

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

Some Recent Trends in the Theology of Baptism

(Continued)

INFANT BAPTISM OR BELIEVER'S BAPTISM

First, we must direct our attention to baptism in the New Testament. By far the majority of recent writers are convinced that baptism in the New Testament is the baptism of believers, and some even go so far as to maintain that no other form of baptism is known there. Writers who have taken this view include P. T. Forsyth,⁶⁰ H. W. Robinson,⁶¹ H. G. Marsh,⁶² F. J. Leenhardt,⁶³ and J. R. Nelson.⁶⁴ Others agree that there is no New Testament evidence for infant baptism but yet feel that it is quite likely that such a practice took place even in apostolic days. E. J. Bicknell⁶⁵ is one who maintains that this is true, but he also declares that not only Scripture but the language of the Prayer Book and of Article XXVII of the Church of England are concerned with adult baptism and are applicable in their fullest sense only when applied to adults; to apply them to infants, he says, means that they require accommodation to new conditions. If Bicknell's main assertion is true, however, it is difficult to see how such can be the case.

The reasons for holding to the view that infant baptism was practised from the earliest times are principally three: (a) Bicknell⁶⁶ argues it on the grounds that the conditions of the apostolic church were very similar to those of the mission field and on the mission field, then as now, adult baptism was the rule and infant baptism the exception. But, at most, this is an argument from silence and we cannot really go further than P. T. Forsyth⁶⁷ who points out that in view of the missionary nature of the early church it is only to be expected that adult baptism should predominate. Besides, W. Machin⁶⁸ has made it clear for us that even on the mission field whenever a family is converted the whole

⁶⁰ *The Church and the Sacraments*, p. 211.

⁶¹ *Baptist Principles*, p. 7.

⁶² *The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism*, p. 174.

⁶³ "Pédobaptisme catholique et Pédobaptisme réformé" in *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses*, vol. 25, (1950), p. 146.

⁶⁴ *The Realm of Redemption*, p. 129.

⁶⁵ *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, p. 473.

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 474. Cf. H. R. Mackintosh, "Thoughts on Infant Baptism," in *The Expositor*, vol. xiii, pp. 193-203.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 212.

⁶⁸ "Baptism and Confirmation," in *Theology*, vol. 49, (1946), p. 190.

family is baptized,⁶⁹ and we are therefore surely right to assume that by analogy the children of the converts in the New Testament ought also to have been baptized with their parents. If they were, why do we not hear of it? But this leads on to the second reason. (b) It is often asserted⁷⁰ that such children were baptized and that they are included in the references to the baptisms of a "household."⁷¹ H. G. Marsh,⁷² for instance, goes so far as to maintain that where we hear of "households" it is impossible to imagine that no children were included in their numbers, but Barth,⁷³ on the other hand, considers this to be no more than "a thin thread" to which one may hold for a proof of infant baptism in the New Testament; even then he reminds his readers of the sequence of Word, Faith and Baptism that is kept in *these* narratives, and questions whether one really wants to hold such a thread. H. Cook,⁷⁴ moreover, makes it clear that in his opinion the possibility of the households referred to containing children is so slight as to be negligible, whilst R. E. White⁷⁵ says that if they were included it would make the practice of the apostles inconsistent with their teaching, and with their appeals to the solemn obligations which the baptized voluntarily accepted. Thus, far from adding to the possibility of infants being baptized, as in a modern missionary church, the evidence from the "household" baptisms seems rather to weaken the case. It should not be thought, however, that advocates of believer's baptism accept this as adequate proof that there was no baptism of infants in New Testament times; silence is no argument for either point of view, whereas believer's baptism has a firm Scriptural foundation on which to stand. (c) A third argument in favour of infant baptism in the New Testament is that it would most naturally be practised on analogy with Jewish proselyte baptism. Flemington⁷⁶ says that if a proselyte had any children when he went over to Judaism it was customary for those children to be circumcised and baptized and admitted as proselytes. This, presumably, Flemington regards as an argument in favour of the children of Christians being baptized when their parents embraced the faith, but then he goes on to say that children born subsequently were not baptized. To meet the argument that the church does baptize children of parents who have already

⁶⁹ This does not apply in the case of the Baptist Missionaries.

⁷⁰ W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, p. 131.

⁷¹ *Acts* x. 24; xvi. 15, 33; xvii. 8; *I Cor.* i. 6.

⁷² *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁷³ *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*, pp. 44-45.

⁷⁴ *What Baptists Stand For*, pp. 107f.

⁷⁵ "Some Important Issues for Baptismal Theology," in *The Expository Times*, vol. lxi., (1949-50), p. 109.

⁷⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 131.

embraced the Christian faith, Flemington then compares infant baptism to circumcision, but by this time the whole argument savours too much of artificiality to be worth of our consideration. It is questionable whether Cullmann⁷⁷ is any more successful in his efforts to reduce the confusion here to order, and E. A. Payne⁷⁸ has drawn attention to some of the dangers of arguing on analogy with Jewish proselyte baptism.

Here we reach the conclusion that the evidence for infant baptism in New Testament, or even apostolic times, is not very strong; at the most it is no more than a possibility, and until further evidence is forthcoming the anti-Paedobaptists can rest content that their views accord most naturally with those of Scripture.

At the same time, it has been equally pointed out, and with much truth, that the New Testament knows nothing of the baptism of adults born of parents already Christian and brought up by them.⁷⁹ Cullmann⁸⁰ observes that chronologically such a case would certainly have been possible in New Testament times, but we hear of none. In reply to this criticism, however, two points may be made. The first is the simple comment from E. A. Payne⁸¹ that we know far too little of family details in the early Church to make such an assertion with any degree of reliability. The second is the abundant evidence for such baptisms at a time nearer to the apostolic age than we know infant baptism to have been regularly practised.

Indeed it seems difficult to determine the date at which infant baptism became the regular mode. P. T. Forsyth⁸² says that it was not until the third century, but William Robinson⁸³ has drawn attention to such great figures as Gregory Nazianzen, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine, who, in the fourth century, were not baptized until they had reached manhood, although they all had Christian mothers. H. Wheeler Robinson⁸⁴ prefers to date the beginnings of infant baptism as a general practice in the fifth century, and so does the Archbishops' Com-

⁷⁷ *Baptism in the New Testament*, p. 25.

⁷⁸ "Professor Oscar Cullmann On Baptism," in *The Baptist Quarterly*, vol. xiv, (1952), p. 57.

⁷⁹ J. K. S. Reid, "Theological Issues Involved in Baptism," in *The Expository Times*, vol. lxi, (1949-50) p. 202. Cf. R. E. Davies, "Christian Initiation: the Doctrine in the New Testament," in *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 39, (1951), p. 4; C. T. Craig, *The One Church in the Light of the New Testament*, p. 71.

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

⁸¹ "Professor Oscar Cullman on Baptism," in *The Baptist Quarterly*, vol. xiv, (1952), p. 57.

⁸² *Op. cit.*, p. 211.

⁸³ *Infant Baptism Today*, p. 8, cf. R. E. White, *loc. cit.*, p. 110.

⁸⁴ *Baptist Principles*, pp. 36f.

mission on "Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion,"⁸⁵ whilst F. J. Leenhardt,⁸⁶ who can scarcely be called anti-Paedobaptist, supplies much evidence to show that the triumph of infant baptism was a slow process. After referring to the already mentioned children of Christian parents who were baptized in manhood even during the fourth century, he then shows how from the fifth to the eighth centuries it was normally infants of two or three years who were the candidates for baptism. The beginning of the regular baptism of babes-in-arms Leenhardt will not date before the eleventh century. Probably the most we can say is that infant baptism began to be practised in the third century, since this is when it met with opposition,⁸⁷ and also when there began to set in a disintegration both of the New Testament doctrine of the seal and of the primitive liturgical pattern,⁸⁸ but it is equally clear that it established itself but slowly. Consequently we have good evidence for the fact that the baptism of adults had a fairly strong hold, even among the Christian families themselves, until quite a late date.

Nevertheless the fact remains that the Church at some stage in her history did make a change from adult baptism, which was most frequently practised in New Testament times, to infant baptism, and most sections of the Church which today practise infant baptism defend it on the grounds that it emphasises the objective givenness of the Gospel of Redemption. "Christ has redeemed all mankind," writes J. S. Whale,⁸⁹ "and the divinely given sign of this fact is baptism. It proclaims that Christ has done something for me, without even consulting me or waiting for my approval." Such has been the view of many recent defenders of infant baptism, including E. J. Bicknell,⁹⁰ W. F. Flemington,⁹¹ O. Cullmann,⁹² R. E. Davies,⁹³ F. C. Tindall,⁹⁴ C. T. Craig,⁹⁵ and the members of the Archbishops' Commission on "Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion."⁹⁶ J. R. Nelson⁹⁷ is one of the few

⁸⁵ *The Theology of Christian Initiation*, p. 14. Cf. F. C. Tindall *Christian Initiation*, p. 10.

⁸⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 149f.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 152.

⁸⁹ *Christian Doctrine*, p. 164.

⁹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 475.

⁹¹ *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 135ff, and "An Approach to the Theology of Baptism," in *The Expository Times*, vol. lxii, (1950-51), pp. 356-359.

⁹² *Op. cit.*, pp. 20, 49.

⁹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 130.

who has sought to distinguish clearly between this conception of *gratia praeveniens Dei*, and that which finds its home in the Roman Catholic Church. The Anglican and Free Church doctrine is more concerned with the free and loving initiative of God than with the mechanical effects of the rite itself, and Flemington⁹⁸ expresses the same view when he points out that unless such a baptism is followed by faith it becomes of no value.

