student of Spurgeon's College, Mr. J. B. Hannah, who began his ministry in Warwick in July, 1911. The organ, installed but so recently, was evidently giving trouble, and had to be renovated that same year at a cost of £71. Two years later, on resigning office as Church Secretary, having served in this capacity for eighteen years, the late Mr. W. E. Collier was elected a life-deacon. Mr. Hannah left Warwick for Burnley in 1913. He was followed in the pastorate at Castle Hill by the Rev. W. J. Fox. His stay in Warwick was brief like that of his immediate predecessor. Mr. Fox was evidently interested in the history of Castle Hill, for he typed out copies of the Church Books up to the beginning of the present century. This must have involved hours of painstaking work, for the writing in earlier books is difficult to decipher. The present writer here acknowledges a deep debt of gratitude to the late Rev. W. J. Fox.

A vacant pastorate ensued to the following April when it was filled by the Rev. H. Lanman, who had previously been minister at New Barnet. In September, 1917, it was decided to hold afternoon services instead of evening services. (This, of course, was during the first war, and the earliest raids had been made). The rising cost of living is reflected in the numerous increments given to Mr. Lanman; his stipend reached the figure of £200 by the year 1920. Also, it was the custom of the church at this time to give to the minister three-quarters of the balance in hand at the end of the financial year. The organ was again giving trouble, and plans were afoot for its disposal or complete re-building. The latter course was adopted, the work being carried out by Messrs. Hewins of Stratford-upon-Avan at a cost of £260. In the previous year a new boiler was installed. Mr. Lanman's ministry was evidently a happy one according to his letter of resignation sent at the end of 1922. He terminated his ministry at Warwick in the following March, having laboured successfully in the town for six years.

During the vacancy caused by the departure of Mr. Lanman, the Rev. A. J. Billings, M.A., minister of the Leamington Church, acted as Moderator. Mr. H. J. White was the next man to be invited to the pastorate. He had been trained for the ministry at Regent's Park College, and commenced his work in Warwick on completion of his training. The period of his ministry was one of steady growth and progress. At a Church Meeting in April, 1927, the need for enlarged school premises was spoken of, and it was agreed that a fund should be started for this purpose. An opportunity to purchase premises on the north side of the chapel later presented itself, but unfortunately the diaconate decided against committing the church in this way. The Warwick ministry of the Rev. H. J. White terminated at a farewell meeting held in January, 1928, when many paid tribute to his work, and numerous presentations were made. He had accepted the invitation of the Church at Oldfield Park, Bath.

Again during the vacancy the Rev. A. J. Billings acted as Moderator. During September, 1928, Mr. Victor A. Price, of Bristol College, preached on two Sundays with much acceptance, and so was given an invitation to the pastorate. He began his ministry on the first Sunday in November. At the annual Church Meeting in 1929 the late Mrs. E. Salmon had the honour of being elected the first lady deacon of the Church. Then the following year the church adopted the principle of open membership, though with the safeguard that the minister shall always be a baptized person. A scheme for extending the school-room was completed in 1931 at a cost of £168. Mr. Price left for South Harrow in 1933, having worked successfully in Warwick for five years.

Then came a vacancy extending over two years, when Mr. F. N. Allen, of Spurgeon's College, was invited to accept the pastorate. So began a ministry that was to last for nine years. During this period the church received a legacy from Mrs. Pryce Davies in the form of a bungalow, ground and effects. These were subsequently sold to the County Council for £600. The idea in the mind of Mrs. Davies in making the gift was that it should be used to build a mission in memory of her son, Harold, and that the mission should be known by his name. Unfortunately it has not been found possible to fulfil this wish. Rules for the church were drawn up by a sub-committee, and adopted early in 1939. Afternoon instead of evening services were held at the beginning of the war, but evening services were soon restored. Owing to the war not a great deal was made of the 300th Anniversary of the Church, but a special service was held (Thursday, November 7th) followed by tea in the Court House, when many congratulatory messages, including one from the Bishop of Coventry, were received. Having served the church well Mr. Allen removed to Bilston early in 1944.

Mr. I. H. Williams was the next to be invited to the pastorate of Castle Hill, and he began his ministry on November 5th, 1944. At this time the Church Secretary (Councillor W. V. Collier) became the Mayor of Warwick, and continued in office for three years, the minister of Castle Hill acting as Mayor's Chaplain. Again Mr. Williams acted in this capacity when Councillor T. T. Bromwich, another member of the church, was Mayor from 1949 to 1951. Not till 1948 was it decided "that a memorial to Thomas Hurd be placed in the church at an estimated cost of £30." This period of ministry saw the beginning of the Girls' Life Brigade. Much good work was done by Mr. Williams in Warwick before he left for Holyhead in July, 1951.

There followed a vacancy of several months before an invitation was given to the Rev. W. T. Goodwin, of High Wycombe, to become pastor. A house had been purchased in Cape Road for use as a manse from the legacy of the late Mrs. Elizabeth Davies. From the same legacy an electrical heating system was installed in the church. The latest and present ministry began in September, 1952. The period since has been one of difficulty occasioned through many losses, yet a happy spirit is manifest in the church. The windows have been put in good repair, a screen erected across the back of the church to make an entrance lobby, the organ thoroughly overhauled and the interior of the church has been redecorated. So to the end of the story so far. Baptist witness in Warwick continues by the grace of God. Castle Hill has never been a strong cause, but in a quiet and unassuming way it ministers help and blessing to many. May it continue and grow that this, the County town of Warwick, may have at its heart a witness to the truth and virility of the Baptist position!

W. T. GOODWIN.

John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism

(Concluded)

VI. HOOPER IN GLOUCESTER

A Brief Survey of Bishop Hooper's Visitation Book[208]

HOOPER went down to his bishopric about the beginning of April, 1551. He now had a real opportunity to put his precepts into practice. He felt himself responsible for the salvation of the people in his diocese and so the first thing he did was to carry out a visitation and examination of the clergy who would be his "brethren and fellow preachers"[207] in this work. The result of that visitation cannot have been very encouraging and the results show the situation among the clergy in England at that time.[208]

The examination consisted of questions concerning the Commandments, the Apostles Creed and the Lord's Prayer. The clergy were asked the number of the Commandments, where they were to be found in Scripture, and whether they could repeat them. They were asked to repeat the Creed and prove it from Scripture and, concerning the Lord's Prayer, they were asked to repeat it, to say who its author was, and where it could be found in Scripture. The results were as follows: 311 clergy were examined, and 79 were reckoned as satisfactory. Of the unsatisfactory clergy, 9 did not know how many Commandments there were, 33 did not know where they could be found in the Bible, and 168 could not repeat them. In the case of the Creed, 10 could not repeat it and 216 were unable to prove it. Concerning the Lord's Prayer, 39 did not know where it appeared in the Bible, 34 were ignorant as to who its author was and 10 could not repeat it. To take two examples:

> "Parish Church of Wydforde . . . John Nutle rector, not examined because decrepit, Charles Gawden, minister, Commandments, says ten, Exodus 20 but cannot repeat. Creed and Lord's Prayer, can say nothing to these nor repeat them from memory. Parish Church of Camme-cum-Stinchecombe . . . Nicholas Compton, Vicar, Commandments, knows their number, but says that they are written in Matthew 16, or in some of the Evangelists, and cannot repeat them. Creed, repeated the Articles, but did not prove one of them from Scripture. Lord's Prayer, can scarcely reply."[209]

Perhaps the most remarkable statement came from Philip Hawlinge (or Huling), minister of Awre, who suggested that the Creed might be proved from the Royal Injunctions and the first chapter of *Genesis!*

In connection with the results of this visitation it must, however, be remembered that at that time the Ten Commandments were not greatly used in public worship and also of course that the English version of the Bible had not long been in use. Nevertheless, the position was clearly bad, and Hooper set to work to improve the situation. To this end he produced a series of articles, injunctions and interrogatories for his diocese.

One of his chief tasks obviously was to improve his clergy. Therefore in an injunction which begins: "That whereas the people of God cannot be instructed in the truth of his word, except the parsons and curates, that have oversight over them be learned and exercised in the testaments of God, the new and the old . . ."[210] he ordered the clergy to study one book a quarter and stated that they should be examined each quarter on the contents of the book. For the first year the books to be studied were *Romans, Deuteronomy, Matthew* and *Genesis*.[211]

For our purpose, however, what is more interesting is the injunction ordering assemblies of clergy once a quarter. Every clergyman in the diocese was ordered to appear four times a year before Hooper or his deputies in assemblies in the deanery of the area of the diocese in which he worked. The purpose of their assembling together was "for the determination of such questions and doubtful matters in religion as may happen to stand and be in controversy between men learned and them; and there to speak modestly, soberly and learnedly what they will."[212] In other words, problems concerning religion were to be brought by these ministers to the assembly and there debated among themselves in the presence of the bishop or his deputy.

The practice was uncommon in an English bishopric at that time and the question may be asked as to where Hooper got the idea. The answer may well be—from Zürich. These assemblies of ministers up and down the diocese for the discussion of religious matters may have been suggested to Hooper either by the Zürich practice of Synods or more probably, by the first half of the "Prophesyings," i.e. the ministerial discussion, which we noted Hooper attended in Zürich. It is obvious that the state of the clergy did not permit of the presence of the laity at these assemblies. Hooper's desire was that the problems should be discussed by the ministers privately so that when they were settled the ministers could carry the answers back to the people. This was of course basically the same idea as the "Prophesyings" in Zürich. An interesting point which arises is that, from this Gloucester diocese, a link can perhaps be traced with the well known Elizabethan "Prophesyings" which began some thirteen years later. This link is John Parkhurst.

