The Emergence of the Protestant Evangelical Tradition

RICHARD TURNBULL

It has been increasingly recognized that there are substantial differences between evangelicals. This has become focussed in recent years with the strengthening of the evangelical movement within the Church of England; when a group is in a distinct minority there is much greater emphasis on those unifying aspects rather than differences. The recent divisions over the ordination of women to the presbyterate have only served to heighten the tensions. We should not be surprised by such different concerns and emphases among those that call themselves evangelical. They reflect the diversity of the evangelical tradition from its emergence in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. But, as Alister McGrath has said, 'evangelicals are shockingly ignorant of their own heritage.'[1] The purpose of this article is to trace that heritage, and examine how mainstream Protestant evangelicalism emerged.

Unity and diversity

In 1783 a group of London evangelical clergy founded the Eclectic Society for conducting theological discussion and the investigation of religious truth. For many of the meetings in the period 1798–1814 the notes made by one of the participants, the Revd. Josiah Pratt, later secretary of the Church Missionary Society, were published in 1858 by John Henry Pratt.[2] The members of the Society when the notes began consisted of a number of well-known evangelical clergymen, including the Revd. John Newton, the Revd. Thomas Scott, the Revd. Richard Cecil, the Revd. John Venn, the Revd. Basil Woodd, the Revd. Josiah Pratt; two dissenting ministers, the Revd. J. Clayton and the Revd. J. Goode; and a layman, John Bacon, Esq. Other members joined over time and there were also country members who attended meetings when in London, and these included the Revd. Charles Simeon. The notes of these meetings represent a crucial source for the understanding of the content of evangelical theology at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

This is not the place for a full discussion of the content and range of the Eclectic Society's discussions. For the purposes of understanding the emergence of Protestant evangelicalism two comments only are necessary.

First, despite the wide range of opinion expressed at the meetings, and clearly different emphases emerging in relation to biblical interpretation and providence, there was an essential unity, particularly in the area of atonement and justification. Secondly, there was a notable absence of any extensive discussion of church and sacraments, although baptism and baptismal regeneration were dealt with on occasion. There was no discussion of the Lord's Supper. These points are important for the later discussion.

The atonement then stood at the centre of the evangelical tradition. The scriptural content of the doctrine is largely derived from Paul's letter to the Romans, a letter that was instrumental in the conversion of Augustine, Luther and Wesley. As evangelicalism emerged from the Arminian-Calvinist controversy, a more moderate Calvinist line came to be the accepted norm among evangelicals. Perhaps a better description is that of Daniel Wilson, later Bishop of Calcutta, in referring to practical Calvinism.[3] What was meant by this was two-fold. First, it meant a retention of the Calvinist stress on sin and depravity, and hence on the work of Christ on the cross: rather than a strict application of the benefits of the atonement only to the elect, it meant an emphasis on the sufficiency of the cross for all. Secondly, it meant the invitation to all to believe,but recognising that while not all will be saved there is also a mystery to God's purposes in election. Evangelicals were also united in affirming that Jesus died for our sins as a substitute. Thus at a meeting of the Eclectic Society, the Revd. J. Clayton said that the sin of the believer was imputed to Christ as a substitute or surety, and on another occasion, the Revd. H. Foster said that the substitution of Christ for sinners was the greatest possible act of love for his children. Thus Christ takes our sins and Christ's righteousness is imputed to us on the basis of faith—hence justification by faith. It is important to understand why evangelicals came to emphasize the substitutionary atonement. The reason is closely connected with the doctrine of assurance. The great impact of the doctrine of assurance on the emergence of evangelical doctrine was the very personal and individual nature of the certainty of the forgiveness of sins. Thus it is *my* sins which have been forgiven; it is for *me* that Jesus died on the cross. It is the specific nature of the atonement which came to mark out evangelicals. Wilberforce's great protest was against those who rested their hopes in generalities whereas evangelical religion demanded faith and hope in specifics.