Be that as it may, there have been other writers who have put forward different reasons for continuing the practice of infant baptism; Barth,⁹⁹ who is one of the most outstanding, for instance, suggests that there are four: (a) the need which pious parents have of comfort; (b) that the child might be sure of a good upbringing; (c) because believer's baptism seems to be accompanied by certain dangers; (d) it illustrates the antecedent grace of God. Yet, over and above these, Barth questions whether the chief reason is not that today one does not want to renounce the present form of the national Church. Cullmann¹⁰⁰ rejects this view on the grounds that it would be just as easy to say that Barth is pleading for believer's baptism in order to preserve the Confessional nature of the Church, and there is no doubt truth in this assertion. Where Cullmann loses our support, however, is when he goes on to suggest that the question of baptism does not depend on our doctrine of the Church, for to build our doctrine of the Church on either or both of the sacraments seems to many of us like starting with the coping stone instead of the foundations.¹⁰¹

Furthermore, however the Church may defend the change from believer's baptism to infant baptism it is still true that the change has given rise to greater problems.¹⁰² The principal reason for this seems to be that New Testament statements about believers' baptism had been too readily applied to infant baptism without modification,¹⁰³ whereas the baptism of infants cannot bear the whole weight of theological meaning which the New Testament places upon the initiation of adults.¹⁰⁴

O. C. Quick¹⁰⁵ is brave enough to say that he believes that most of the modern difficulties concerning the nature of the sacrament of baptism have arisen because neither the orthodox, nor their

⁹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 49f.

¹⁰⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

¹⁰¹ Cf. H. Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

¹⁰² Not least among these problems of course, is that of the relationship between baptism and faith, which is treated separately.

¹⁰³ Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

¹⁰⁴ *The Theology of Christian Initiation*, p. 12; cf. P. T. Forsyth, *op. cit.*, pp. 194f.

¹⁰⁵ *The Christian Sacraments*, pp. 168ff.

critics have sufficiently realised that the change from adult baptism to infant baptism as the normal practice of the Church should have involved a shifting of emphasis from the instrumental to the symbolic aspect of the sacrament, and this is certainly one of the problems to which the transference of the rite from adults to infants has given rise. Quick argues that most Christians in the early Church interpreted baptism as an instrumental rite; by it, the old life was left behind and the new life entered upon. When the sacrament was applied to infants, however, the question invariably arose as to the nature of the old life that was left behind, and the answer was found in the doctrine of original sin. Such a doctrine of baptism is, in Quick's opinion, open to objection and hence his view that when it was applied to infants it ought to have been regarded less as an instrumental act and more as a symbolic rite. If the change from adult to infant baptism is justified at all, then it must be accompanied by this change in baptismal theology, and Quick would agree that the emphasis on the symbolic aspect of the sacrament is fundamentally connected with the teaching both of our Lord Himself and of St. Paul. This contribution from Quick has taken an important place in modern discussions on the nature of the rite, though there is still evidence that the problem of the correct emphasis has not been fully dealt with.¹⁰⁶

In quite recent times, a further difficulty has arisen in the problem as to who may be the subjects of baptism, and some scholars have written trenchant criticisms of present day infant baptism. Most notably in this connection are Barth¹⁰⁷ and Brunner,¹⁰⁸ though the work of Leenhardt¹⁰⁹ should never be forgotten. Attention has been drawn, however, to the difference between their views and those of the Baptists¹¹⁰; whereas the Baptists and certain others oppose infant baptism on doctrinal grounds, Brunner and Barth object chiefly on the grounds of the state of Christianity today. It is true that Barth is the more sceptical of the two and almost pleads for a clean break in baptismal practice, but Brunner quite approves of infant baptism on the mission field where the faith of the parents is examined beforehand.¹¹¹ Leenhardt¹¹² too is concerned to plead for the

¹⁰⁶ This seems to be true, despite the assertion of F. C. Tindall (*op. cit.*, p. 8), that such a distinction is now a commonplace in our discussions.

¹⁰⁷ *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹⁰⁸ *The Divine-Human Encounter*, p. 132.

¹⁰⁹ *Le Baptême Chrétien*, pp. 71ff. Cf. "Pédobaptisme catholique et Pédobaptisme réformé," in *Études Théologiques et religieuses*, vol. 25, (1950), pp. 143-206.

¹¹⁰ B. Citron, *New Birth*, pp. 139ff.

¹¹¹ Cf. C. T. Craig, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

¹¹² *Le Baptême Chrétien*, pp. 71ff.

reformation of infant baptism rather than its abolition.

The last generation has also witnessed a movement towards this goal inside the Church of England, where there are three principal attitudes to infant baptism¹¹³: (a) some who would not refuse or delay the baptism whatever the circumstances; (b) others who desire such a reform of baptism as to ensure that it was only administered where there was the likelihood of the child having a Christian upbringing; (c) others again, who feel that the whole question is so much under discussion that it is better for the time being to aim at improvements in practice rather than at any radical reform.

It is really with the second group that we are concerned, and it may be observed that this seems to fall most naturally into line with Article XXVII, on which Bicknell¹¹⁴ comments that it is very doubtful whether it is right to baptize infants indiscriminately. The Second Interim Report of the Joint Committee on Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York¹¹⁵ in 1949 give us a survey of the present situation.

That there are difficulties in the way of a reform of infant baptism no one can deny, though there is a certain feeling of artificiality for some of us when the Reports tell us¹¹⁶ that to refuse baptism to some children would only lead to further difficulties later concerning Christian Marriage and Christian Burial. What is more important is the fact that the real difficulty in such a reformed doctrine would be that of giving a fair judgment, and many parish priests would experience serious difficulties in their attempts at discrimination. The only alternative¹¹⁷ to this seems to be so to reform baptism that it is deferred altogether to the "age of consciousness," and there are a few within the Anglican Communion who would advocate such a measure, but we are informed that even among those who are desirous of reform at all, most would probably not accept such a drastic move.

Thus we are faced with the facts that the present position of baptism in the Church is, according to Brunner, "scandalous,"¹¹⁸ and that it is a matter of concern inside the Church of England. Reform, if it comes at all, is hardly likely to do more than limit baptism to the children of Christian parents, and in that respect

¹¹³ Taylor, *Baptism in the Church*, pp. 34ff; *Baptism Today*, p. 4; F. C. Tindall, *Christian Initiation*, pp. 19-20.

¹¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 476.

¹¹⁵ *Baptism Today*, Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1949.

¹¹⁶ p. 28.

¹¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 28f.

¹¹⁸ *The Divine-Human Encounter*, p. 132.

the difficulty already mentioned seems to the present writer insuperable. Yet there is not a widespread desire to revert to what is commonly acknowledged to have been the baptism of the New Testament, neither is it likely that the Church as a whole would welcome a call to cast off a rite which has been practised for over 1,500 years.

P. T. Forsyth¹¹⁹ as early as 1917, suggested that both forms of baptism ought to exist in the one Church and a monopoly claimed for neither. The difficulty with such a solution seems to be that if a child's parents decided to baptize him in infancy he is thereby robbed of the privilege of believer's baptism should he later desire it. In other words, believer's baptism would only be a possibility for those whose spiritual welfare had been left uncared for at birth. So we reach an impasse. Add to the difficulty here those dealt with previously concerning baptism and faith, and it seems more and more to the present writer that the only solution is a fervent call to as full and complete adoption of believer's baptism as the Church can produce. If, however, to ask for such is "to cry for the moon," as indeed it appears to be, and if in the interests of reunion a fresh doctrine of baptism is needed so as to cover both forms, then we can but pray God to lead us to the right one. The only way open at present seems to be that infants where one or both parents are Church members would alone be baptized at birth; the rest would await personal decision. But if this practice were not to lead to more difficulties than it solved, then the interpretation of the rite would have to be so simple as to be almost meaningless. Indeed, there are those who maintain already that infant baptism, if a sacrament at all, is a very different one from believer's baptism¹²⁰; such would be even more the case if one doctrine were to embrace both methods. Either it would not be a sacrament at all or it would be something quite different from what we have had in the past.

A. GILMORE.

(To be Concluded)

¹¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 214ff.

¹²⁰ Leenhardt, "Pédobaptisme catholique et Pédobaptisme réformé," in *Etudes Théologiques et religieuses*, vol. 25, (1950), pp. 186ff; also *Le Baptême Chrétien*, p. 69; Nelson, *op. cit.*, p. 129. Cf. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 28f.

John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism

I. INTRODUCTION

THE following pages are an attempt to give a brief account of the life of John Hooper sometime Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, and to indicate something of his influence upon English Church History at the time of the Reformation.¹

As we piece together the story of John Hooper we shall find that we are writing of the most influential Englishman belonging to the group in Edward VI's reign which strove to introduce that trend of teaching which later became known as Puritanism. Hooper's puritanical emphasis is well-known and often emphasised. He appears in all Church History books as the bishop who refused to be consecrated wearing episcopal dress. It is also well known, but not so often emphasised, that Hooper spent two years in Zürich in close friendship with Zwingli's successor, Henry Bullinger. What is not so well known and therefore scarcely, if ever, emphasised is the fact that as far as can be ascertained Hooper never visited Geneva and Calvin. The theological school in which Hooper studied when he was abroad was that of Zürich. His chief teachers were Henry Bullinger and Ulrich Zwingli. It is true that the latter had been killed sixteen years before Hooper's arrival in Zürich, but Zwingli's teaching and influence in that town were very much alive then—as indeed they are today. The lessons Hooper learned in Zürich were not only theology from the pages of the text-book and from the clamour of the public disputation, but were also the working out of the theory in church practice. The lessons he learnt in Zürich were the very same lessons which Hooper in turn tried to teach the English Church. As we shall see he found the Church in England a most unwilling pupil. Nevertheless there were some in that Church who learned well of Hooper. The seeds he sowed in the reign of Edward VI bore fruit in the time of Elizabeth I in the plant of Puritanism.