Parkhurst was the rector of the parish of Bishop's Cleeve in

Hooper's diocese, and in the visitation examination of 1551 was one of the few who were found "insigniter doctus."[213] It is clear that such a man would be used by Hooper in these assemblies and in other ways, and it is known that the two men became very friendly. When Queen Mary's injunctions were issued early in March, 1554, the fourth injunction urging all bishops to be vigilant "that no person be admitted or received to any ecclesiastical function, benefice, or office, being a sacramentary, infected or defamed with any notable heresy"[214] would make quite certain that Parkhurst would lose his charge at Bishop's Cleeve. He was faced with the prospect of exile and no doubt his contact with Hooper led him to choose Zürich. Parkhurst left England in the early summer of 1554 and arrived in Zürich about the middle of July.[215] He remained in exile until the death of Mary in 1558. Whilst in Zürich Parkhurst and his fellow exiles would see the "school" of which Hooper had no doubt often spoken.

It is clear that the Elizabethan "Prophesyings" as they are reflected in the records left of their practice in Northampton and Lincoln[216] were not exactly the same as those of Zürich. In these English "Prophesyings" the public preaching, in which three ministers usually took part, preceded the private ministerial discussion instead of vice-versa, and the attendance on the part of the ministers seems to have been voluntary. Nevertheless, the fact of these exercises bearing the same name as the Zürich practice and having the same basic idea, i.e. the education of the laity through the ministers working together on Bible exegesis, would seem to suggest some contact between the Zürich and English practice.[217]

The likelihood of such a contact is increased when we consider where these "Prophesyings" first appeared in Elizabethan England. It is true that the fullest records we have are of the exercises in Northampton in 1571, and in Lincoln in 1574, but the first recorded appearance of them is in Norwich in 1564. In this year it is recorded that the preachers of the city began "both for their better exercise and also for the education of the people, prophesying; which is done once in three weeks . . ."[218] The Norwich "Prophesyings" were instituted with the exegesis of *Romans*. The point of interest is that the Bishop of Norwich since 1560 had been John Parkhurst.[219] There is no definite evidence that it was at his instigation that the "Prophesyings" began, but it is not unlikely. There is a letter of a later date from Parkhurst to certain people in Bury St. Edmunds written on February 16th, 1572 agreeing that the practice could well be extended to Bury. The letter begins: "For as much as the godly exercise of expounding the scriptures by way of 'prophesy' is seen daily to bring no small benefit and furtherance to the Church of Christ where the same is used within this diocese . . ."[220] This clearly indicates that the practice was well

established in the Norwich diocese by 1572 and encouraged by Parkhurst. It is also interesting that the recipients of this letter are authorised to take charge of the "Prophesyings" and that *all* the clergy should attend. If they do not they are to be reported so that they may be "reformed." This apparent compulsion is the Zürich practice and not that reflected at Lincoln and Northampton where attendance was voluntary.

There were certainly other influences at work in the setting up of the Elizabethan "Prophesyings," notably the memory of the practice in A'Lasco's Strangers' Church in London in the reign of Edward VI.[221] But there seems also to be an influence which went out from Zürich through Hooper and his assemblies to Parkhurst, who came to Zürich and saw for himself the value of the practice before returning to England to take up office in the Church.[222]

In addition to these assemblies a second result of Hooper's visitation was that he made use of another Zürich idea and appointed superintendents.[223] The superintendent corresponded to the Zürich *Dekan*. In Zürich the area was divided into seven *Kapiteln*, each *Kapitel* having a *Dekan*. His task was to make certain that all was well in the realms of church order and preaching, and also to report to the Synod ministers who persisted in offences against ecclesiastical or moral laws.[224]

Unfortunately we know all too little about the superintendents in Hooper's diocese, but what little we know indicates that they had a similar function. Hooper mentioned the fact that he had "made superintendents in Gloucestershire" when he wrote to William Cecil, the secretary of the Council, on October 25th, 1552, and added that he was about to examine the clergy to see what progress they had made since the last examination.[225] He writes also concerning the superintendents and says: "If I commend not myself presently their well doings and see what is evil done I shall not see the good I look for." In his injunctions issued after his 1551 visitation, Hooper indicates the need of exhorting

> "such men as be already sworn before me in my visitation, with the church wardens, to take heed diligently of the manners and conditions of the parson, vicar, and curate of the parish and . . . of the parishioners and so by writing deliver . . . every quarter unto me, or to mine officers, all such faults and transgressions as shall be committed by any of them . . . contrary unto God's laws and the king's in any unhonest life or false religion."[226]

It is very probable that these men of whom Hooper speaks were in fact the superintendents, who would thus have the task of making certain that the clergy and laity in their area obeyed the laws of doctrine and of the realm. John Foxe seems to confirm this when he speak of both John Rogers and Hooper agreeing on the policy of setting one superintendent over every ten churches, to help in

getting rid of "popish priests," and to ascertain that the minister did his duty in profiting both himself and his people.[227]

Hooper's Fifty Visitation Articles are of special interest in view of their similarity to the well known *Forty-Two Articles*. It is clear that Hooper based his articles on the *Forty-Two Articles* and on the articles which Bishop Ridley issued for his London diocese in 1550.[228] It is interesting to remark that the *Forty-Two Articles* were of course not officially issued until early in 1553. Thus Hooper anticipated them by nearly two years. It is however known that a set of articles, presumably similar to the *Forty-Two Articles*, was in existence before Hooper issued his. Hooper himself, writing to Bullinger on December 17th, 1549, and on February 5th, 1550,[229] expressly mentions with approval the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury has some articles to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity must subscribe before they are allowed to begin their activities. Hooper also required subscription by his clergy to the Visitation Articles which he had issued, but it was clear that he was acting on his own responsibility. In fact, Hooper wrote to Cecil on July 6th, 1552 indicating what he had done and pleading "for the love of God, cause the articles that the king's majesty spake of when we took our oaths to be set forth by his authority. I doubt not but they shall do much good: for I will cause every minister to confess them openly before their parishioners."[230] Hooper wished to add the King's authority to his own in causing his clergy to subscribe to the articles.

In October, 1552, when Hooper was at Worcester, the diocese of which had been added to that of Gloucester, examining the cathedral clergy on their subscription to his articles, two canons, Joliffe and Jonson, refused to subscribe. A dispute followed, an account of which was published in 1564 in Antwerp by Joliffe.[231] This account, in Latin, preserves 19 of the articles in dispute and of these 10 coincide almost word for word with the Latin articles of the Forty-Two and 7 agree though less fully stated.[232] Thus it seems clear that some form of the *Forty-Two Articles* was in existence both in English and in Latin for some time before they were officially published.[233]

For our purpose, however, what is of particular interest is not so much where Hooper's articles agree with the *Forty-Two Articles* and with Ridley's Articles, but rather where they differ from them or go beyond them. It is in these differences between Hooper's and the other articles that we can catch a glimpse of Hooper's distinctive point of view. Therefore we may perhaps now remark on a few of these differences.

(*a*) While the first of the *Forty-Two Articles* defines the doctrine of the Trinity, Hooper puts this second in his set. At the head of Hooper's articles stands, as we might expect, the article concern-

ing the absolute authority of the Scripture. All things necessary for salvation are contained in the Old and New Testaments, and Hooper adds that the ministers must take care not "to establish and confirm any manner of doctrine . . . which cannot be duly and justly approved by the authority of God's holy Word."[234]

(*b*) In his article on the church Hooper differs from the Forty-Two in two points. The twentieth article of the Forty-Two says that "The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men." Hooper omits the word "visible."[235] Secondly, Hooper adds an important clause which once again sheds doubt upon the accepted idea of apostolic succession in the Church.

> ". . . the church of God is not by God's word taken for the multitude or company of men, as of bishops, priests, and such other, but that it is the company of all men hearing God's word, and obeying unto the same; lest that any man should be seduced, believing himself to be bound unto any ordinary succession of bishops and priests, but only unto the word of God, and the right use of the sacraments."[236]

(*c*) On the question of good works, the twelfth article of the Forty-Two simply denies that works done before justification by faith are of value. Hooper agrees, but adds the positive side: "That good works do necessarily follow justification,"[237] and puts in an extra article insisting upon good works being required of "every Christian man."[238] This emphasis is typical of Hooper and may well derive from his covenant conception.

(*d*) Hooper reproduces the article on the ministry almost verbatim from the twenty-fourth article of the Forty-Two. He then makes two additions. First, he puts in a sentence condemning "all manner of simony in all kinds of ministers and orders of the ecclesiastical ministry."[239] Secondly, he adds an interesting statement which might appear to make his idea of the ministry one of function only. Hooper says

> "We understand by the ministry and know it not by the name alone, but by the work and administration in it, to the edifying of the church and body of Christ by the faithful administration of God's word and sacraments . . . from the which if a minister cease, he leaveth to be a minister, and should not be taken for one."[240]

In this connection we may note here an instance recorded in the diocesan records of Gloucester for the reign of Elizabeth I when, on December 10th, 1561, Robert Byocke, curate of Stroud, was accused of unlicensed preaching. Byocke, in evidence, claimed that he was "made minister" by Hooper in a room in the episcopal palace, no one else being made a minister at the same time. Byocke goes on:

> "All the orders that he had given unto him by the said bishop were given him at that one time, but what orders they were he, this deponent, knows not more than that the said bishop willed and charged him to go forward according to the words of the Bible, which he then

> did hold in his hand, and to preach the same and to minister the sacraments. . . . And . . . he has preached and ministered the sacraments ever since unto this present day."[241]

This may well be an exceptional incident. But the fact that it could happen at all seems to indicate that Hooper's conception of the ministry was, in accordance with his whole outlook, very simple.