But substitution is only half the story. The evangelical system did not just assert, as a matter of divine sovereignty, that Jesus bore our sins as substitute, but also provided cogent theological reasons as to why the atonement was effective. It was because as our substitute Jesus bore the penalty of death which was rightly due to us that the atonement is effective and the ground of hope. Hence the substitution is penal. This was well summarized by Josiah Pratt, at a meeting of the Eclectic Society:

> Then we must represent CHRIST to them as a SURETY, as a SUBSTITUTE, and His ability and willingness to discharge their debt *for* them; that

> He *atones* for their crimes; and that He works out *another righteousness* for them. This is a most essential branch of His mediatorial excellence. It is the ground of all our hopes. What He *did* and *suffered*, He did and suffered in *our stead*.[4]

The substitution of Christ for the sinner has thus taken on the notion of satisfying divine justice. Again it is the particulars that are important. Wilberforce complained bitterly of those who thought the demands of divine justice had been lessened on those who adhered to the new dispensation. The evangelicals looked to Scripture and concluded that the wrath of God could not be excluded from consideration.

National Protestantism

The Protestant evangelical tradition which emerged in the early nineteenth century consisted of a number of different strands. One important antecedent strand was what has been referred to as Ultra-Toryism[5] or Protestant Constitutionalism[6] and is here described as national Protestantism. The essence of this strand of opinion is the understanding of Protestantism in political terms. The existence of such a tradition was inevitable given the nature of the Reformation in England, an important part of which was the assertion of independence from the political power of Rome, and also the continuing rôle of the state in the process of liturgical reform. The aftermath of the Reformation settlement in England was constant political conflict over the next one hundred and thirty years or so until the Glorious Revolution of 1688 settled the nature of England's Protestant constitution. Thus Protestantism came to be seen 'as the fundamental essence of the British constitution'.[7] The late 1820s and early 1830s were a time of great constitutional change reflected in, among other issues, the question of Catholic Emancipation, the Test Act, and the Reform Bill. To the national Protestants what was at stake as much as anything else was the constitution itself. Closely connected to the threat to the Constitution was an implied threat to the Established Church. The relief of Roman Catholic disabilities would imperil the Protestant constitution; political reform would inevitably lead to church reform. The most prominent national Protestants were the Earl of Eldon, the Duke of York, the Duke of Cumberland, the Duke of Newcastle and the Earl of Winchelsea. It is not insignificant that this list is entirely of peers. To the members of the upper House of Parliament the defence of the constitution was always a prominent theme and, of course, they were not subject to the pressure of re-election. In the House of Commons, however, there were the first stirrings of Protestant evangelicalism, prompted by the same constitutional issues.

National Protestantism and Evangelicalism

By the time of the Catholic Emancipation bill, the doyen of evangelicals in Parliament, William Wilberforce, was nearing the end of his Parliamentary

career. The future leader of Protestant evangelicalism, the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, then Lord Ashley, was in the early years of his own career. Both supported Catholic Emancipation, Wilberforce enthusiastically, Ashley reluctantly. The claims of national Protestantism had influence on a number of Members of Parliament, but so did the more specifically religious and theological claims of evangelicalism. The years 1829–1833 saw a number of members of Parliament representing various strands of the link between evangelicalism and Protestantism, the claims of national Protestantism gradually giving way to those of the evangelical cause, although both strands continuing. The national Protestant wing of the movement had its most prominent supporters in Sir Robert Inglis, the member for Oxford University, and close confidant of Ashley; Michael Sadler, member for Newark and also, from 1832 onwards, John Pemberton Plumptre, the member for East Kent. All three could lay claim to evangelical belief; none was closely associated with evangelical societies, but again all three devoted themselves to constitutional issues, ranging from the Poor Law to the Corn Laws, but always including the Protestant nature of the constitution. Evangelical groups in Parliament, however, also included the most moderate evangelicals, those committed to the views of the *Christian Observer*, essentially those in the tradition of Wilberforce, and more interestingly the group known as Recordites. This group represented the more fervent evangelicals, those supported by the editorial stance of *The Record*, and, although there was some overlap, this group was not identical to the national Protestants. The case of Lord Ashley is most instructive, but will be postponed for fuller discussion of his whole place in the scheme of the growth of Protestant evangelicalism. The scene is now set to consider the emergence of the tradition in three ways.