The influence of Geneva on the later development of Puritanism is so marked that it is often forgotten that before this Geneva influence really began to make itself felt in England at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth I there had been already a decade of Zürich influence working in the same direction. It is with this Zürich influence and its chief mediator, John Hooper, that this essay is concerned.

II. HOOPER'S LIFE BEFORE HIS ARRIVAL IN ZÜRICH

There is very little material out of which to reconstruct Hooper's life prior to his arrival in Zürich. Any would-be biographer must reconcile himself to the acceptance of the fact that for fifty of Hooper's sixty years there is almost no evidence of his activities. But the extraordinary activity of his last ten years more than compensates for this earlier lack. In view of this dearth of material any reconstruction of his earlier life must of necessity be conjectural.

The exact date of Hooper's birth is no longer known but it was probably about 1495. He was a West Countryman, a native of Somerset. His family seem to have been prosperous and sent their son to the University at Oxford. The University register shows that one John Hooper of Merton College graduated as Bachelor of Arts in 1519. It is generally assumed that this refers to our John Hooper though even this is not certain.² Having possibly made this one brief appearance into the light of history, Hooper disappears from view for twenty years. It seems almost certain that he disappeared into the shadows of the Cistercian Monastery in his native county at Cleeve.³ Here he would remain until the dissolution of that monastery by Henry VIII, under the Act of 1536.

A year or so later he is reported to have been in Oxford again and before long fell foul of Dr. Richard Smith, the Regius Professor of Divinity. Smith was a strong Romanist and it is possible that Hooper had already begun to show himself sympathetic towards certain trends of Reformation doctrine. After his clash with Smith Hooper left Oxford and gravitated to London, finding himself congenial employment as steward in the household of Sir Thomas Arundel. This involved the life of a courtier which Hooper found very pleasant and all went well until he came across certain writings of Zwingli and some of Bullinger's Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles.⁴ He was immediately attracted to the views of these Zürich teachers and studied these books very carefully. Before long Hooper had made this Zürich teaching his own and began to propagate it. When Arundel heard of this change in Hooper's mind he was very concerned and sent his erring steward to Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, to have these views argued out of him. This was easier said than done. The Bishop talked with Hooper in vain. Gardiner found what others were later to find, that Hooper stuck to his views with a tenacity which his opponents did not hesitate to call obstinacy. Eventually Gardiner had to admit defeat and sent Hooper back to Arundel. The exact year of Hooper's acceptance of Zürich

teaching cannot be fixed with any certainty but it was most probably in the early 1540's. This was an unfortunate time to choose to become a follower of Zwingli. The reaction towards the acceptance of Roman doctrine in the English Church was in full swing. 1539 had seen the issuing of the Six Articles Act, the bloody whip with six strings, which made denial of transubstantiation, to mention one string, punishable by death. The six articles reflect the reaction back to Roman doctrine. Gardiner was sympathetic towards this reaction. Hooper was now known to him as a man who would deny every one of the six articles. Not surprisingly Hooper felt that to remain in England was unwise and made up his mind to leave the country. But where was he to go? His thoughts turned towards Zürich. There he could meet and talk with Bullinger and with others who had known Zwingli; there he could learn more of the doctrine he had come to accept and could see for himself the practices of the Zürich church. So it was that one day the steward of Thomas Arundel's household disappeared and began his journey to Zürich. His way led through Strasbourg, and it is with Hooper's stay in this city that we finish with the need of conjecture and enter the realm of certainty. It is from Strasbourg that Hooper wrote the first of his letters to Bullinger—letters which are preserved in the Zürich archives as a minute part of the vast collection of Bullinger letters.⁵

The first news Bullinger received of Hooper's existence reached him about the beginning of February, 1546. Hooper was then in Strasbourg staying at the house of Richard Hilles, an English merchant. How long Hooper had been in Strasbourg is difficult to estimate; probably several months at least. It was on January 27th, 1546 that Hooper wrote his first letter to Bullinger.⁶ This letter was sent to Zürich together with two others; one from Richard Hilles,⁷ who had already been in correspondence with Bullinger for five years, and one from Ludwig Lavater,⁸ a Swiss student studying in Strasbourg, who belonged to a well-known Zürich family. Both Hilles and Lavater commended Hooper to Bullinger.

Hilles told Bullinger that Hooper was once at the court of the English king but is now "a disciple of Christ, the king of kings, and glowing with zeal and piety and most attached to your name among those of all other divines. . . ." Lavater wrote to Bullinger saying that he would be receiving a letter from an Englishman "who is most attached to you—a well educated man, most accomplished and most worthy of your friendship—to whom I would wish, if time permits, you should reply." Thus sponsored, Hooper's first letter reached Bullinger.

From this letter we can catch a fleeting glimpse of Hooper's background and development. Hooper wrote that his life as a courtier "living too much of a court life" and his practice of "impious worship" had been changed by reading and studying certain works of Zwingli and Bullinger.⁹ He had now come to see and understand what God was, to which knowledge he had come through "the goodness of God, for which I am solely indebted to him and to yourselves." Nothing now remains for him "but to serve my godly brethren in Christ and the ungodly for Christ." Hooper went on to tell Bullinger that his intention had always been to visit Zürich but that so far he had been prevented by illness and lack of funds. He was now going to risk a visit to England in order to try and find the means whereby he could live amongst them in Zürich.

It was not long before Bullinger received a second letter from Hooper.¹⁰ Seeking confirmation of the principle of his exile, he asks Bullinger for his advice on whether it is lawful for a godly man to be present at Mass and whether, to avoid being present at such a ceremony, it is necessary for a man to leave his own country.

These first two letters from Hooper were received by Bullinger in a friendly fashion. Lavater and Hilles wrote again to Bullinger on April 30th, 1546 with further news of Hooper. Lavater indicated that Hooper was pleased with the messages Bullinger had sent him and that the Englishman had asked the writer to greet Bullinger in his name.¹¹ The letter of Richard Hilles¹² informed Bullinger that Hooper had in fact returned to England to obtain money so that he might remain "always . . . far from the impurity of Babylon." He was expected back in Strasbourg before long on his way to Zürich, which was his ultimate destination. So it was that in the early months of 1546 the first seeds of a friendship between John Hooper and Henry Bullinger were sown; a friendship which was to influence the course of English Church History.

It was not only friendship that Hooper found in Strasbourg but romance also. He had been very ill during his stay with Richard Hilles and had been nursed by two sisters who came from the neighbourhood of Antwerp. One of the sisters was married to Valerand Poullain, a minister in Strasbourg, but the other was unmarried, and it was with her Hooper fell in love. Her name was Anne de Tscerlas. He left her in Strasbourg whilst he visited England but on his return, about the beginning of 1547, they packed their belongings and set off together for Zürich. When they reached Basle they stayed with friends and made preparations for their marriage. We know neither the exact date of their

marriage nor the church in which it was solemnised. There is no record of the marriage in the registers of the churches of St. Peter, St. Alban, St. Leonard and St. Martin, but it may well have taken place in the chief church, the Minster, the marriage register of which is lost. The nearest one can get to fixing the date is to say that they were almost certainly married sometime during the first three weeks of March, 1547. Dryander, a friend in Basle, records in a letter dated March 26th, 1547 that the Hoopers were married "a few days ago."¹³

Very soon after his marriage Hooper himself wrote again to Bullinger.¹⁴ He acknowledged the answer to his query concerning the attendance of a godly man at Mass—the answer he had received in Strasbourg the previous year. Bullinger, he wrote, had convinced him that "it was more advisable and consistent with godliness that I should rather endure the loss of home and fortune for Christ's sake, than participate in the ungodly worship of the Mass." He cannot express his thanks enough to Bullinger for his help so far and hopes to visit Zürich very shortly. It was in fact on March 26th, 1547 that Hooper and his wife left Basle for Zürich.

From what has been written thus far it is clear that even before Hooper arrived in Zürich itself he was under the influence of Zürich teaching. It had been the writings of Zwingli and Bullinger that had finally converted him to Protestantism. It was the steadfast profession of this Protestantism that had caused his exile and the decision to stay abroad had been confirmed by Bullinger himself. Clearly Hooper's mind was well prepared for the further lessons he was soon to learn from his Zürich teachers.

III. HOOPER IN ZÜRICH

Zürich in the middle of the sixteenth century was a town of some 6,000 inhabitants. Their dwellings hugged the banks of the River Limmat where it flowed out of the Lake of Zürich. From the midst of this town rose the twin towers of the Great Minster, the church founded centuries earlier at the traditional burial place of the Zürich martyr saints. It was to the Great Minster that Zwingli had been appointed "People's Priest" in 1519 and upon this church the Reformation had centred. Close by the Minster stood the Town Hall in which the famous public disputations of 1523 had been held, the first of which had resulted directly in the setting in motion of the Zwinglian reformation, and the second of which had indirectly resulted in the beginning of the Zürich Anabaptists. From the bridges across the river looking southwards could be seen the expanse of the Lake of Zürich some twenty miles in length with small villages clustered on its green banks. Beyond

the lake on clear days the rugged outline of the Alps could be seen white against the blue of the sky.