(*e*) In his article on the sacraments Hooper follows the twenty-sixth article of the Forty-Two fairly closely, but adds an introductory clause indicating that, as Christ's people in the Old Testament had the sacraments as seals, so also in the New Testament the sacraments were seals, "and with the same to be annexed into the society of one godly people."[242] The Church of the Old and New Testaments is one Church.

(*f*) Although Hooper was a staunch supporter of the throne he did not adopt the rendering of the *Forty-Two Articles* concerning the king's supremacy in the Church. The thirty-sixth Article of the Forty-Two stated: "The King of England is supreme head in earth next under Christ, of the Church of England, and Ireland." Hooper rejected the word 'head' and substituted 'supreme magistrate and power' and so anticipated the Elizabethan article in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* which also rejected the term 'head.'[243] The designation 'Head of the Church' is reserved for Christ alone.

(*g*) Hooper adds an article on a subject which was much emphasised by Bullinger; the care of the poor. This care is commended to us by Christ and therefore it is very necessary that collections should be made in every parish church for the relief of the poor of the parish, and also for strangers.[244]

(*h*) The final emphasis which requires our attention in Hooper's articles is that of the need for absolute simplicity both in worship and in the church buildings. Hooper was, of course, not the only bishop in England working for this end, but he surpassed the others in his desire for simplicity. Hooper objected to the presence of altars, an objection shared, for example, by Ridley.[245] Hooper, however, in addition, opposed the retention of the partition between the people and the minister. In his *Sermons on Jonah* Hooper said:

> "But this I would wish, that the magistrates should put both the preacher, minister, and the people in one place, and shut up the partition called the chancel, that separateth the congregation of Christ one from the other, as though the veil and partition of the temple in the old law yet should remain in the church; where, indeed, all figures and types ended in Christ."[246]

This demand is confirmed in his forty-third article. The article is almost word for word the same as Ridley's fifth injunction to the London diocese in 1550 concerning the replacement of altars by tables. Ridley, however, says concerning the position of the table,

that it should be placed "in such place of the choir or chancel, as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers with the communicants, may have their place separated from the rest of the people."[247] Hooper's forty-third article says, on the other hand, that the table should be placed "so that the ministers and communicants may be seen, heard, and understood of all the people being present." This clearly goes much further than Ridley's injunction. But Hooper has not yet finished, he adds: "further, that the minister in the use of the communion and prayers thereof turned his face toward the people."[248] This is distinctly contrary to the Prayer Book of 1549 which was then in use, in which the minister stood or knelt before the altar.

The church buildings were to be stripped of every possible relic of Roman Catholicism. Hooper's injunction to this effect was extreme and deserves to be quoted, at least in part. He enjoins the clergy:

> "that you exhort your parishioners and such as be under your care and charge for the ministry of the church, that they take down and remove out of their churches and chapels all places, tabernacles, tombs, sepulchres, tables, footstalls, rood-lofts, and other monuments, signs, tokens, relics, leavings and remembrances, where such superstition, idols, images, or other provocation of idolatry has been used. And also that ye take away all the greis, ascences, and upgoings that heretofore went to any altar within your churches or chapels: and to take down all the chapels, closets, partitions, and separations within your churches, whereat any mass hath been said, or any idol, image, or relic used to be honoured: . . ."[249]

The only thing that could be left was the private pew which a man had "within the church for his quietness, for himself and his to hear the common prayer."[250] Glass windows were not to be broken but when they needed repairing or replacing no image or picture of any saint should be allowed to remain on the window. If it was desired for any painting on the glass then it should be only flowers or quotations from scripture.[251] Images painted on the walls of the churches were to be defaced.[252] This work must be done by the parishioners themselves.

The ideal church building which Hooper desired to see throughout his diocese was to be simple in the extreme. The walls and roof would be bare and windows as plain as possible. There would be a pulpit containing the Bible in English and the paraphrases of Erasmus on the New Testament. There would also be a communion table "decently covered," baptismal font, pews for the people, a box for contributions for the poor and a chest in which to keep the baptismal and marriage registers. That was all. There can be little doubt that Hooper had in mind what he believed to be the apostolic simplicity of the churches he had seen in Zürich, and so he went beyond the other English Reformers in Edward's reign in his

striving for simplicity. It can also be seen that these points arise naturally out of Hooper's strict biblicism and his love of simplicity in church practice.[253]

These then are the most important points in which Hooper departs from the sources of his articles and injunctions. We shall, however, do well to notice one or two further points which he emphasises in his Visitation Book.

The aim of Hooper in his bishopric may well be summed up by the twelfth question concerning the clergy to be asked of the parishioners. It reads: "whether they (the clergy) do diligently and often stir and provoke the people to the knowledge of God in Christ, after God's Word and also to obedience unto their king in their sermons and homilies every holy-day."[254] Hooper was always very practical in his suggestions, and more than once emphasises that if the people are to be taught by the clergy then they must be able to hear and understand what they say. All preaching must be in the vernacular and as the promises of Scripture should "heal, help, succour and comfort as well the poorest as the richest, the unlearned as the learned, him that sitteth next the church door, or nearest the belfry as him that sitteth in the chancel or nearest the chancel door," then when necessary the minister must come and stand in the body of the church and there reverently and plainly proclaim "the treasures and unspeakable riches of God's laws and promises." This makes certain that if any of the parish remain ignorant then their damnation will be upon their own heads and, says Hooper, "I and you shall this way deliver our own souls."[256] This bringing of the clergy into the midst of the people was, of course, most unusual in the English church of Hooper's day.

Hooper set a minimum standard of knowledge among the laity and says: "where knowledge of the Ten Commandments, the Creed and Paternoster lacketh in such as be of discretion, there lacketh God's grace and favour. . . ."[257] If people did not know the basic requirements of a covenant they could not enter it. Thus Hooper ordered the clergy to set aside certain days for the people to be tested by open confession of these three requirements "so that by this means (if curates be diligent) the people may come to the knowledge of God in Christ: of which, if they be ignorant of negligence or contempt they cannot be saved."[258]

It was to be the same in the Communion Service, to prevent any unrepentant person taking the Communion unworthily, the curate was, if possible, to make the communicants one after another individually repeat the Ten Commandments, Creed, the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer. If there were too many for this to be done, then the curate was to say these four things slowly, phrase by phrase, so that all might repeat them after him.[259]

Hooper's injunctions and interrogatories cover many other

points varying from the use of superstitious charms by midwives to the strict observance of a Sabbath day, but from the brief survey of his Visitation Book which we have given, it can be seen that he made a real attempt to put his theory into practice. The Bible was to be the basis of authority both for doctrine and for church practice, and Hooper's concern was that the message contained in the Bible should be conveyed to his people so that they might respond to it and obtain salvation.

HOOPER'S RELATIONS WITH HIS PEOPLE

There can be little doubt that Hooper was a severe man, both by disposition and in appearance. John Foxe relates the story of a man he knew who had a problem and visited Hooper to seek his advice. He knocked on Hooper's door, but when the bishop came the visitor was so "abashed at his austere behaviour" that he dared not go into the house but sought counsel elsewhere.[260] To balance this judgment we should also record that of Thomas Fuller, the 17th century church historian.

> "yet, to speak truth all Hooper's ill nature consisted in other men's little acquaintance with him. Such as visited him once, condemned him of over austerity: who repaired to him twice, only suspected him of the same; who conversed with him constantly not only acquitted him of all morosity, but commended him for sweetness of manner; which, saith my author, endeared him to the acquaintance of Bullinger."[261]

There are at least two instances recorded for us of Hooper's concern for the poor of his diocese. On April 17th, 1551, very shortly after his arrival in Gloucester, Hooper wrote an impassioned appeal to William Cecil on behalf of the poor asking for some Government action concerning high prices.

> "For the love and tender mercy of God, persuade and cause some order to be taken upon the price of things, or else the ire of God will shortly punish. All things be here so dear, that the most part of the people lacketh and yet more will lack necessary food."

Hooper complains of the money going into the pockets of the few rich people. He then goes on:

> "The prices of things be here as I tell ye; the number of people be great, their little cottages and poor livings decay daily; except God by sickness take them out of the world, they must needs lack. God's mercy give you and the rest of my lords wisdom to redress it, wherein I pray God ye may see the occasion of the evil and so destroy it."[262]

John Foxe records that he twice visited Hooper at Worcester and saw for himself how every day the bishop had a number of the poor to dinner, who "were served with hot and wholesome meats." Typically enough, before they were served they were examined on the Lord's Prayer, Creed and Ten Commandments by Hooper or one of his deputies. When the poor had been examined and

served, Hooper himself sat down to dinner and not before.[263] Hooper may have been severe, but he did not lack the virtue of humanity.