The Response to Tractarianism

Many evangelicals must have sympathized with the tone of Keble's Assize Sermon in 1833 bemoaning the spiritual state of the church and the nation. However, the resulting series of Tracts emanating from this group of Oxford clerics soon alienated the evangelicals. There was an increasing emphasis on the notions of apostolic succession and the nature of the priesthood. As the Oxford Movement gained momentum it was necessary for evangelicals to define their theological position in relation to that of the Tractarians. This theological response has been well detailed by Peter Toon.[8] The impact of Tractarianism was to force evangelicals to define their beliefs in the key areas of Bible and tradition, justification by faith and church and sacraments.

Three Tractarian publications in the 1830s caused evangelicals to believe that Tradition was being given a position of equal weight with Scripture, namely Keble's *Primitive Tradition* (1836), Newman's *The Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837) and Manning's *The Rule of Faith* (1838). Emphasis was placed upon an oral tradition derived from the apos-

tolic age—by which was meant the first five centuries—as the key to biblical interpretation. The crucial effect of this was to lead to an increased emphasis among evangelicals on the supreme authority of Scripture. Earlier discussions in the Eclectic Society over the nature of biblical inspiration gave way to affirmations of the fact of inspiration. Thus William Goode referred to Holy Scripture as 'the sole infallible and authoritative Rule of faith',[9] and Daniel Wilson claimed that to exalt Tradition is to 'convert the keeper into the interpreter of the Bible', the effect being to 'distil the doctrine of inspiration', putting 'the word of man for the word of God'.[10] Evangelical writers rejected the emphasis placed by the Tractarians on the early fathers and responded with assertions of the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

Newman, in his *Lectures on Justification* (1838) maintained that justification involved both a declaration of pardon for past sins and a making righteous of the person who receives that declaration, thus blurring the Reformed distinction between justification and sanctification. Evangelicals responded by an ever firmer assertion of the atonement as the basis of faith and justification. Any emphasis on baptism as an instrument of faith for justification, or of the continued need for sustenance from the eucharist, implied a theology of salvation by works, and the insufficiency of the atoning death of Jesus and hence had to be resisted. It was not just the evangelical understanding of the atonement which was at stake but also the centrality of the doctrine. Hence the Tractarian notion of 'reserve'. Thus, the Tractarian Isaac Williams, in Tract 80:

> The prevailing notion of bringing forward the Atonement *explicitly* and *prominently* on all occasions is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture, nor do we find any sanction for it in the Gospels. If the Epistles of St. Paul appear to favour it it is only at first sight.[11]

The doctrine of reserve was basically that the atonement was essentially mysterious and should only be taught gradually, and indeed profoundly, as the baptized lived out their Christian life under increasing obedience to the will of God. To evangelicals this would only serve to place the people under clerical subjection and deny access to the whole counsel of God, indeed to the key to justification, the saving work of Christ on the cross through the free grace of God.

This leads on to the area of church and sacraments. The consequence of the emerging Tractarian emphasis on church and sacraments led evangelicals, really for the first time, to apply their principles to the issues of church, ministry and sacraments. In 1853, William Goode claimed that the theological differences between Tractarianism and evangelicalism could be traced to different views on the nature of the visible and invisible church. From the Roman and Tractarian emphasis on the visible church derives the error of apostolic succession and the exaltation of the priesthood. Thus to the Tractarian, episcopacy was of the very 'being' of the

church, on which the validity of the presbyteral order depended. Although evangelicals generally, but not universally, accepted the distinction between bishop and presbyter as instituted by Paul's consecration of Timothy and Titus, and saw the episcopal system as the most superior form of church government, they denied it the centrality accorded to it in the Tractarian system, and did not accept that it represented any channel of special grace.