Zürich was a busy town for it stood on the route of a main thoroughfare leading south into Italy and north into Germany. Down this road the Hoopers travelled in the late March days of 1547, and it was through the north gate of the town that they came on March 29th. They brought with them two further letters of introduction to Bullinger; one from Myconius¹⁵ and the other from Dryander.¹⁶ Both these letters commended Hooper and his wife to Bullinger as being pious people who were sound in doctrine and worthy of Bullinger's friendship. Their arrival was deemed important enough by Bullinger to be recorded in his diary,¹⁷ and he adds that they stayed a few days in his house. On April 4th Bullinger wrote to Myconius: "The Englishman you commended to me I have been compelled to receive into my own home. . . . I use the word 'compelled' in a manner of speaking only for I received him willingly and heartily because one can see that he is sincere."¹⁸ Bullinger lived in a house in the square around the Great Minster which may be identified today as 4 *Zwingli Plats*. Later on in the same letter Bullinger indicates that the Hoopers will soon move into the family of John Jackly who lived just opposite to the house in which Zwingli had lived. Thus the Jacklys' house was just around the corner from Bullinger's in the narrow street today named *Kirchgasse*.

Henry Bullinger, the chief minister of Zürich, who welcomed the Hoopers, deserves to be better known than he is.¹⁹ He has always been overshadowed by Zwingli, yet it was Bullinger who established Zwingli's work in Zürich. Zwingli worked in Zürich for twelve years; Bullinger for forty. Bullinger carried on a quite phenomenal amount of correspondence with church leaders in many lands, offering them advice when they sought it—and it must be said on occasions when they did not. The influence of Bullinger on English Church History has yet to be estimated.

Bullinger was born in Bremgarten, a small town in Canton Aargau. He went first to the school in Bremgarten and then to the Latin school in Emmerich when he was twelve. In 1519 he entered the University of Cologne and whilst he was there studied the writings of the Church Fathers, especially those of Chrysostom, Ambrose, Origen and Augustine. It was while Bullinger was in Cologne that some of Luther's early writings came into his possession, notably *The Babylonish Captivity of the Church* and the treatise *On Christian Liberty*. The years 1521-22 were the turning point in Bullinger's religious development; he turned to the Bible and read the New Testament with the help of Jerome's commentaries. He recorded in his diary that he "began to abhor

Papal doctrine." At the same time he read Melancthon's *Loci Communes*. In April, 1522 Bullinger returned to Bremgarten and continued his study of the Bible and the Church Fathers. Further writings of Luther came into his possession and he moved towards the acceptance of Reformed doctrine. In 1523 he was invited to teach in the monastery school at Kappel and, as no vow nor any statement of faith was required of him, he accepted the invitation. His first duties were to teach the younger pupils Latin, but before long he was giving lectures on Biblical exegesis to the monks themselves. This was an odd situation to have a sympathiser with Reformed doctrine giving exegetical lectures in a monastery and results were soon forthcoming. By autumn, 1525 Mass was no longer said in the cloister chapel and in 1526 it was replaced by a simple service of the Lord's Supper.

Not until late in 1523 did Bullinger come into contact with Zwingli, but it was not long before they were close friends. We have seen that other Reformed influences were at work on the young Bullinger and he was not a follower of Zwingli in all his theological thought. In 1528 Bullinger entered the ranks of the evangelical ministers and returned to Bremgarten as Pastor during the following year. His reputation as a preacher quickly spread and when Zwingli was killed at the battle of Kappel on October 11th, 1531 Bullinger was suggested as a possible successor. On December 9th he was appointed to follow Zwingli at the Great Minster in Zürich. Thus Bullinger had been in Zürich for just over fifteen years when Hooper arrived and was then in his forty-third year. This meant that in all probability Hooper was several years older than Bullinger, but there was never any doubt as to who was the teacher and who the pupil.

Of Hooper's two years stay in Zürich very little written evidence remains. This is not surprising as there would obviously be little need for him to write to Bullinger when he was living only just around the corner. There are, in fact, one or two letters written by Hooper²⁰ to Bullinger during this time but they deal with affairs in England; a report of the Battle of Pinkey for example, which Hooper had probably received in English and translated into Latin for Bullinger. The only evidence of any journey away from Zürich, undertaken by Hooper was a short visit to Constance in 1548²¹ with an Englishman resident in Switzerland named Butler.

It is quite clear that the friendship between Bullinger and Hooper deepened as the months went by. They would meet and in a friendly fashion discuss theological matters. This is evident from the letters exchanged between the two men after Hooper's return to England and is confirmed by a contemporary witness,

Josiah Simler, in his account of Bullinger's life written in 1575.²² Further evidence that theirs was not merely an academic friendship is supplied by the fact that when Hooper's first child Rachel was christened in the Great Minster on March 29th, 1548, Henry Bullinger was one of the godparents.²³

It is not difficult to reconstruct the life and teaching that Hooper experienced in the Zürich of the mid-sixteenth century. Space allows us only to mention the more important aspects of this Zürich life and teaching and first of all reference must be made to the theological school in Zürich about which so little is written and yet whose methods and name came to play a part in the England of Elizabeth I.

THE ZÜRICH 'PROPHESYINGS'

Although Bullinger was the recognised leader of the Zürich church, there were other personalities whom Hooper met and from whom he learnt. The most notable of these were Conrad Pellican,²⁴ Theodore Bibliander²⁵ and Conrad Gesner.²⁶ In letters to Bullinger from England Hooper constantly sent greetings to these three and to their wives. It was not, however, only as private individuals that Hooper met them, but also in their capacity as teachers in the school in Zürich which Hooper undoubtedly attended. There had been a Latin school there for several centuries before the Reformation, but in 1523 the Zürich Council gave Zwingli permission to reorganise it with the aim of providing an opportunity for a study of the Bible and the exegesis of it. In June, 1525 Zwingli was able to put this plan into operation and a new school was opened. The instruction in Latin continued, but that part was separated from the new form of instruction which Zwingli called the *Prophezei*. This word was a new creation by Zwingli but is based upon 1 *Corinthians* xiv. 1. "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy."

The "Propheying" had two parts. The first part was attended by the ministers of the town and also by the students preparing for the ministry. They assembled every morning except Friday and Sunday in the choir of the Great Minster at 8 a.m. each with a Bible. After a prayer together one of the students read in Latin the text to be discussed that day. Next, Jacob Ceperin (who soon died of overwork and was succeeded in December, 1525 by Pellican) translated the text into Hebrew and spoke of any linguistic difficulties. He then retranslated it into Latin showing, as he did so, any divergencies or mistakes in the original Latin text read. Zwingli (who was succeeded by Bibliander) then interpreted the same passage from the Greek Septu-

gint. While this was going on the students were not bound to remain silent but could ask questions and there was a general discussion of the text. This went on for about an hour and, finally, Zwingli summed up the discussion.

While this had been going on a congregation had assembled in the nave of the Great Minster and at the end of the theological discussion the second part of the "Prophesyings" began. This consisted of one of the city ministers, usually either Leo Jud or Megander, speaking in the Swiss language to the assembled congregation telling them what had taken place in the theological discussion and passing on the conclusions.

This was the original organisation of the "Prophesyings" under Zwingli. When Bullinger succeeded him he made one or two alterations. As he was already committed to preach daily in the Great Minster he felt that he had enough to do and so did not take over Zwingli's place in the school but appointed Bibliander. He did, however, give frequent lectures. He organised the first part of the "Prophesyings" more formally and moved it from the choir of the Great Minster to a lecture room in a nearby building. In addition to Bible exegesis there was systematic instruction in Latin, Hebrew and Greek. From 1541 onwards Natural Science was introduced, taught by Conrad Gesner. The character of Zwingli's original "Prophesyings" was, however, by no means lost. The lectures were still attended by the ministers of the town and there would still be discussion. In addition, there was still the second part of the "Prophesyings," the preaching in the vernacular to the people in the Great Minster.

Such then was the system of ministerial instruction in which Hooper shared during his stay in Zürich and it seems probable that it was not without influence upon him as we shall later see. It is clear also that the Zürich practice was one of the models upon which the well-known Elizabethan "Prophesyings" in England were based.

CHURCH PRACTICE IN ZÜRICH

We are fortunate in having an account of Zürich church practice which is almost contemporary with Hooper's stay in Switzerland. This account is by the same Ludwig Lavater whom Hooper had met in Strasbourg. It is contained in a book entitled *De Ritibus et Institutis Ecclesiae Tigurinae*, written in 1559.²⁷ The basis of Zürich practice is described by Lavater in these words: "Nothing is done in the Zürich church except that which was the practice in the church at the time of the apostles."²⁸ The importance of this basic principle cannot be overemphasised. It was the principle which Hooper made his own and which he tried

to force the other English Reformers to accept. It was the principle which he attempted to work out later in his own bishopric in Gloucester. It was this principle which was the ultimate cause of the lighting of his martyr's fire in the shadow of his own cathedral at Gloucester.

In Zürich Hooper saw a church devoid of all ceremonies which had come into being after apostolic times. He saw churches emptied of all images and statues, retaining only what furniture was absolutely necessary.²⁹ He saw churches without altars, having instead a simple table which was brought in whenever the Lord's Supper was celebrated.³⁰ He saw churches which did not glitter with gold, silver and jewels but rather churches which were simple buildings³¹ just as Hooper imagined the churches at Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus to be. He saw ministers in the churches who even when preaching and administering the sacraments wore no distinctive dress, but the respectable clothes of the ordinary citizen. They did not dress up like actors.³² He saw the congregation receive the Lord's Supper not on their knees but sitting. All this simplicity made a deep impression upon him and he came to equate simplicity with purity. Soon after Hooper left Zürich he sent a friend, Jan Utenhove, to Zürich recommending him to Bullinger with the words: "He is coming to you on my recommendation, that he may hear your godly sermons and theological lectures, and observe the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, which as it is most simple among you, so is it most pure."³³ This is surely a Puritan statement if ever there was one. It was written with reference to Hooper's experience of the Zürich church. It expressed an attitude which was to have far-reaching results.