Hooper did not only exhort his clergy to their preaching of the Gospel to the people; he set them an example of remarkable zeal. Foxe, who was an eye-witness, records:

> "No father in his household, no gardener in his garden, nor husbandman in his vineyard was more or better occupied than he in his diocese amongst his flock, going about his towns and villages in teaching and preaching to the people there."[264]

To this and other testimonies of Hooper's energy given by Hooper's friends we can now add the report of another eye-witness, the unknown citizen of Gloucester who was the host of Joshua Maler, the visitor from Zürich. The citizen reported that Hooper did not fail to visit even the smallest village in his visitation and that in Gloucester itself for two consecutive months the bishop had preached three times every day.[265]

The energy which Hooper expended in travelling up and down his diocese, especially when Worcester was included in his area, was quite phenomenal. He had to try and be in two places at once for as soon as he stayed in Worcester any length of time, then, according to his standards, the Gloucester clergy were in need of correction. He spent, for example, the early part of the summer of 1552 in London for the session of Parliament, then in June he returned to Worcester. On July 6th he was back in Gloucester because of the "negligence and ungodly behaviour of the ministers there."[266] He returned to Worcester at the beginning of October to deal with the cathedral clergy there and was disputing with Canons Joliffe and Jonson. On February 2nd, 1553 he wrote to Cecil again, from Gloucester, saying that he had just completed a "long and full circuit from church to church in Worcester and Warwickshire."[267] This tour would thus be carried out in the height of winter. On July 10th, 1553, he was in Worcester having arrived there on July 3rd, "weary from his journey through the whole diocese of Gloucester."[268] That same day he was leaving on yet another visitation. It is thus obvious that the reports of Hooper's energy are founded on fact.

On at least two occasions Martin Micron wrote to Bullinger asking him to write to Hooper and suggest that he unite prudence and Christian lenity with severity of discipline.[269] Micron does not indicate in what sphere of activity Hooper was showing this extreme severity but he may well have been referring to the diocesan court which dealt with breaches of ecclesiastical and moral law. The court until Hooper's arrival, had been largely run by lay officials, but Hooper took over the position of supreme judge which was his by right, although that right had not been exercised by his pre-

decessors for many years. Hooper's dealings in the diocesan court have been efficiently and accurately described by F. D. Price in his article on the Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper,[270] and it only remains for us to emphasise one or two points concerning Hooper's dealings with the people in this court.

John Foxe records that Hooper, in his judging, "was indifferent to all men, as well rich and poor."[271] John Ab Ulmis, however, records an accusation that Hooper "acted with severity in the discharge of his function towards trades people and those of the lower orders, but was lax and indulgent with those of higher rank."[272] Hooper denied this accusation, saying: "you may punish me with death if I fail to convince you of the impartiality of my proceedings towards all alike."[273] The accusation was, it seems, sufficiently answered when Sir Anthony Kingston, an influential man, was accused of adultery in Hooper's court. At first he refused to appear but when he eventually did appear and was rebuked by Hooper, he abused and struck the bishop. Hooper laid the matter before the king's Council and consequently Kingston was fined £500 and handed over to Hooper to do penance.[274] This was not an isolated instance of Hooper punishing the rich.[275] In addition, there are instances of cases which were being tried in Hooper's absence in which the people involved requested adjournment until the bishop's return so that he could deal with the case himself.[276] On some occasions the cases before the court were settled by the personal intervention and arbitration of the bishop. F. D. Price, who spent many months studying the records of Hooper's court, remarks

> "Under Hooper, the personal touch of the bishop regularly shines through the dull, formal records of the diocesan administration, bringing together unhappy husbands and wives, restoring concord among families divided against themselves over disputed wills, pointing out their follies to gossiping and quarrelling women and giving good advice to all and sundry."[277]

But Hooper's severity must not be overlooked. His chief method of punishment was that of public penance. But it was penance with a difference. In the days of his predecessors the guilty person's penance was that of a ritual act calling for a barefooted march round the church or churchyard, clad only in a sheet and carrying a lighted candle. The march finished up at the High Altar with the saying of the Paternoster one or more times. Hooper, however, made the act of penance full of meaning. He usually retained the penitent's dress so that there could be no doubt at all as to what was taking place, but the chief point of the act of penitence was a public declaration of contrition. The guilty person, instead of carrying a candle and saying so many Paternosters had to state the offence that he had committed and appeal for forgiveness. This public act of penance was usually ordered to be carried

out in two places—in the church from which the penitent came, and at the high cross in Gloucester on Saturday, being market day. The number of times the act is repeated varied with the seriousness of the offence and with the age and health of the offender. Normally the number ranged from between two and five acts in each place. To take two examples. Thomas Tycull of Haresfield was found guilty of bawdry and sentenced :

> " to go penitently in his shirt only, barefoot, barelegged and bareheaded, three Saturdays next after the coming, about the high cross in Gloucester, and in like manner three Sundays following in his parish church of Haresfield."[278]

John Parry of Brockworth was ordered :

> " to say openly standing upon the high cross that this penance I am commanded to do for that I have committed adultery with a woman whom upon mine oath before I declared to be an honest woman and in like manner six Sundays following in the parish church of Brockworth."[279]

The theory that lay behind Hooper's actions in ordering this public penance did not arise from the fact that penance of itself had any worth before God. It was an act to cause the offender to examine his conscience and to make certain that he was genuinely repentant of his offence. But probably more important in Hooper's mind was the effect these public acts of penance had upon those who saw them. It was an attempt to discourage them from any similar offence, and also to show that to be a Christian meant to live according to the Law of God. Once again we can perhaps see Hooper's covenant idea in practice. He did his best to make sure that the people once in the covenant relationship stayed within it. " Walk before me and be ye perfect " was God's demand to the people of the covenant. Hooper wanted to see that demand obeyed.

Hooper's teaching forever emphasised the importance of the individual, and the necessity of the individual making his response to God's offer of the covenant which brought salvation and life. It is clear that in his bishopric Hooper directed his energies to putting that into practice. He first endeavoured to raise the standard of the clergy, but that was only his first task, it was not to be an end in itself. His ultimate aim, as he so often stated it, was that the clergy might preach properly to the individual people. He felt the responsibility for their salvation. In the situation in which he found himself, with so much ignorance among the clergy, and consequently with people both ignorant and indifferent, Hooper had no option but to adopt the policy that he did. First, of ascertaining that the people knew at least the basic facts of God's dealing with men as they are contained in the Commandments, Creed and Lord's Prayer. Secondly, to endeavour to keep the people on the right path, by kindness where possible, but if not, by the use of discipline.

This emphasis on the individual, his salvation, his subsequent behaviour, and all that that emphasis entails; together with the simplicity of worship and of church buildings, resulting from the absolute authority of the Bible in doctrine and practice, is the basis of religious Puritanism. It is possible to extract from Hooper's writings his idea of a Christian man.[280] It is a conception in which one can glimpse the shadow of the soberly dressed Puritan as he journeys through life with his Bible in his hand interpreting it strictly, and severely exhorting his family and his neighbours to hear the Gospel. The Puritan figure is on the threshold and is knocking at the door.

DEATH OF HOOPER

Hooper's bishopric lasted only two years and five months. In July, 1553 Edward VI died. The Earl of Warwick attempted to place on the throne Lady Jane Grey. Hooper claims that he did not support her for she was not the lawful successor to the crown. Mary Tudor, who was a Roman Catholic, was next in succession, and Hooper rode around his diocese rallying support for Mary.[281] Lady Jane Grey's reign lasted nine days and she was replaced by Queen Mary. Hooper, known to be one of the extreme Reformers, was clearly in danger from the newly established Roman Catholic regime. But he refused to leave his people and flee abroad. He was arrested in September, 1553 and imprisoned in London. In March, 1554 he was deprived of his bishopric and in January, 1555 he was accused of heresy. The principal charges against him were that he had broken the vow of celibacy and that he denied the real bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He refused to alter his views and was condemned to death. On February 4th, 1555 he was degraded and the next day, early in the morning, he left on his last journey to Gloucester. He was to die in the place where he was once the bishop, and so it was that on February 9th, 1555, he was burnt at the stake with great suffering, being three-quarters of an hour in the flames before he died. Today in Gloucester at the place of his death there stands a monument which bears the inscription:

> "Gloria Soli Deo. For the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God 'not accepting deliverance' John Hooper bishop of Gloucester and Worcester was burnt to ashes on this spot. February 9th anno domini 1555."

VII. CONCLUSION

We must now draw together the threads of our argument. In the Introduction we suggested that in our brief telling of the story of John Hooper we should discover that he learned his theological lessons in Zürich and that he attempted to teach those same lessons to the English Church. We have endeavoured to show the truth of those two statements in the foregoing pages. What then is the implication of what we have seen? To answer that question we

must first put another. What is the place of John Hooper in English Church History? He was a Reformer, that is clear—but he was more than that. There is a title which Hooper bears in almost all the histories of the reign of Edward VI. That title is the "Father of Nonconformity."[283] But care must always be taken to define what is meant by "Nonconformity." Thomas Fuller writing in 1655 said:

> "For now nonconformity, in the days of King Edward was conceived; which afterward in the reign of Queen Mary (but beyond the sea at Frankfort) was born; which, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was nursed and weaned; which, under King James, grew up a strong youth, or tall stripling; but, towards the end of King Charles's reign, shot up to the full strength and stature of a man, able, not only to cope with, but conquer, the hierarchy, its adversary."[284]

In the twentieth century the Free Churches in England are spoken of as "Nonconformist Churches." This is an extension of the original meaning. Originally the term Nonconformist applied to those ministers within the State Church in England who did not conform to certain rites laid down by the authority of the Church. True Nonconformity was originally a movement within the English State Church. This is the movement of which Hooper is the father.