In the matter of the sacraments, let us first consider baptism. Baptism was seen by the Tractarians as the external instrument of faith, a faith which required continued nurture in the communion. The Tractarians thus emphasized baptismal regeneration—the infusion of grace and the forgiveness of sins. To the evangelical this seemed to deny the completeness of Christ's work on the cross and the result was a narrowing of evangelical opinion. Earlier discussions over the nature of baptismal regeneration among evangelicals now gave way to a firm rejection of all notions of regenerative baptism.

The other major sacramental controversy was, of course, the issue of the nature of Christ's presence in the consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper. Although the complexity of the Tractarian view should not be underestimated the essentials were summarized by William Goode, in his lengthy treatise, *The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist* (1856). According to Goode, the Tractarians believed that the body and blood of Christ formed one compound whole with the bread and wine, and that the body and blood are hence received by the unbelieving communicant as well as the believer (contrary to Article Twenty-nine) and also that the body is eaten by the mouth—contrary to Article Twenty-eight which states that the reception of the Body is by faith.[12]

Care should be taken not to misrepresent the Tractarian view. To the Tractarian a sacrament was an external instrument of grace accompanying an internal instrument of grace. It was, however, their emphasis on the effective nature of the external instrument, whether church, baptism or eucharist, that prompted evangelicals to reassert the basic reformed doctrine of justification by grace through faith in the atonement. The emphasis on the visible church led to evangelicals emphasizing the invisible church, the community of justified believers regardless of any human organization.

All of this has implications for the development of the Protestant evangelical party. The rise of Tractarianism led to evangelicals reasserting basic Protestant, Reformed, theological beliefs. This was not an adoption of new beliefs by evangelicals, for as has already been shown, the atonement, indeed the penal and substitutionary atonement, represented the united views of evangelicals from an early date. Indeed their views on atonement and Scripture and on the nature of the church were reassertions of the emphasis of the Reformers themselves on these central doctrines. But in the areas of the nature of the church, the authority of Scripture, and the place of the sacraments evangelicals hardened their views, or at least

narrowed them, by being forced to define them more precisely. Thus Protestantism and evangelicalism, already closely associated, became even more firmly wedded together. The emphasis on the invisible church allowed for cross-denominational evangelical co-operation, increasingly a characteristic of Protestant evangelicalism. Evangelicals were now following the Puritan tradition of applying their theological principles to the issues of church and ministry, and indeed, the state.

The London Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews

It is important to recognize that the development of the distinctive Protestant evangelical tradition was the result of a number of factors of which the response to Tractarianism was only one. The importance of the story of the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews is that it illustrates how an important theological *motif* combined with national Protestantism within the Evangelical cause.

The first attempt to formulate a mission society specifically with Jews in mind was made in 1801 when Joseph Frey commenced a mission under the auspices of the London Missionary Society (L.M.S.). It was separately incorporated in 1809 and this allowed it to appeal more successfully for the support of evangelicals in the Established church, who continued to have many scruples about co-operating with dissenters in the inter-denominational L.M.S. In 1815 the London Society was reconstituted on more specifically Anglican lines. The principal motivation for such a society was closely connected with the increasing emphasis in the first three decades of the nineteenth century on prophetic speculation and interpretation. Many evangelicals understood biblical prophecy to demand the conversion of the Jews before the conversion of the heathen. Thus it is not surprising that many missionary-orientated evangelicals were attracted to the Society, including Basil Woodd, William Goode and Charles Simeon. This approach to mission looked for the gradual conversion of the world to Christ. If Scripture demanded the large scale conversion of the Jews first, then this was surely an enterprise to attract widespread support.

There were, however, differences over the priority of mission; whether the focus should be on the conversion of the Jews before the Gentiles or *vice versa*. In the aftermath of the initial euphoria following the foundation and expansion of the mission societies around 1800 the question was asked why such progress had been so slow. The conversion of the world seemed an increasingly long way off. One answer offered was that the Jews must be converted first, because the Jews were destined to be the missionaries to the Gentiles. The greater the emphasis given to this view the greater the ire of the traditional missionary societies.