THEOLOGICAL LESSONS OF ZÜRICH

It was while he was in Zürich that Hooper began his literary activities, writing three works during his stay there.³⁴ It is beyond the scope of this present essay to give a detailed account of the theological thought of Hooper and to show its close connection with that of the Zürich theologians.³⁵ It must suffice for us to indicate certain leading ideas of Hooper which are of importance for the understanding of his subsequent actions in England and therefore for the estimation of his place in English Church History.

(a) *The Question of Authority*

The ultimate authority from which all teaching on doctrine and practice must be taken is the Bible, the Old and New Testaments. Nothing may be countenanced which is not prescribed in Scripture; of that Hooper is absolutely convinced. "Now the

orator of God must persuade with none other arguments or words than the master of the School, Christ, hath taught, the prophets and apostles written. It is no orator of Christ's that, contrary unto his canons, the rules and precepts, would persuade in the Church anything more than is prescribed in the Scripture; the which is most perfect and sufficient to persuade in cause of religion all things."³⁶ We have seen that the principle of the Zürich church practice was that of confirmation to the church of the apostles. Hooper adopted this principle and applied it strictly. "Which was the most pure Church?" he asks. "The Church before the doctors wrote that only was taught by the simple text and word of the apostles, or the Church that hath been taught this many years by the blind doctrine of men?"³⁷ It is a rhetorical question. The traditions of men and of the Church and even the creeds are to be followed only in so far as they are in accordance with God's word. In a sermon preached before King Edward VI Hooper said: "The word of God wherewith he governeth and ruleth his Church is a sceptre of iron and not a rod of willow to be bowed with every man's finger, neither a reed to be broken at man's will."³⁸ This principle applied both to doctrine and practice and is a foundation stone of all Hooper's life and teaching.

(b) *The Covenant between God and Man*

Hooper was not, and would never have claimed to be, a particularly deep or original thinker. It is not to be expected that he should have produced a carefully thought out theological system. The chief purpose of his writings was to make plain to his ordinary readers that they were sinners and that God in Christ had offered them salvation from their sins. Hooper wished to show his readers the way of that salvation, the way of the Christian life and the way of worship. It is, however, possible to detect something of a framework within which Hooper set his thoughts. This framework is the idea of the Covenant between God and man.

Hooper believed that God wills that all men should be saved, but that at the same time God gives to every man according to his acts. The mercy and justice of God extend to include the wish that every man should be saved, that in fact to all men is given the opportunity of salvation. But in some way this salvation depends upon man's reaction to this merciful offer of God, both at the time when he first accepts it and in his maintenance of that acceptance throughout his whole life.

It is no accident that the first three Biblical citations Hooper gives after his statement that God wills all men to be saved are the promise of the bruising of the serpent's head in *Genesis* iii. 15, and the two accounts of the promise to Abraham of a seed in

Genesis xv. and *Genesis* xvii. In these instances Hooper sees God in covenant relationship with man, promising the blessing of the seed, but at the same time requiring of Abraham, for example, in *Genesis* xvii. 1. "Walk before me and be thou perfect." Hooper goes into details concerning this covenant relationship between God and man in his introduction "*Unto the Christian Reader*" at the beginning of his *Declaration of the Ten Commandments*.³⁹

He begins by saying that there can be no contract, peace, or alliance between two persons unless the persons who are entering into the contract agree upon the terms of the contract.⁴⁰ The Ten Commandments then are nothing else "but the tables or writings that contain conditions of peace between God and man, and declareth at large how and to what the persons named in the writings are bound unto one another."⁴¹ Hooper refers back with a scriptural reference *Genesis* xvii. to the Covenant of God with Abraham. The Ten Commandments are the conditions of this Covenant. The contents of these conditions on one side, "bind God to aid and succour, keep and preserve, warrant and defend man from all ill, both of body and soul, and at last to give him eternal bliss and everlasting felicity."⁴² On the other side of the Covenant man is bound, "to obey, serve and keep God's commandments, to love him, honour him, and fear him above all things."⁴³ If man made no attempt to do so, then God was released from his obligations. These were the terms of the contract agreed to by both parties.

This Covenant did not first come to Sinai with the Ten Commandments. The Covenant was made, after the Fall, with Adam, and with his seed in *Genesis* iii. 15.⁴⁴ But it is more plainly expressed in *Genesis* xv. and xvii. where God, after the Covenant is renewed with Abraham, promises to bless in the seed of Abraham all the people of the world.⁴⁵ God has thus deigned out of his great mercy to make a Covenant with undeserving man.

This Covenant was sealed by the blood of circumcision which act was the sign and seal the "sphragis" of the agreement.⁴⁶ Christ came and died a death in blood as a confirmation of this Covenant made between God and man, for on the basis of *Hebrews* ix. 16ff. there must be a confirmation of the Covenant by the death of the testator, and a Covenant confirmed with blood.⁴⁷

This then was the Covenant which God made with men. He would be their God, He would send Christ to die as a confirmation of the fact of the Covenant, and in that death make it possible for man to have eternal life. Hooper believed that this offer of God in this Covenant, this promise of grace, applied to all men. God wished all men to be saved, i.e. He wished to be the protector and

preserver of all men and to lead them to everlasting life, according to his side of the Covenant. This was the content of the promise of grace. Hooper says: "The Scripture answereth that the promise of grace appertaineth unto every sort of men in the world, and comprehendeth them all."⁴⁸ On the other hand, however, God gives to all men according to their acts, so Hooper goes on to say: "Howbeit within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect or pass over they exclude themselves from the promise of Christ."⁴⁹ If men fail to embrace by faith the opportunity and make no attempt to walk before God and to be holy then they would be judged according to their acts, or rather by their failure to believe and walk in the right paths.

All this necessarily means that there is only one Covenant and that the Church of the Old and New Testaments is one and the same.⁵⁰ Naturally also the sacraments before Christ are different only in form and not in essence to those of the Church after the coming of Christ. "As well was Christ delivered unto them in the use of their sacraments as unto us, but not so openly . . . the sacraments of the Old Testament and of the New in effect be one."⁵¹

Thus with one Covenant and one Church from the time that the first promise was offered to Adam so there is always the same content of the command which man must fulfil, "Walk before me and be thou perfect." Failure to follow this way meant exclusion through man's own fault. "Cain was no more excluded until he excluded himself than Abel; Saul than David, Judas than Peter."⁵² These men failed to hold to the content of this command. What then is the content of this command? The negative side is that: "the contemners of God, or such as willingly continue in sin and will not repent,"⁵³ are excluded from the general promise of grace. The positive side is that those who in faith repent and attempt to conform their lives to the Law of God are reckoned as members of this Covenant.⁵⁴ Naturally Hooper is concerned with this in relation to the people of his day rather than the days of the Old Testament and interprets it chiefly in the light of the Christ who has come, not as in the Old Testament as the Christ who was to come. Hooper says clearly to his readers, "we have the Scripture daily in our hands, read it and hear it preached. God's mercy ever continue the same. Let us think verily that now God calleth, and convert our lives to it. Let us obey it, and beware we suffer not our foolish judgments to wander after the flesh."⁵⁵ The way into the Covenant is that of repentance and faith and the way to remain within it is to live the Christian life.

In view of this covenant relation it is not surprising to find Hooper's continual and urgent emphasis on the absolute necessity

for a repentant man's Christianity to show itself in his everyday life. For it is possible for a man having accepted the promise offered in the Covenant to be damned if "by accustomed doing of ill he fall either in a contempt of the Gospel, will not study to live thereafter, or else hateth the Gospel because it condemneth his ungodly life."⁵⁶ In other words, if he fails to keep his side of the Covenant. This strong, almost fanatical, ethical demand is reflected in all Hooper's activities in England.

Hooper's conception then is of a Covenant, made after the Fall, and a Covenant which binds God only in so far as men make some response to his promise of grace. The Covenant is a conditional promise on the part of God to which man must respond in obedience before this obligation of God can be brought into action. It cannot be said that there is a fully developed covenant theory running obviously throughout all Hooper's works. The clearest statement of it is that given above. Nor is it perhaps possible to fit everything Hooper says in all his works into such a theory, but we believe that in so far as there is a theological system in Hooper's mind, it is that of the Covenant, in the sense enumerated above. This is not unexpected. For if we ask, who was the first theologian in the Reformation to produce such a covenant theory as the basis of his theological thought we find that the answer is Henry Bullinger. It is present in the works of Zwingli, but it is first systematised in Bullinger⁵⁷ and it can be shown that the source of Hooper's thought is almost certainly these Zürich theologians.

(c) *The Lord's Supper*

For Hooper the Lord's Supper is the sacrament to the Church today as the Passover was to the Children of Israel. They are both memorial meals; the latter was appointed "to be a memory of the thing done in Egypt," the former "to be a memory of the thing done in Mount Calvary."⁵⁸ The institution of the Lord's Supper is of the order of Christ and to change the order of it in any way is "as much as to say Christ is a fool and knew not how to celebrate the ceremony that represented his own death."⁵⁹ In the words of institution the bread and wine do not change substantially but are put to a different use and it is interesting to note that both Hooper and Bullinger use the same illustration to make this point clear, that of wax and a king's seal.⁶⁰ Wax alone is of little value but when the seal of a king is upon it then this wax, although substantially still wax, takes on an entirely different value. It represents the king. To deny the king's seal and to say it is only a piece of wax is no less treason and contempt than contempt of the king himself. So it is with the bread and the wine, which by

divine choice and by the word of institution become as the seal of the king himself, and therefore cannot be reckoned as merely bread and wine.