Hooper was not a Separatist, although his teaching on occasions, if taken literally, was radical enough to point in that direction.[285] Hooper himself however had no wish to separate from the State Church. He wanted to work within it and to reform it from the inside according to his own principles. That was the difficulty. His principles were not in agreement with those of the men in power. Hooper was required to conform to certain ecclesiastical rites—he refused—and so became, in his refusal, a "Nonconformist." It is true that he later conformed, but nevertheless the protest had been made; the Nonconformist movement had begun.[286]

There is however a title for Hooper in English Church History which is today less open to misunderstanding than "Father of Nonconformity" and yet means the same thing. This title is "Father of English Puritanism." For Puritanism as it developed in England in the reign of Elizabeth I was none other than this Nonconformist movement. It was the refusal of men within the State Church to conform to rites as demanded by the authority of that church. Puritanism and Nonconformity at first were one and the same movement. The problem as it first clearly showed itself in Elizabeth I's reign was, as with Hooper, difficulty over vestments. The principle that Hooper had striven for was invoked. The Church must be reformed according to the Word of God—not only in doctrine, but also in church practice. This was the root of the matter.

Hooper himself stood, of course, in the Reformation tradition with his emphasis on, for example, justification by faith. This was orthodox teaching shared by all the English Reformers. The

cleavage between Hooper and the English bishops came chiefly on the question of the absolute authority of the Bible. Two presuppositions lie at the root of Hooper's arguments. The first is that there must be a scriptural warrant for all that is done in public worship and therefore the authority of the Church to decree rites and ceremonies is denied. When it is answered that this should not be pushed so far as to include small matters, like vestments, which are things indifferent, then the second presupposition is stated, that the matters in dispute are not indifferent, for they are relics of popery and are not scriptural. This was the heart of Hooper's teaching, and it was the heart of English Puritanism.

The first English Puritans agreed with the Elizabethan State Church on basic doctrines, but in church practice the Puritan's rigid appeal to Scripture caused disagreement.[287] As the result of this appeal, the Puritans followed Hooper and refused to wear clerical vestments; they desired to empty church buildings of all altars, images, ornaments, etc., and leave only the necessary furniture. As the name "Puritan" probably suggests,[288] they wished to purify the English Church by removing all relics of the unreformed Church and restoring what they considered to be the simplicity of the apostolic Church. For them, simplicity meant purity. They wanted a clean break, not only with medieval doctrine in the English Church, but also with medieval practices. There could be no half measures, all church practices must have scriptural warrant.

To illustrate this point—and the illustration could be multiplied many times—we quote from the first Puritan admonition to Parliament from the year 1571. The Puritans suggest concerning the sacraments, among other things:

> "That people be appointed to receive the sacrament rather sitting for the avoiding of superstition than kneeling."
> "That both the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and baptism also may be administered according to the ancient purity and simplicity."
> "And finally that nothing be done in this or any other thing but that which you have the express warrant of God's Word for."[289]

This might well be Hooper speaking. The flames at Gloucester had silenced his voice sixteen years previously, but his teaching lived on and bore fruit in Elizabethan Puritanism.

Although this was the heart of the matter it was not only their strict appeal to Scripture for church practice as well as for doctrine that characterised the Puritans. There was also the emphasis upon the individual and his experience of salvation. Salvation was an individual thing which each man must come to experience for himself. It is not through church ceremonies that a man comes to faith and salvation but through hearing and reading the Word of God, through a personal recognition of sin, and a turning away from it. There must be a personal visit to the cross of Calvary and a return free from the burden of sin. There is no need for a priestly ministry

to intercede; every man, be he minister or layman, rich or poor, may come to God through Christ. The minister's task was zealously to point out to the individual, from the Word of God, the road of salvation. But the individual, having been shown the road, may and must travel it alone. This Puritan emphasis reached its peak in Bunyan's figure of Christian in the *Pilgrim's Progress*. As G. M. Trevelyan remarks: "The lonely figure of the first paragraph in *Pilgrim's Progress*—the poor man seeking salvation with tears, with no guide save the Bible in his hand . . . is the representative Puritan of the English Puritan epoch."[290]

More than a century separated Hooper and Bunyan, yet the emphasis on the individual and his own personal experience of the journey on the road to salvation is present in Hooper. We remarked earlier that in Hooper the Puritan figure was knocking at the door. During the following century the door was opened wide and that figure came in and made himself at home in English Church History.

Not unconnected with this emphasis on the individual is the covenant theology which played such a large rôle in later Puritan theology.[291] God offered the covenant to all believers, but an individual can enter it only through his personal decision. We have seen that this too is basic in Hooper. Along with this also goes the Puritan emphasis on the living of a good life. The life of those who are within the covenant. We have seen Hooper's emphasis on discipline as he attempted to keep the people on the right way. In Elizabeth I's reign the Puritans, under the influence of Geneva, heightened this discipline and made it, alongside the Word and Sacraments, a third mark of the true Church.

This strictness was not limited to the Church but extended to family life. In the century after Hooper's death the unit of the Puritan family developed, with its family piety, strictness of life, and consequent high moral standards. It is therefore interesting to recall what John Foxe wrote of the home of a man he visited.

> "In every corner thereof there was some smell of virtue, good example, honest conversation and reading of Holy Scriptures. There was not to be seen in his house any courtly rioting or idleness; no pomp at all; no dishonest word; no swearing could there be heard."[292]

This could clearly be a pattern of a 17th century Puritan home. Yet the household of which Foxe wrote is none other than that of John Hooper himself.

Thus there can be little doubt that Hooper, in his call to reform the Church according to Scripture and to return it to the state of apostolic simplicty, in his theology of the covenant between God and man, in his emphasis upon the soul and salvation of the individual, in his family life, and indeed in his whole life and

thought, sowed the seeds of Puritanism in the England of Edward VI. Hooper rightly bears the title of "Father of Nonconformity," or better "Father of English Puritanism."[293]

Hooper's place in English Church History is thus fixed. We are now in a position to answer the first question we asked. What is the implication of Hooper's relationship to Bullinger and to Zürich? It is this. As Hooper learned most of his teaching from Zürich, then to Zürich in a measure, the origins of English Puritanism must be traced. There is no need to list again the ideas for which Hooper was indebted to Zürich. Let it suffice to recall that it was from his own experience of the theory and practice of the Zürich church that he learned the all-important call which lay at the heart of Puritanism—the call for an absolute reform according to the Word of God, not only in doctrine but also in church practice, and a return to the simplicity of the apostolic Church.

Hooper, the man who was chiefly responsible for sowing the seed of Puritanism in the England of Edward VI, was a follower of Zürich. But when Mary came to the throne of England and the seeds were taken out of England by the exiles to Frankfort and elsewhere, the soil in which they were planted was chiefly Genevan soil. So it was that when the young plant of Puritanism was brought back by the returning exiles in 1558 it looked very much like a Genevan plant. As it grew in the England of Elizabeth I Puritanism developed still more Genevan characteristics; so much so that in the past there has been a general tendency to attribute the origins of Puritanism entirely to Geneva. Now it is becoming obvious that this solution over-simplifies the issue. The truth of the matter probably is that the origins of Puritanism cannot be traced entirely to any one single place or person. We, too, must therefore take care not to over-simplify by concluding that the origins of Puritanism lie entirely in Zürich. Nevertheless, we believe that it can be seen that in so far as Hooper was the chief influence leading towards Puritanism in England under Edward VI, to that extent at least, the origins of Puritanism lie not in Geneva, the city of Calvin, but rather in Zürich, the city of Zwingli, and of Hooper's faithful friend and teacher, Henry Bullinger.

NOTES

[206] There is now no copy of the original edition of this book extant. The source from which we learn of its existence is a manuscript in the Morrice Collection of Manuscripts in the Dr. Williams's Library in London.

[207] Hooper, when writing to his clergy signs himself "Brother and Fellow-Preacher." L.Wr. p. 98.

[208] The oldest copy of the result of this visitation is also among the Morrice Collection of Manuscripts in the Dr. Williams's Library, London. There is a typed copy of this in the Gloucester City Library in the Hockaday Collection, VI. 2. James Gairdner produced a summary of the Visitation in the *English Historical Review*, Vol. XIX (1904), pp. 98-121.