There is, however, another aspect to the important rôle of the London Society, a crucial theological issue. The Secretary of the London Society from 1815, Lewis Way, noted the connexion between the biblical prophe-

cies of the restoration of the Jews and the last things, the second coming of Christ. Way came to believe in the imminence of these events. With the arrival of Henry Drummond as Vice-President of the London Society in 1822 the emphasis on millenarianism was growing. If the restoration of the Jews is associated with the second Advent, then the millennium can only be located after the event. Thus the traditional millennial view of evangelicalism was undergoing change.

It is worth reflecting briefly on the nature of millenarianism. The postmillennial view held that the millennium—that is the one thousand years of peace referred to in Revelation chapter 20—would be preceded by the gradual improvement and conversion of the world. At the end of this time Christ would return. This optimistic view of the world was clearly conducive to the establishment of mission societies in order to help bring about the hoped-for conversion of the world. By contrast the premillennial view maintained that Christ would return in order to inaugurate the thousand years of peace and that the time leading up to the Second Coming would be characterized by increased conflict and distress in the world.

The impact of the French Revolution had driven many evangelicals to the study of unfulfilled prophecy in the Bible and returned to that tradition which sought to associate the fulfilment of such prophecy with contemporary political events. With the prominence given in the biblical prophecies to the AntiChrist it was hardly surprising that Protestants, and increasingly one strand of evangelicals, associated such imagery with the Papacy and the Church of Rome. The restoration of the Jews would herald the return of Christ and judgment on the Church of Rome, the nation, and indeed, the whole church. This view was known as historicist premillennialism and must be distinguished from futurist premillennialism which maintains a premillennial Second Coming but projects the events of Revelation far into the future (dispensationalism).

The biblical prophecies concerning the Jews refer also to the restoration of the Jews to their homeland. Thus a political dimension was added to the Jewish mission, indeed an issue that would clearly be attractive to the national Protestants. It is significant that Sir Robert Inglis was a supporter of the London Society. The focus of the national Protestants came in later years to concentrate upon the issue of the establishment of a Jerusalem bishopric. By concentrating on the establishment of a bishopric in Jerusalem, restoration and conversion came together, as did Protestantism and evangelicalism. The connexion is shown by the fact that the first occupant of this post, Michael Solomon Alexander, consecrated in 1841, was himself a Jewish convert to Christianity.

It was thus historicist premillennialism, growing in strength from 1820 onwards that paved one way for a more thoroughly Protestant assertion of evangelicalism, even if the full rigours of premillennialism were not adopted by all; it did, however, add another strand of evangelical opinion which allowed for the identification of the AntiChrist with Rome. In the

London Society this emphasis came increasingly to prominence. Indeed the London Society can be seen as a bridge for evangelicals of various persuasions. It also brought a more politically Protestant emphasis in the campaign for the Jerusalem bishopric.

Anthony Ashley Cooper, Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury

A theological movement, a missionary society, and now an individual. Until he became the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury in 1851, Anthony Ashley Cooper was known as Lord Ashley. He was in his own words 'an Evangelical of the Evangelicals'.[13] Throughout most of his life Shaftesbury was associated with a wide range of evangelical causes, and as the Protestant evangelical tradition emerged as a party it was Shaftesbury who became its most prominent advocate.

Shaftesbury, born in 1801, was an aristocrat and a Tory. The Constitution formed part of God's ordering for society. He was thus a ripe candidate for association with the national Protestants. However, the relationship is not quite so straightforward and seems to have developed closely alongside his evangelicalism. Thus in the crisis over Catholic Emancipation he switched sides in order to vote in favour of Catholic relief, albeit reluctantly. He did so, however, because he took the view that the Constitution would be better served and better protected if His Majesty's Catholic subjects were under its protection rather than its oppression.