What Hooper says about the meaning of the Lord's Supper can best be summarised in three Latin phrases. It is first of all *memoria et recordatio*.⁶¹ It is a memorial of the Lord's death, but it is more than that. It is a recalling to mind of the benefits of that death. It is a rethinking of the situation. By *recordatio* Hooper probably means what Zwingli meant by his newly-coined word *Wiedergedächtnis*. In partaking of the bread and wine a believer not only remembers what Christ did (*memoria*), but in thinking through this (*recordatio*) he comes to realise that the benefits of Christ's act on Calvary appertain to him now. Secondly, the Lord's Supper is a *communicatio et participatio*.⁶² It was instituted by Christ not only as a memorial of his death but also "to confirm and manifest our society and communion in his body and blood, until he come in judgement."⁶³ The Lord's Supper is a time of participating in a special way in the fellowship of the Church and in communion with Christ. In this communion the Church manifests to the world the unity of its members and its unity with Christ, the Head. The third point is that the Lord's Supper is a *sacrificium*.⁶⁴ Hooper distinguishes two sorts of sacrifices. There is a propitiatory sacrifice which obtains remission of sins; this is a "once for all" sacrifice and was the one that Christ made on Calvary. This is the equivalent of the Greek word *Hilastikon*. This sacrifice in the Lord's Supper can only be a memorial. There is also, however, a sacrifice of joy (*Eucharistikon*). This can be repeated by men. This sacrifice of joy should be repeated at the Lord's Supper as man recalls how great are the benefits of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ.

There must be careful preparation for the Lord's Supper both by minister and people. Of the form Hooper says "the more simple it is, the better it is, and the nearer the institution of Christ and his apostles."⁶⁵ All that is required is bread, wine, a table and a white table-cloth."⁶⁶ The table should be placed in a position where it is clearly visible to all present. The minister should prepare himself carefully, seeking a fervent spirit to teach the truth to his hearers and to exhort them to recall and rethink the work of Christ.⁶⁷ The people should prepare themselves by confession of sin and repentance, and by reconciliation to their neighbours.

The service should normally take place in a church but when the ministry is corrupt and the sacraments used contrary to the institution of Christ then "every man may in his private chamber with his Christian and faithful brothers communicate according

unto the order of Scripture."⁶⁸ This statement could well form a basis of separatism from any church which recognised any authority alongside that of the Bible, be it reckoned the authority of the Church or of tradition. Doubtless Hooper had in mind the Roman Catholic Church when he wrote. But the principle could also have been applied against the Church in England, as indeed it was, not long after. The order of service should be as close as possible to that of Christ at the institution of the Lord's Supper.⁶⁹ The minister must call all to repent and examine their consciences. He must then preach the death of Christ and redemption as Christ did. The preaching is to be in the vernacular and clearly audible. In all that he does the minister must turn and face the people.⁷⁰ After the preaching comes prayer together as Christ prayed with his disciples, then follow the words of institution and the distribution of the sacraments. The bread should be broken by the minister and given to the people, not thrust into their mouths. The people should not receive the sacrament kneeling but sitting.⁷¹ The final act of the service is one of thanksgiving and a collection of alms for the poor.

It will be seen from what we have mentioned earlier that this conception of the simple form of the Lord's Supper looks to be very similar to that current in the reformed church in Zürich during Hooper's stay there. A detailed comparison confirms this impression.⁷² Hooper's ideas on the meaning of the Lord's Supper may also be traced to lessons learnt in the Zürich school. For the Zürich theologians the Lord's Supper was a memorial meal, and a time of recalling and rethinking the benefits of Christ's death. It was for them also a time of communion together manifesting to the world the fellowship of Christians in the Church and providing an opportunity to offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving.

There still remains the problem of the presence of Christ at the Lord's Supper. It was differences of opinion over this question that went a long way towards causing the tragic division among the Protestant churches in the Reformation.⁷³ On this point Hooper stands firmly with the Swiss church, and more especially with Zürich.

Although Hooper, like Zwingli, Bullinger, Calvin and Bucer denies any idea of a corporeal presence at the Lord's Supper, he does speak of a real presence of Christ. "The thing present in this sacrament is Christ himself, spiritually; the thing absent is Christ's body, corporeally."⁷⁴ Christ himself can be present to the believer by faith. His body may be in heaven "and yet extends his virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul by the means of faith, which at the time of the receiving of the sacrament

is in my soul."⁷⁵ Hooper makes clear what he means by taking the sun as an example. The sun remains in one place in the heavens and extends his beams and lights the earth. So Christ's body remains in heaven, yet where faith is, there he is spiritually (i.e. not substantially) present. Thus the virtue of this presence expels all darkness and sin out of the heart.⁷⁶ It is interesting that Zwingli, Bullinger, Calvin and Bucer all use the example of the sun to illustrate how they think of Christ's presence at the Lord's Supper, and as Dr. Cyril Richardson points out, the use they make of this illustration shows clearly the difference between their points of view.⁷⁷

Zwingli uses the analogy of the sun to show that Christ can be present in one place in heaven, by his humanity but everywhere present by his divinity. This does not divide the unity of the Person. Zwingli says "An example is the sun, whose body is in one place while its power pervades all things."⁷⁸ Bullinger follows Zwingli as may be seen from the twenty-first article of the second Helvetic Confession. "The Lord is not absent from his church celebrating the supper. The sun is absent from us in the sky, yet is nonetheless efficaciously present to us, how much more Christ the sun of righteousness, absent from us in heaven in his body is present to us not indeed bodily but spiritually by life-giving operation." For Zwingli and Bullinger there is no question of a substantial relationship between the believer and the body of Christ in heaven, the relation is spiritual.

Calvin and Bucer on the other hand use the analogy of the sun to indicate that the sun's rays share the substance of the sun and suggest although the body of Christ is in heaven it is still possible for believers to participate in its substance. Calvin writes: "For if we see that the sun, in sending forth its rays upon the earth, to generate, cherish and invigorate, in a manner transfuses its substance into it, why should the radiance of the spirit of Christ be less in conveying to us the communion of his flesh and blood?"⁷⁹

In his use of the analogy of the sun it can be seen that Hooper stands with Zürich. The presence is spiritual. There is no thought and no possibility of a substantial presence. For Hooper, where faith is, there Christ is present spiritually. On occasions we find Hooper also speaking of a sacramental presence⁸⁰ as did his teachers in Zürich. The king of kings has set his seal upon the bread and the wine, and although substantially still bread and wine they are put to new use, tokens of his body and blood. With his faith heightened by such tokens, the believer will naturally be more aware of the spiritual presence of the Lord at the Supper and this heightened awareness is the sacramental presence.

IV. THE RETURN FROM EXILE

While Hooper had been sitting at the feet of the Zürich teachers, the situation in England had been rapidly changing. Henry VIII had died and had been succeeded by his son, Edward VI, a boy of ten. In consequence the government of England had been placed in the hands of a Regency Council under the leadership of the Duke of Somerset. The news which reached Zürich from England during Hooper's stay was varied. An attempt had been made to remove Roman Catholic practices, a successful attempt in many respects, but what the eventual doctrine would be which would replace the Roman was not at all certain. John Ab Ulmis, a Swiss student in Oxford, writes to Bullinger on August 18th, 1548 concerning the waverings and uncertainties of Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and says that the catechism which he published in 1548 contained a Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.⁸¹ Burcher the Merchant, writing from Strasbourg on October 29th, 1548,⁸² also gives this information and adds that this book has given rise to fightings among the common people because of their diversity of opinions. Peter Martyr was already in Oxford and, according to a letter from John Ab Ulmis to Bullinger, was not a Lutheran, nor yet "inclining to your opinion" concerning the real presence at the Lord's Supper.⁸³ Thus the position in England as the news reached Zürich at the end of 1548 was that the Mass was banished, that the Protestant doctrine was being accepted, but as to what form of Protestantism would eventually triumph, whether Lutheran or another, was not certain. In the summer of 1548 Bullinger had sent a book to the Archbishop of Canterbury and also a letter which consisted of "a grave and learned admonition as to his episcopal duties" followed by "a subtle transition to the Eucharist."⁸⁴ The result desired was not forthcoming, for Ab Ulmis writes: "We entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter" for Cranmer had fallen "into so heavy a slumber."⁸⁵

It seems likely that Hooper, towards the end of 1548, when this situation in England, with all its uncertainties and doubts, became clear, began to turn his thoughts towards a return to England. He had already fired two shots in the form of his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book* and *The Declaration of Christ and His Office*, but shots fired from such a distance as Zürich would make little noise in London. Bullinger doubtless realised this, and would see how much impact a man of Hooper's uncompromising personality would make in England in the present uncertain situation. It seems that they had talked together of the risks involved in a return to England,⁸⁶ especially as it was known

that Mary, who was next in succession to the throne, was a Roman Catholic. Yet there was no reason to expect that Edward would die, and anyhow risks must be run for the sake of the Gospel. The chief reason for Hooper's exile had been that a godly man should not attend Mass, and now Mass was banished from England. Hooper was an Englishman and now England had need of all the preachers she could find. Such were the arguments which might well be used to urge Hooper to return to England. They were the arguments which we believe Bullinger did use. At any rate, in January, 1549 Hooper had made up his mind to return for, on January 18th, John Rudolph Stumph, a Swiss student bound for England, wrote to his father that "the Englishman I have discovered returns to his native land in two months with his wife and child."⁸⁷ Preparations for the return went on, and on March 12th, Stumph tells his father that his books, together with Hooper's left Zürich by carrier on the previous day.⁸⁸ So the day of departure came, noted in Bullinger's diary as March 24th, 1549.⁸⁹ The farewells were said⁹⁰ and down the road northwards to Basle in the company of Stumph, the student bound for Oxford, went John and Anne Hooper with their baby daughter, Rachel.