[209] See *English Historical Review, op. cit.*, p. 111 and p. 118.
[210] L.Wr., p. 132.
[211] *Ibid.*
[212] *Ibid.*
[213] See *English Historical Review*, op. cit., p. 105. The fact that Parkhurst was already in possession of his living in 1551 would seem to suggest that Miss Garrett is not strictly accurate when she writes of Parkhurst: "Just before the accession of Mary he had received the rich living of Cleeve in Gloucestershire." C. H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles.* Camb. 1938, p. 244.
[214] Gee & Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, Lond. 1896, p. 380-381.
[215] It is possible that Parkhurst was the bearer of the letter written from prison by Hooper to Bullinger on May 29th, 1554. Z.S.A. E. II 369: 41; E.T. p. 66; O.L. 1, p. 103.
[216] See J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation under Elizabeth.* Vol. II, 1. Oxford 1824, pp. 133-140, and J. Strype, *Life of Edmund Grindal*, Oxford 1821, pp. 260-262.
[217] See F. Blanke, "Zwingli's 'Prophezei' und die Anfänge des Puritanismus" in *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, No. 1175, June 29, 1939.
[218] State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, addenda XII. 27 (Calendar 1601-1603, p. 552). Edward Gaston to Haddon in a letter dated October 16, 1564.
[219] Parkhurst, although a bishop, did not disguise the direction in which his sympathies lay. In 1561 we find Cecil, the Secretary of State, writing to Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, after a visitation by the Queen to the Norwich area stating the Queen's displeasure at the lack of uniformity in Parkhurst's bishopric and of his failure to enforce the commands issued by the authority of the church. Cecil writes: "the Bishop of Norwich is blamed even of the best sort for the remissness in ordering his clergy . . . surely I see a great variety in ministration. A surplice may not be borne here." J. Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, Vol. I, p. 214. Oxford 1821. See also *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, Vol. II, p. 36.
[220] "Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, to Mr. Thomas Fowle, Mr. John Handson and Mr. John Grundye: for the setting on foot of the exercise of 'prophesy' at Bury St. Edmunds." J. Strype, *Annals, op. cit.*, Vol. II. 2, p. 194.
[221] For an examination of this see W. Bellardi, *Die Geschichte der 'Christlichen Gemainschaft' in Strassburg* (1546-1550). Leipzig, 1934, pp. 116-118. See also Bellardi's *Die Vorstufen der Collegia Pietatis Speners* (Dissertation Breslau 1929), in which he deals with the history of the "Prophesyings" in England.
[222] The Elizabethan "Prophesyings" were of course strongly supported by many bishops and it was a refusal to suppress these exercises that caused the sequestration of Grindal, Archbishop of Canterbury in June, 1577.
[223] It is interesting to note that Parkhurst also set up superintendents in his diocese in Norwich. They were to watch over every minister and parishioner and were to report to the synods. They were also appointed moderators of the "Prophesyings." Strype, *Annals, op. cit.*, Vol. II. 2, p. 696f.
[224] See E. Dollfuss Zodel, *Bullinger's Einfluss auf das zürcherische Staatswesen von* 1531-1575, Zürich 1931, p. 20. Also L. Lavater, *De ritibus, op. cit.*, p. 95.
[225] L.Wr., p. xix.
[226] L.Wr., p. 134.
[227] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, vol. VI, p. 610.
[228] For Ridley's Articles see his *Works.* Parker Society, Camb. 1841, p. 319f.

229 Z.S.A. E. II 343: 457 and Z.S.A. E. II 369: 12/13; E.T. p. 46 and p. 48; O.L. 1, p. 71 and p. 76.

230 L.Wr., p. xviii.

231 The title of this work is "Responsio venerabilium sacerdotum, Henrici Joliffi et Roberti Jonson, sub protestatione facta, ad illos articulus Ioannis Hoperi, episcopi Vigorniae nomen gerentis, in quibus a catholica fide dissentiebat; una cum confutationibus ejusdem Hoperi, et replicationibus reverendissimi in Christo patris bonae memoriae Stephani Gardineri, episcopi Vintoniensis, tunc temporis pro confessioni fidei in carcere detenti." Antverpiae, MDLXIIII. ex Officina Christopheri Plantini.

232 For a comparison of these Latin articles recorded by Joliffe and the *Forty-two Articles,* see C. Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion,* 3rd edition, 1876, p. 78.

233 It is interesting that Constant in his *Introduction of the Reformation into England* 1547-53, Vol. II, 1941, p. 296 and note 3, suggests that the similarity of Hooper's Articles to the Forty-two is due to Hooper's influence on the Forty-two and not vice-versa.

234 L.Wr., p. 120.

235 L.Wr., p. 120-121.

236 *Ibid,* p. 121.

237 *Ibid.*

238 *Ibid,* Article VIII.

239 *Ibid,* p. 123.

240 *Ibid.*

241 Gloucester Diocesan Records (hereafter G.D.R.), XVIII, 49-50.

242 L.Wr., p. 124.

243 The Article on Royal Supremacy in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* reads: "The Queen's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other of the dominions, under whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, doth appertain. . . ."

244 L.Wr., p. 127.

245 Cf. the famous occasion June 11, 1550 when Ridley pulled down the altar of St. Paul's and replaced it with a table, *Chronicle of the Greyfriars of London,* ed. J. Nichols, Camden Society, 1852, p. 67.

246 E.Wr., p. 491.

247 Ridley *Works, op. cit.,* p. 319-320.

248 L.Wr., p. 128. It is interesting that this practice is today found in England but only in the Free Churches.

249 L.Wr., p. 135.

250 *Ibid.*

251 *Ibid,* p. 138.

252 *Ibid,* p. 138-9.

253 It should not be forgotten that Hooper seems to have spent some years of his life as a member of the Cistercian Order. The rule of this Order was very austere and demanded simplicity in life, dress and church practice. It is not however possible to discover how strictly the sixteenth century Cistercians in Cleeve Abbey where Hooper probably had been, had held to this Rule. Hooper never refers to his time as a monk in his writings, but it is interesting to conjecture whether the "Puritanism" of the Cistercians had any conscious or unconscious effect on his own enthusiasm in this direction.

254 L.Wr., p. 144.

255 *Ibid,* p. 131.

256 *Ibid.*

257 *Ibid,* p. 133

258 *Ibid.*

259 *Ibid,* p. 132-3.

[260] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 639.
[261] T. Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, Vol. II, *op. cit.*, p. 374.
[262] The letter is printed in Bradford, Vol. II, p. 395f.
[263] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 644.
[264] *Ibid*, p. 643.
[265] S.C. S. 200, p. 28.
[266] Letter in L.Wr., p. xviii.
[267] Letter in *Report of Historical Commission*, Cecil I, No. 422, p. 107.
[268] Hooper writing to Cecil, *ibid*, No. 464, p. 125.
[269] See Z.S.A. E. II 369: 103; E.T. p. 374; O.L. 2, p. 576 and Z.S.A. E. II 369: 96; E.T. p. 328; O.L. 2, p. 498.
[270] Published in *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 1938, Vol. 60, pp. 51-152. Anyone working on the G.D.R. must be grateful to two men. First, to F. H. Hockaday who put them in order, and secondly, to F. D. Price who worked patiently through the "dog Latin" in which they are written to produce his article. Mr. Price is always accurate when dealing with the diocesan records but his statements about Hooper's general life and background must sometimes be received with caution.
[271] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 644.
[272] Z.S.A. E. II 369: 101; E.T. p. 291: O.L. 2, p. 441.
[273] *Ibid.*
[274] *Ibid.* Cf. J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 654, where Kingston at Hooper's burning, thanks Hooper for the influence for good the bishop had been in his life.
[275] Cf. G.D.R. VI. 8, 37, 90, 100, and 104, where Edward Myll, the Squire of Harescombe made appearances on the charge of adultery and was punished. F. D. Price, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
[276] Cf. G.D.R., Vol. VI, 113. F. D. Price, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
[277] F. D. Price, *op. cit.*, p. 82-3.
[278] G.D.R., VI. 1. F. D. Price, *op. cit.*, p. 90-91 (spelling modernised).
[279] G.D.R. VI. 100. F. D. Price, *op. cit.*, p. 91 (spelling modernised).
[280] See Original Thesis, pp. 172-176.
[281] L.Wr., pp. 556-7.
[282] The details of Hooper's death are given in J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, Vol. VI, pp. 656-659. Foxe does not hesitate to give all details and they do not make pleasant reading.
[283] As so often happens, the writer who first coined this title is not easy to trace but it was well established by the time Canon Dixon wrote his *History of the English Church* in 1885. The title will arise naturally from the idea of the "Nonconformist infant" which Fuller gives in the quotations cited in the next note.
[284] T. Fuller, *The Church History of Britain, op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 373.
[285] We may note, for example, Hooper's statement that when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is used contrary to the institution of Christ then "every man may in his private chamber with his Christian and faithful brothers, communicate according to the order of scripture." E.Wr., p. 173. With this we may compare Hooper's advice written in a letter from prison to "certain godly persons instructing them how to behave at the beginning of the change of religion." Hooper writes: "There is no better way to be used in this troublesome time for your consolation than many times to have assemblies together of such men and women as be of your religion in Christ." L.Wr., p. 589.
[286] See Fuller's quotation given earlier in this section. James Gairdner remarks: "Hooper's struggle with authority demands special notice in church history. It was quite unprecedented in character; but in the days of Elizabeth he had many followers. He was the beginner of what, by the

commencement of the seventeenth century and probably earlier still, had received the name of nonconformity." *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, Vol. III, 1908-13, p. 276.

[287] Cf. the remarks of Miller and Johnson speaking of the later Puritans' differences with Archbishop Laud. "If the bishop submitted to the Bible as God's Word, received it by faith and reinforced his faith with rational convictions—very well then, let him accept it and act accordingly. Let him not, once he has established its authority then turn about and explain away a good part of it, invent reasons to prove that only some portions are God's law, that the Bible is not binding on every point on which it speaks but merely on some few. If the Bible declares God is three persons in one, let that be believed, said the Puritans; if the Bible says that wigs are an abomination unto the Lord: let that also be believed.