Throughout the period 1826–1835 Ashley's evangelical convictions were deepening. The biographers of Shaftesbury tend to postpone his conversion to evangelicalism to 1834 or 1835 and a meeting with Edward Bickersteth which led to his adoption of premillennialism. The problem with this analysis is that it confuses the adoption of a particular stance within the evangelical tradition with conversion to that tradition itself. This stems from the fact that all of Shaftesbury's biographers are historians rather than theologians. There is substantial evidence of a process of conversion in Shaftesbury's heart and mind throughout this period. Most crucial in this respect is his reference to Thomas Scott's biblical commentary.

> It was not until I was twenty-five years old, or thereabouts, that I got hold of 'Scott's Commentary on the Bible', and, struck with the enormous difference between his views and those to which I had been accustomed, I began to think for myself.[14]

This is reinforced by his diary entry for his birthday in 1826, when he recorded that 'latterly I have taken to hard study.'[15] On two occasions in 1829 Ashley mentioned references to him as a 'Saint', the popular designation at this time of the evangelicals in Parliament. Ashley disavowed the description, a point used by the biographers to argue that Ashley cannot thus have been an evangelical at this time. However, others clearly thought

that he did display evangelical characteristics, in order to warrant the comment. In addition a careful reading of the diary entries suggests that Ashley was modestly disavowing the title, rather than necessarily the evangelicalism so implied. Indeed the very name 'Saint' was a nickname used by others, not by the evangelicals themselves.[16] Ashley was at this time beginning to take a more active evangelical rôle in Parliament. He sat on the Select Committee on Sunday Observance in 1832 and it was a leading evangelical, Sir Andrew Agnew, who acted as intermediary between Ashley and the Revd. G.S. Bull when Ashley was invited to take up the issue of factory reform.

This developing evangelicalism came to manifest itself in a number of ways important to the investigation of the Protestant evangelical tradition. First, there was Ashley's position in response to Tractarianism. This prompted an increased emphasis on the implications of evangelical belief for the nature of church and ministry. His Protestantism had already been aroused by his European tour of Italy in 1833 when he attended Catholic mass, there being no Protestant place of worship and he described the ceremonial as 'tedious and unscriptural', 'everlasting movement and gesture, with numberless repetitions of robing, candles, incense, and drawling chants.'[17] It was inevitable that he would oppose the doctrines of the Tractarians. He summarized his views when referring to auricular confession:

> . . . the most monstrous, perhaps, of all the monstrous practices of the Roman system . . . a deep-seated corruption of faith and doctrine, enticing, and intending to entice, the people from the simplicity of the Gospel, and to lead them to submit to the sacerdotal forgery of a sacrificing priesthood, and the necessary and inevitable train of abominable superstitions.[18]

At the same time Ashley was becoming involved with a range of evangelical societies. In 1836 he was involved in the foundation of the Church Pastoral-Aid Society, which soon attracted the antagonism of the Tractarians because of its emphasis on the rôle of lay agency in ministry. Ashley remained President for life. He was also closely involved with the Church Missionary Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London City Mission, and the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity Among the Jews, to name but a few. Ashley had adopted premillennial views in 1835 and the imminence of the Second Advent was a constant theme in his thought. The pessimism inherent in such a view also reflected the volatile nature of his own character. Although Ashley avoided the extremes and rigours of premillennialism, in particular the tendency to set a date for the Second Coming, it did provide another strand of thought which allowed Rome to be identified with the Antichrist and hence reinforce Ashley's Protestant evangelicalism.