As Hooper turned his face toward England it was with the conviction that he had found the church which in practice and in doctrine was the right one—the church of Zürich. It conformed closely to the Church of the apostles in all its simplicity and that was the criterion by which to judge all churches. Hooper felt it his mission to make the church in England as like the church in Zürich as possible. Hooper returned to England with his beliefs fixed. He was going to an England where it seemed the leaders were uncertain as to the best form of Reformed church to build. Into this uncertainty Hooper was going to bring certainty. He had no doubts. He knew what he believed and why he believed it and he was prepared to die for his beliefs. He knew that he had left behind him in Zürich firm friends who would stand behind him in his mission. He knew that he could turn at all times to Bullinger for help and that Bullinger would not let him down.⁹¹ Bullinger never did let him down, nor indeed did Hooper fail Bullinger. It was circumstances beyond the control of both of them which caused the mission to fail in its ultimate object. But although Hooper did not succeed in moulding the English church according to the Zürich pattern we shall see that his doctrines and practices learnt from Zürich helped to set in motion a movement which has had a profound effect upon the church in England. That movement is Puritanism.

(To be continued)

FOOTNOTES.

¹ This essay is a summary of a Thesis submitted to the Theological Faculty of the University of Zürich. A typewritten copy of the original thesis is in the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich under the title of *A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to his Contact with Henry Bullinger*. Two further copies are in the possession of the present writer and are available for consultation.

² It is interesting to note that a friend of Hooper's, a merchant named Burcher, says that Hooper went to Cambridge. See *Epistolarum Tigurinarum Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848* (hereafter referred to as E.T.) p. 441 English translations of these letters are in two volumes of *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation* ed. Hastings Robinson, Parker Society, Cambridge 1846 and 1847 (hereafter O.L. 1 and 2). The present reference is O.L. 2. p. 680.

³ J. Strype *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Oxford, 1822, Vol. III, Part 2, p. 276, Catalogue of Originals contains a copy of the sentence passed on Hooper on January 29th, 1554, in which Hooper is described as *presbyterum, olim monachum domus sive monasterii de Cliva, ordinis Cisterciensis*.

⁴ E.T. p. 21, O.L. 1 p. 33.

⁵ Much of the evidence used in this essay is derived from the correspondence which Bullinger had with England and with Englishmen in the years 1546-1555. Most of the originals of the letters are to be found in the Archives in Zürich. References to letters in the Zürich Archives are introduced by Z.S.A. In some cases however the original of the letter is no longer extant or is not available in Zürich, in such cases reference is made to the manuscript copy in the Simler Collection in the Zürich Zentralbibliothek. In working through the Simler Collection I was assisted by some notes made by the late Dr. Rudolph which were lent to me by Prof. H. Straumann. References to letters in the Simler Collection are introduced by S.C. As far as possible, in the case of published letters, reference is also made to the collection of letters in which they appear.

⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 343:377; E.T. p. 21; O.L. 1 p. 33.

⁷ Z.S.A. E. II 343:345; E.T. p. 166; O.L. 1 p. 250.

⁸ S.C. S. 59:46; Original is Manuscript F. 39:733 in Zürich Zentralbibliothek.

⁹ Z.S.A. E. II 343:377; E.T. p. 21; O.L. 1 p. 33. It cannot be said with certainty precisely what writings of Zwingli and Bullinger these were. Bullinger's commentaries were published in one volume in 1537 and in 1538 his commentary on II Thessalonians was translated into English. Zwingli's works were circulating in England during the 1530's and it is interesting to note that Cranmer in a letter to the reformation leader in St. Gall, Vadian, in 1537 claims to have read almost everything that had been written by Zwingli. (*Cranmer Works*, Parker Society, Vol. II, p. 344).

¹⁰ Z.S.A. E. II 369:194; E.T. p. 24; O.L. 1 p. 38.

¹¹ S.C. S. 59:73. Original is Manuscript F. 39:727 in Zürich Zentralbibliothek.

¹² Z.S.A. E. II 343:346; E.T. p. 169; O.L. 1 p. 254.

¹³ Z.S.A. E. II 366:36.

¹⁴ Z.S.A. E. II 345:422; E.T. p. 25; O.L. 1 p. 40.

¹⁵ Z.S.A. E. II 343:347; S.C. S. 63:177.

¹⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 366:36; S.C. S. 63:178.

¹⁷ Heinrich Bullinger's *Diarium*, ed. Emil Egli, Basel 1904, p. 35 published in *Quellen zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte II herausgegeben vom Zwingliverein* in Zürich.

¹⁸ Z.S.A. E. II 342:170; S.C. S. 63:190.

¹⁹ There is no book on Bullinger (1504-1575) in English, and few in German.

See C. Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*. Elberfeld, 1858.

F. Blanke, *Die Junge Bullinger*. Zürich, 1942.

A. Bouvier, *Henri Bullinger Réformateur et Conseiller oecuménique*. Zürich, 1942.

A. J. vant'Hoof, *De Theologie van Heinrich Bullinger in betrekking tot de Nederlandsche Reformatie*, Amsterdam, 1888.

²⁰ Z.S.A. E. II 343:381; S.C. S. 68:115. About Nov., 1548, also S.C. S. 68:114, probably about the same time.

²¹ See the letter from Butler to Thomas Blaurer. E.T. p. 412; O.L. 2 p. 635. The note 3 on this page is incorrect. Thomas was the brother of Ambrose Blaurer.

²² In *Narratio de ortu, vita et obitu reverende viri D. Henrici Bullingeri, 1575 p. 22*. Under the year 1547 we read *Ioannes quoque; Hopperus postea Glocestris episc. in Anglia et martyr, iisde temporibus Tigurum venit cum uxore, Bullingero familiarissimus, cum quo de omnib. cap. religionis tū precipae de sacramentis sepe disseruit, et que nostrorum esset sententia exquiries, et qd adversariorum obiectis respondendum sit discere cupiens: quae autem ipsius sententia fuerit, et quam consentanea doctrinae nostrarum ecclesiarum, scripta sanctissimi martyris testantur a viro Cl. Ioanno Foxo historiae martyrum Anglicorum inserta.*

²³ The extant baptismal register of the Grossmunster records this baptism.

²⁴ Pellican was a Hebrew scholar. In the Simler Collection S. 65:143 there is a letter from Hooper to Pellican which bears this inscription "*Præceptoris suo colendissimi ac Domino D. Conr. Pellicano vir de omni pietate ac religione viri optima merito.*" In the letter Hooper thanks Pellican for books borrowed.

²⁵ Bibliander later, in 1552, dedicated a book to Hooper.

²⁶ Conrad Gesner was well-known for his researches in the fields of medicine and natural history.

²⁷ For simplicity reference is given to the 1702 edition of *De Ritibus et Institutis Ecclesiae Tigurinae* the pages of which are numbered.

²⁸ *De Ritibus op. cit.* p. 0.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 19.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 19.

³¹ *Ibid.* p. 19.

³² *Ibid.* p. 17.

³³ Z.S.A. E. II 343:42; E.T. p. 36; O.L. 1 p. 56.

³⁴ These three works were: *An Answer to Stephen Gardiner's book on the Lord's Supper, A Declaration of Christ and His Office, A Declaration of the Ten Commandments.*

These works may be found in *Early Writings of John Hooper* ed. Samuel Carr, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843 (hereafter E.Wr.). A second volume of Hooper's works was published by the Parker Society at Cambridge in 1852 and entitled *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper* (hereafter L.Wr.) ed. Charles Nevinson. This volume however contains a work *A brief and clear Confession of the Christian Faith* which, as I hope to show elsewhere, does not seem to have been written by Hooper. See original thesis pp. 21-28 for details.

³⁵ This I have attempted to do in detail in my thesis pp. 94-178.

³⁶ E.Wr. p. 105.

³⁷ E.Wr. p. 343.

³⁸ E.Wr. p. 436.

³⁹ E.Wr. pp. 255-270.

⁴⁰ E.Wr. p. 255.

⁴¹ E.Wr. p. 255.

⁴² E.Wr. p. 255.

⁴³ E.Wr. p. 256.

⁴⁴ E.Wr. p. 258.

⁴⁵ E.Wr. p. 259.

⁴⁶ E.Wr. p. 133.

⁴⁷ E.Wr. p. 251.

⁴⁸ E.Wr. p. 259.

⁴⁹ E.Wr. p. 259.

⁵⁰ E.Wr. p. 126.

⁵¹ E.Wr. p. 126.

⁵² E.Wr. p. 259.

⁵³ E.Wr. p. 262-3.

⁵⁴ E.Wr. p. 263.

⁵⁵ E.Wr. p. 265.

⁵⁶ E.Wr. p. 264 and p. 76-77.