"And there the Anglican protested, and the fight began." *The Puritans*, New York, 1938, p. 43.

[288] The origin of the name "Puritan" is not quite certain. A. F. Scott Pearson on page 18 of his book, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism*, Cambridge, 1925, says that he has found it in prominent use in documents in the sense in which we understand it from the year 1572 onwards. It is likely therefore that its origins lie several years prior to this date, but they are obscure. It is quite possible that the name originated from certain Separatists who used the name to designate the purity of their groups. John Stow records: "About that tyme were many congregations of the Anabaptists in London, who cawlyd themselves Puritans or unspottyd Lambs of the Lord." *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles*, ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society, XXVIII, Lond. 1880, p. 143. It is not possible to date Stow exactly but there is a report in the Calendar of State Papers Spanish II.7 (1568) which gives a similar statement of those claiming "stainless religion." It is not unlikely that the name as we understand it was taken up and applied to the group in the Elizabethan church who protested against vestments and who caused the Vestment Controversy of the winter of 1567-8.

[289] Printed in Frere & Douglas, *Puritan Manifestoes*, 1907, p. 14.

[290] G. M. Trevelyan, *English Social History*, 1946, p. 234.

[291] See especially Perry Miller, *The Marrow of Puritan Divinity*, Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXXII, 1936, p. 247-300, and the same author's *The New England Mind*, New York, 1939, p. 365. Appendix B. of this book, p. 502f., gives a chronological bibliography of publications concerning Covenant Theology from William Perkins onwards. See also Ralph Bronkema, *The Essence of Puritanism*, Goes, Holland 1929, p. 100-124.

[292] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 64. See also L. Schücking, *Die Familie in Puritanismus*, Leipzig, 1929, especially p. 84. "Die ganze Puritanische Bewegung wurzelt ja letzten Endes in der Familie und ist ohne sie nicht zu denken."

[293] That Hooper was recognised as a forerunner by the exiles in Frankfort, where, as Fuller said, nonconformity was born, is clear from references made to him first by John Knox in his Frankfort sermon of March, 1555, and secondly, in the famous Supplication to the Senate of Frankfort in the same month of 1555. These instances are recorded in *Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort in Germany* (W. Whittingham), p. 55 and p. 58. As August Lang says of Hooper: "His genuine Zwinglian radicalism for practical reform was doubtless the spark which later, first in Frankfort, and then in England under Elizabeth, lit the first flame of the spirit of Puritanism." *Archivefür Reformationsgeschichte*, 38, 1941, p. 234. (My translation).

W. MORRIS S. WEST.

Reviews

Dictionary of Mysticism. Ed. Frank Gaynor. (Philosophical Library of New York, $5.00)

The Philosophical Library are in process of issuing a "Mid-century Reference Library" under the general editorship of Dr. Dagobert Runes. The project is ambitious, and extends from volumes like the present one to a "Dictionary of Diplomacy" and an "Encyclopaedia of Tobacco."

The title of the present volume is a little misleading. Its scope is mainly Eastern mysticism and the occult. Of "orthodox" Christian mysticism is has very little to say. For instance, the reader who looks up "Stage of Illumination" will be surprised that he is simply told to look up Dasa-Dhumi, which he will discover to be the Sanskrit name for the ten stages in the spiritual development of a Bodhisattua. "The dark night of the soul" makes no reference at all to St. John of the Cross. Moreover, he will search in vain for any reference to such terms as "ligature" and "acquired" and "infused" contemplation. All this seems a little puzzling as the drawing on the dust-cover is of St. Jerome and his lion, and the books which lie open round him appear to be written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. Modern religious movements come off better. We learn that Christian Science was founded by Mary Baker Eddy, and the Theosophical Society by Col. Olcott and Mme. Blavatsky and a note of their main tenets is given. The Quakers and George Fox get a mention. It is a little surprising to find Freemasonry figuring once or twice till one remembers that Annie Besant came back from the Continent as "The Most Puissant Commander, the Venerable and Illustrious Brother Besant" of the Rite Mixte du Droit Humain, and observes that, according to the Dictionary, "A great deal of ancient and medieval occult lore, particularly of the Kabalah and of alchemy, has been retained by the Order in a more or less modified form." But the 2,200 definitions afford a mine of information on Buddhist and Hindu terms, astrology, necromancy, occultism, magic and demonology, psychical research and kindred subjects.

Great Systems of Yoga, by Ernest Wood. (Philosophical Library of New York, $3.50.)

Professor Ernest Wood was formerly a Professor of Physics in India, and while teaching in that capacity he became deeply interested in the ancient philosophies and psychology of India,

learning Sanskrit so that he might read the authorities in the original. On retiring from his post he devoted himself to expounding these doctrines to the Western World, believing that they would be of great value here.

The dust-cover shows a man tied up in the kind of physical knot which we can only associate with acrobats, and in consequence one opens the book expecting more of a dissertation on advanced gymnastics than anything else. Indeed when expounding the physical exercises of the Hatha and Laya Yogas, Professor Wood quotes from the Shiva Sanhita as follows: "When the Yogi is able to practise holding the breath for an hour and a half, various siddhis (faculties and powers) arise, including phophecy, travelling at will, sight and hearing at a distance, vision of the invisible worlds, entering others' bodies, turning various metals into gold, invisibility at will, and moving in the air." The author, however, lays it down firmly that he does not believe that purely physical exercises can develop the mind at all, or contribute to yogic or occult experience, but merely develop the body. This quotation is an extreme case and the other systems of yoga here described aim much more directly at mental and spiritual control. Indeed one might describe many of them as severe disciplines to arrive at the fruits of the spirit.

To a student of Yoga this book will be an invaluable guide by an expert. To the average Christian three lessons seem to emerge. First, the amazing determination and discipline of those who embark on this quest for perfection. Second, the intimate correlation of the physical and spiritual, so often overlooked in the West, and third, the fact that occult powers and spiritual ones are entirely different things.

DENIS LANT.

The Dawn of the Post-Modern Era, by E. J. Trueblood. (Philosophical Library, New York, $3.75.)

The underlying assumption of this book is that in the last decade or so the modern epoch has come to an end. The split atom and a split humanity have brought us to "the Post-Modern" era. The task which the author sets himself is to analyse the life of post-modern man and to describe the re-orientations necessary in the changed conditions. In many ways this is a praiseworthy attempt at that task and the book reveals a wide range of investigations into the many fields in which guidance is needed. Not the least commendable feature is the evident sympathy with which the author writes of the problems confronting our generation.

The over-all solution he offers is a philosophy of personalism and much of what he says, both positively and also as against the

prevalent materialism, is valuable. The book is weak however at a vital point. There is no doubt of the author's sympathy towards religion or of his conviction that Christianity has a vital role to fulfil. But his philosophy seems to be the important thing and religion appears as one among several sources which will serve towards its realisation. Moreover, in spite of occasional allusions which suggest a more adequate theology the general impression gained is that in this sphere he is least up-to-date. His Christ is "the greatest religious genius of all time" and Christianity's task is "to rediscover the genius of its Founder." This kind of doctrine was found inadequate by the Church of the Modern era; it is unlikely to satisfy or save the Post-Modern.

G. W. RUSLING.

A Foundation of Ontology, by Otto Samuel. (Philosophical Library, New York, $3.75.)

Nicolai Hartmann, whose ontology is here expounded and criticised, died in 1950. Our author describes him as one of the three greatest modern philosophers (the other two being Martin Heidegger and Max Scheler) and sets out to introduce English readers, for whom only Hartmann's "Ethik" has been translated, to his "Zur Grundlegung der Ontologie." He deals carefully with Hartmann's terms, such as "Being" (Sein), Extant (Seiendes), Hereness (Dasein) and Suchness (Sosein), but his purpose is critical and he develops a distinctive viewpoint of his own, which he describes as meontological. This is a difficult book about a difficult subject. Philosophers are often hard to understand and German philosophers sometimes impossible. One wonders what the scientist who, after hearing F. H. Bradley lecture, was asked if he now knew what philosophy was and replied, "Yes, organised piffle!" would have made of this. It is heavy going. The reader will lay the book down, if not enlightened, at any rate humbled, and that is not the least of the benefits of philosophy—it induces humility.

Christ and the Human Life, by F. W. Foerster. (Philosophical Library, New York, $5.00.)