His involvement in the London Society shows how Ashley was combining Protestantism and evangelicalism. But the emergent Protestant

evangelical party was also able to turn its attention to other areas, invariably led by Ashley. Thus evangelicals opposed the continued grant to the Roman Catholic seminary at Maynooth, and Ashley was outraged by the Papal Aggression of 1850, the reconstitution of a Roman Catholic hierarchy for England and Wales. The use of territorial titles was seen by Ashley as a claim to sovereignty, which he claimed had been encouraged by the Tractarians. This partly explains Shaftesbury's subsequent vigorous opposition to ritualism, Protestantism and evangelicalism now being effectively one movement. 'Let us turn our eyes to that within, from Popery to Popery in the bud; from the open enemy to the concealed traitor.'[19]

Conclusions

The intention of this article has been to trace the emergence of the distinctive Protestant evangelical tradition. This has been done through a consideration of a theological movement in the response to Tractarianism, an evangelical society, the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity Among the Jews, and an individual, the Earl of Shaftesbury. A number of points are clear. The Protestant evangelical tradition represented a core development from the earlier evangelicalism of the Eclectic Society. The central aspect of belief in the atonement, remained constant, but in response to Tractarianism, evangelicals defined more precisely their understandings of biblical authority and the issues of church, sacraments and ministry. Reinforcing the Protestantism emphasized by this reaction were two other strands, the theological strand of historicist premillennialism, not adopted by all, but allowing yet another path for a more firmly Protestant evangelicalism, and the increasing identification of national Protestantism with evangelicalism. This last point was shown by the controversies over the Jerusalem bishopric, the Maynooth grant, and the papal aggression.

If the Protestant evangelical tradition represents the core development of evangelicalism we should not thereby overlook the fact that it also represents the combination of different interests. It is inevitable, therefore, that those different interests will continue to be emphasized and claimed by some, alongside or even instead of the core. This is true both in the case of Protestantism and evangelicalism. Thus national Protestantism can still raise some supporters, reflected in, perhaps, the appeal by the publishers of *Churchman* to the national judiciary over the ordination of women to the presbyterate. Similarly, many evangelicals today will seek to lay claim to the early evangelical tradition of Simeon and the Eclectic Society, while disavowing the later developments of Protestant evangelicalism. But whatever else evangelicals appealing to the pre-1820 tradition may claim, they cannot claim the developed core of the tradition. But that core is not just an assertion of national Protestantism. It is rather Protestant evangelicalism, a combination of Reformed theology centred on Scripture and the atonement, reflected in a passionate commitment to evangelical missionary

societies and to cross-denominational evangelicalism as well as the call to the established church to recover its Protestant evangelical roots.

RICHARD TURNBULL is currently completing doctoral research at the University of Durham on Shaftesbury and the evangelical tradition. He will be ordained in 1994 as curate of Highfield Parish Church, Southampton.

NOTES

1 Alister McGrath, *Church of England Newspaper*, July 19, 1992.
2 J.H. Pratt (ed.), *Eclectic Notes: or Notes of Discussions on Religious Topics at the Meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798–1814*, London, 1858.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 507.
4 Revd. J.H. Pratt, Eclectic Notes, January 17, 1803, In What Sense is the Sin of the Believer Imputed to Christ, and the Righteousness of Christ Imputed to the Believer? Proposed by the Rev. J. Clayton.
5 J. Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade in Great Britain, 1829–1860*, Oxford, 1991.
6 I.S. Rennie, *Evangelicalism and English Public Life, 1823–1850*, University of Toronto, PhD, 1962.
7 Wolffe, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
8 Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology, 1833–1856*, London, 1979.
9 W. Goode, *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*, 1842, quoted in Toon, *op. cit.*, p. 128.
10 D. Wilson, *The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture*, 1841, quoted in Toon, *op. cit.*, p. 127.
11 I. Williams, Tract 80, quoted in Toon, *op. cit.*, p. 38.
12 W. Goode, *The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist*, London, 1856, vol. 1, pp. 2–3.
13 Conversation with E. Hodder, 1884, in E. Hodder, *Life and Work of Shaftesbury*, vol. 3, p. 3.
14 Hodder, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 44.
15 *Ibid.*, p. 56.
16 K. Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England*, Edinburgh, 1988, p. 80.
17 Hodder, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 174.
18 Hodder, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 333.
19 *Ibid.*, pp. 332-3.