We are told that Pope Pius XI sent the author his personal blessings and the Protestant faculty of Leipzig conferred on him their honorary Doctorate of Theology, but, even without this information, the reader would be in no doubt as to Dr. Foerster's piety and erudition. His book is a second edition of one published in 1921, but he has "radically revised" the text in the light of world events since then. There are two parts, viz. "Christ and

the Human Soul" and "Christ and the Human Life," the former dealing broadly with theoretical, the latter with practical, Christianity. Chapter headings in Part I include "We are living in an Apocalyptic Time," "Father, Son and Holy Ghost" and "The Political Christ"; in Part II, "The Meaning and Application of the Sermon on the Mount," "Dignity and Education of Woman," and "Self-Knowledge." It will be seen that the work covers a great deal of ground, which is both its chief virtue and principal defect. There is a mass of useful material. People who collect illustrations will find some new ones here. Preachers who like a book which starts trains of thought for next Sunday's sermon will value this one. Those who are seeking the common ground between Roman Catholics and Protestants may feel that in this book they have found the answer. In two respects, however, the book is unsatisfactory. (i) Dr. Foerster seems constantly to be beginning again. So many are the subjects dealt with in the different chapters, and so many the divisions within each chapter. He tells us that his procedure will be, not deductive, "applying a central truth to individual cases," but inductive, "calling reality to witness"; penetrating "from the edge towards the centre, not from the centre outward toward the edge." This procedure may commend itself to those who think highly of the scientific method, but it is questionable as to whether, beginning in that way, you can ever arrive at theological conclusions. Dr. Foerster, at any rate, seems to be better at beginning than concluding. This is the book's second defect, (ii) it frequently leaves an argument in the air. For instance, in a chapter on "Mary," just when the present reviewer felt that he was beginning to understand the place which the Virgin occupies in the devotional life of some Christians as he had never done before, he came on this: "The fact that woman, by her soul's contact with God, can become a maid again, contains such deep knowledge of and such penetration into the most delicate mystery of all spiritual and physical health that one would sin against chastity if he tried to explain it even." Is there anything which it is a sin to explain?

W. D. HUDSON.

The Christian and his Bible, by Douglas Johnson. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 3s. 6d.)

If one cannot accept the author's conclusions, which are unyieldingly conservative, he commands respect by the manner in which in the main he states his case. There is evidence of considerable wading in "critical" waters, but he comes out dry. But the bibliography excludes his readers from any fishing in such dangerous waters!

The only concession we can find follows his conclusion that the Synoptic evangelists are independent of one another. Mr. Johnson adds that "those who believe that a comparison . . . reveals signs of dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark may be allowed their view which does not diminish the value nor the authority of the synoptic gospels." It is a pity that he cannot realise that for many of us this and other "critical" views not merely "do not diminish" but actually enhance the value and authority of Scripture.

Many of the old ideas die hard, e.g. that the analysis of the Pentateuch rests solely on the variation in the Divine names, while the author's appendix on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel might have been penned forty or fifty years ago: it shows little appreciation of the real difficulties of the problem.

Nor on matters of the text is Mr. Johnson any happier. He misses the real significance of the comparative uniformity of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and proceeds to give a curious twist to the discrepancy between it and the Septuagint. He further maintains that we are justified in claiming a "virtual," "essential" infallibility for the "resultant text" of Holy Scripture. As the phrase "resultant text" is in inverted commas, one assumes that it is used in the technical sense, which leaves one agape.

Space forbids reference to numerous other points, but strong exception must be taken to the suggestion, repeatedly made, that rejection of the "plenary" theory is due to agnostic outlook, veiled rationalism, all-pervading humanism and the like. It is hinted that the outlook of the "critic" is essentially deistic and that his view of the Bible suffers accordingly. All this is theological tub-thumping.

With much of the early chapters we can concur, while the closing chapter on "Understanding the Bible" is excellent. The bulk of the book has no necessary connection with them.

W. S. DAVIES.

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau fur Bibelwissen schaft und Grenzgebiete. International Review of Biblical Studies. Vol. 1, Part 2. Patmos-Verlag, Dusseldorf.

The first part of this amazing work classified no fewer than 1,391 articles published in 393 Journals, etc. This second part carries the list of articles from No. 1,392 to No. 2,597. The work is a brilliant idea, and is essential for research. It is a bibliographical goldmine, though it is essential that every piece of gold should be examined before it is used. It is a Journal of Biblical and related Journals, and often gives summaries of the articles it classifies. These few lines can give no indication of the great worth and indispensable character of the work.

Essentials for a Living Church, by James Gray. (Berean Press, 3s. 6d.)

Here are three lectures given in several continents to the Disciples of Christ, on the relation of Scripture and Tradition. The first chapter evaluates Tradition as important, living and inevitable. The second illustrates the relation of Scripture to Tradition from such topics as Doctrine, Baptism and Ministry. In the concluding chapter Principal Gray comes to grips with his problem, i.e. the difficulty of finding the normative standard of Christianity in the New Testament and of applying what must be claimed as an irreducible minimum of the faith to the church and the ministry. The book is far more important than its size would suggest. The material is courageously presented and will stimulate Christians to further thought on these ever-present problems.

Letters to my Daughter, by Dagobert D. Runes. (Philosophical Library, N.Y., $2.50.)

This book contains the personal testament of a Jewish philosopher set forth in the form of twenty-one letters to his daughter, with an appendix of "Evening Thoughts." The style is simple, the thoughts are homely, the themes relevant to our present discontents, and the occasional story arresting. Although in a way the book is a kind of Wisdom Literature brought up to date, the deeper notes of prophetic passion, and the promptings of wonder are not absent. Criticism of Christians is often justified, though blame is not for them alone.

The Church of South India. 1. *Daily Bible Readings.* 2. *Bible Readings and Collects.* 3. *An Order for the Lord's Supper.* (Oxford University Press, Geoffrey Cumberlege, 2s., 1s. 6d., 1s. 3d.)

Here are three most attractive and helpful booklets from the Church of South India. The first is a planned course of daily readings to cover the Bible in one or two years. Theme headings are provided. Through the readings the biblical history of the kingdom of God is set forth, and special attention is paid to Bethlehem, Calvary and Pentecost.

The second provides a selection of one Old Testament and two New Testament passages plus theme headings and short prayers for each Sunday and some festival days. I warmly recommend both these booklets as a guide to both Bible reading and Bible preaching. The second booklet is also meant to be used with the third.

The third booklet will be of interest to Baptists because whilst it presents a typical ecclesiastical order of service for the Lord's Supper, it is quite unlike anything that Baptists are normally used

to. The booklet contains an order for Pre-Communion. Would that Baptists would revive the old custom of the service of preparation for the Communion! Then comes the Preparation (comprising twelve acts of worship), then, The Ministry of the Word (comprising fourteen acts of worship), and lastly, The Breaking of the Bread (comprising twenty-five acts of worship).

Baptists should read and study a book like this, for it will help them to make up their minds about their practices. They will want to ask—What is the relation of this suggested order to the account recorded in 1 *Corinthians?* Does this suggested order of service have the effect of "smothering" the *act* of the Lord's Supper in too many words? When Baptists agree to televise their Communion service, will the service be similar to this booklet or to 1 *Corinthians?*

Deliverance—Challenge—Victory, by W. Gordon Robinson. (Independent Press, 1s. 6d.)

This booklet is an expansion of three talks given for the B.B.C. under the title "The Heart of the Bible," expounded under the three themes of the title. The material is simple, sound and Biblical, and the booklet is to be commended for that reason. At the same time I was disappointed in the sequence. After the first chapter on Deliverance treated against the deliverance from Egypt, I expected the second theme, Challenge, to be concerned with Covenant. That is what follows in the Bible. All I found among other things was a few lines on relationship. Having thus lost the way, he failed to relate victory to the promised land. Thus it may be said that the author's material is sound, and illustrates the themes he has chosen, but it does not give or illustrate the Biblical sequence.

G. HENTON DAVIES.

Epistle to the Galatians, by Herman N. Ridderbos. New London Commentary on the New Testament. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 25s.).

The author is a noted Dutch scholar, who teaches New Testament studies in the Kampen Theological Seminary in Holland, and this is the second edition of the volume. Questions of date, authenticity, content, occasion, purpose, etc. are dealt with in nearly 40 pp. of introduction. Professor Ridderbos dismisses Meyer's contention that this epistle was the outcome of rivalry between Paul and Peter, and Lietzemann's that Paul's opponent was Barnabas, and accepts the traditional view that the Apostle's conflict was with unnamed propagators of a Judaizing interpretation of Christianity which had infiltrated the churches of Galatia. A comparison is made between this epistle and *Romans.* The date of 50-51 is accepted, no doubt

is entertained as to authenticity and the churches of South rather than North Galatia are regarded as the recipients of the epistle. The actual commentary gives fairly full expository notes, clarifying the meaning in many places by reference to the original, and should prove a most serviceable help and guide to those who would understand better the message of this significant letter. The volume combines very well discussion of critical matters with the kind of exposition that is helpful to preachers, and the whole has been well translated by Dr. H. Zylstra.

The Churches and Press Publicity, by Raynor D. Chapman. (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.).

The author of this wise and useful manual of guidance on how to make the best use of opportunities of publicising Christian activities is editor of *The Yorkshire Observer* and a Congregationalist, and therefore well qualified, as these pages prove. While the first part deals with relationships with the Press, the second is devoted to the Church Magazine and much valuable advice is supplied. We warmly commend this little book. Much good would result if the author's suggestions were put into practice.

Church Publicity, by Eric W. Hayden. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 2s. 6d.).

The author is a Baptist minister who possesses a talent with brush and pen. This brightly written booklet, itself attractively produced, pleads with churches to adopt a publicity policy and to bring church advertising nearer to the standards of modern commercial publicity. Useful suggestions as to how this may be done are offered and it is stressed that this need not be as costly as many imagine. There are five pages of illustrations, and the whole makes a helpful production.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Transactions, vol. iv., Nos. 3 and 4, and the *Baptist Quarterly,* vol. iv, No. 5 are needed by Rev. G. W. Rusling, Spurgeon's College; the appropriate price will be paid for them to anyone who can supply.