⁵⁷ It appears in Zwingli's *In catabaptistarum strophas elenchus* 1527—see especially pp. 414-424 in Vol. III of Schuler and Schultess edition of Zwingli's works. Bullinger's systematic treatment of the idea is in his *De Testamento seu Foedere Dei Unico* published in 1534. For a discussion of the origins and influence of this Covenant theology see G. Schrenk *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus* which is Vol. V. in *Beiträge zur förderung christlicher Theologie* Gutersloh, 1923. Schrenk however almost ignores the development of the Covenant theology in the British Isles. For our purpose see the article by L. J. Trinterud "The Origins of Puritanism" in *Church History*, March, 1951, published by the American Society of Church History. This article deals almost exclusively with the Covenant idea and is a summary of its influence in Puritanism. This Covenant theory naturally raises the question of Predestination. I have dealt at length with this problem in Hooper in the original thesis pp. 116-121 and came to the conclusion that Hooper once again stands with Bullinger's teaching of the 1540's in that his writings show a clear cut doctrine of Election. Hooper has one class the elect, but does not speak of the other class of the reprobate. God elects men to life, but the devil and man combine to cause man's downfall. That is as far as Hooper will go.

⁵⁸ E.Wr. p. 125.

⁵⁹ E.Wr. p. 187.

⁶⁰ E.Wr. p. 191 and Bullinger's *Decades* Vol. IV Parker Society, Cambridge, 1852, p. 270 (hereafter referred to as Dec. IV).

⁶¹ L.Wr. p. 515.

⁶² L.Wr. p. 394.

⁶³ E.Wr. p. 175.

⁶⁴ L.Wr. p. 520.

⁶⁵ E.Wr. p. 534.

⁶⁶ E.Wr. p. 534.

⁶⁷ E.Wr. p. 534.

⁶⁸ With this we may compare Hooper's advice given in a letter from prison to "Certain godly persons instructing them how to behave at the beginning of a change of religion." (L.Wr. p. 589) 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."

⁶⁹ E.Wr. p. 61.

⁷⁰ L.Wr. p. 128. This was a most revolutionary demand in England in the middle of the sixteenth century.

⁷¹ E.Wr. p. 536. It should be noted that this protest against kneeling at the Lord's Supper was made in a sermon preached by Hooper in 1550 two years before the better known protest of John Knox.

⁷² For details of the Zürich order see *De Ritibus* op. cit. pp. 52-59, Bullinger's Commentary on *Hebrews* x: 16 contained in *In omnes Apostolicas Epistolas, divi videlicet Pauli XIII et VII Canonicas Commentarii H. Bullingeri*. Froshauer, Zürich 1549, p. 709, and for Bullinger's own ideal see Dec. IV p. 406-7. Bullinger's closing sentence is "*Hic ritus coena domini et simplicissime et optimus est, quem apostoli a domino Christo acceptum omnibus nationibus custodiendum tradiderunt.*"

⁷³ The failure of Luther and Zwingli to agree on this very point at Marburg in 1529 after they had agreed on all other points of doctrine is the supreme illustration of this point.

⁷⁴ E.Wr. p. 209.

⁷⁵ E.Wr. p. 191.

⁷⁶ E.Wr. p. 192.

⁷⁷ C. C. Richardson *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* Seeburg-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, 1949, p. 23ff.

⁷⁸ *Ad Carolam Fidei Ratio, Schuler and Schultess*. Huldrici Zwingli Opera Completa Editio Prima Vol. IV p. 12. There is evidence to suggest that Hooper had this Zwingli work open before him as he wrote on this point.

⁷⁹ *Institutes* Book IV chapter xvii: 12 and xvii: 19. For Bucer see a quotation from his commentary on Matthew xxvi given on p. 90 of *Cranmer's Works*, Vol. I, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843.

⁸⁰ L.Wr. p. 389, and Bullinger Dec. IV, p. 463.

⁸¹ S.C. S. 67:165; E.T. p. 251; O.L. 2 p. 381.

⁸² Z.S.A. E. II 343:375; E.T. p. 416; O.L. 2 p. 642.

⁸³ Z.S.A. E. II 335:2092; E.T. p. 249; O.L. 2 p. 378. The date of this letter is Ascension Day, 1548.

⁸⁴ We learn of this letter to Cranmer from Ab Ulmis's letter of August 18th 1548. S.C. S. 67:165; E.T. p. 251; O.L. 2 p. 380.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ This fact is recalled in the remarkable last letter which Bullinger wrote to Hooper in prison. The letter is in Foxe *Acts and Monuments* ed. S. R. Cattley, London, 1838, Vol. VI, p. 675 ff.

⁸⁷ S.C. S. 69:35.

⁸⁸ S.C. S. 69:36.

⁸⁹ Bullinger's *Diarium*, op. cit. p. 37, line 1.

⁹⁰ An account of the parting conversation between Hooper and Bullinger is given in Foxe op. cit. Vol. VI, p. 538.

⁹¹ Hooper records his debt to Zürich in a letter to Bullinger. "If I am able to effect anything, and if my slender powers are of any benefit to the Church of Christ, I confess and by the blessing of God I will confess, as long as I live, that I owe it to yourself and my masters and brethren at Zürich . . ." Z.S.A. E. II 343:457. E.T. p. 46; O.L. 1 p. 73. The correct date of this letter is December 17th, 1549.

W. MORRIS S. WEST.

J. H. Rushbrooke

DR. Payne not only has the gift of writing lucidly, which is essential to any biographer, but he adds to it a historian's knowledge and authority. In his life of Rushbrooke (*James Henry Rushbrooke, a Baptist Greatheart*, by Ernest A. Payne, Carey Kingsgate Press, 5/-), he has taken great care to collect the significant and salient facts and, without overloading the picture with detail, has given us an authentic portrait fit to hang "in the line" in our gallery of Baptist worthies.

The work has been done admirably and the result is a satisfying book that offers us an inspiring record of a forceful personality and assures for its subject an honoured place in the story of the builders of our denomination who, by their labours, advocacy and devotion, have established a world-wide and effective Baptist fellowship.

Writing of Archbishop William Temple, Dr. Iremonger said: "No particular gift or virtue seems to stand out obviously from the rest," yet he made it plain that Temple was a very great man. Something of the same kind might truthfully be said of Rushbrooke. He was a man of parts, endowed with a variety of gifts; yet to single out this, that or the other for special emphasis would distort the likeness. He himself would probably have agreed whole-heartedly that in some ways nature had not helped him very much—a distinction which, if historians are to be trusted, he shared with Socrates and St. Paul. Of medium height, inclined to a "student's stoop" and a full figure, bald, bearded and spectacled, he would have chuckled (he had a real sense of humour) if it had been suggested that, to use an Americanism, he was "the answer to a film-smitten maiden's prayer"! There was nothing glamorous about him. On the other hand, he had a massive, well-shaped head, clear eyes that could twinkle with fun, and a certain indefinable distinction and dignity that is difficult to analyse. Perhaps it came from his deep seriousness and persistent purposefulness. He always seemed to "mean business." He was tenacious of his point of view, frank and vigorous in his expression of it and, at the same time, willing to hear patiently what others had to say. His solid qualities of mind and character were obvious and impressive. His fundamental convictions went deep and remained, I believe, virtually unaltered, though some of his attitudes changed.

My first meeting with him was on a Saturday evening in 1911 when, arrived from Oxford, as a student to preach the next day at his former church in Archway Road, Highgate, my host took me

for a walk across the Heath to see the new church in Hampstead Garden suburb where Rushbrooke was beginning his ministry. There we met him with Mrs. Rushbrooke, who had just laid the foundation stone of the Manse. At that time he was so eager for Christian Unity that he went beyond a great many London Baptists, who were troubled to discover that he had approved, if not drafted, a trust deed for the church, erected mainly with funds from Baptist sources, which permitted either a Baptist or Congregationalist minister and infant as well as believers' baptism. It is only fair to say his action had the full support of some of the most generous donors. Later on, when he was Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, it is, I think, quite clear that he adopted a different view—he was very critical of schemes for re-union and gave little support to the movement. This caused some of his old friends no small disappointment. Yet there is no reason to doubt his sincerity, and any man has a right to change his mind. As time went on he took up a more rigid denominational position and, while he maintained contact with leaders of other communions, his interest and enthusiasm more and more centred on Baptist belief and work.

A General Baptist, with a course of study at Berlin to his credit, a student and devout admirer of Harnack, the theological Colossus of that day, his thinking was along "liberal" lines, though, like his hero, John Clifford, he never lost the real spirit of evangelism. His broad sympathies enabled him in the Baptist World Alliance to get on happily with the more conservative among American Baptists as well as on the Continent.

He was of course eminently fitted for his Continental work. Though he was heart and soul with his own country in the two wars, he loved the German people among whom so much of our European strength lay. His second wife was a very talented and charming German lady. Did he not once take me specially to see the very lamp-post in Berlin where, when they were both students and waiting for a tram, they had first spoken to one another? Whenever he was in Berlin he went there and raised his hat. Knowing Mrs. Rushbrooke, I raised mine, too. They were deeply devoted to each other. Happily they were of one mind during the wars, though understandably they caused Mrs. Rushbrooke great distress.

He was a good traveller and loved the sea. It was a delight to go with him among Baptists in Central Europe. With a splendid capacity for work, he spent himself freely, went to innumerable meetings, groups and committees, often until far in the night. Nothing was too much to do for our fellow-believers, especially where they might be facing special difficulties raised by local or

national authorities or by fissiparous tendencies in their own fellowships.

Dr. Payne tells the story of his efforts for our persecuted brethren. The full story of the Rumanian episodes would take a long time. Every possible force we could raise was mobilised. Our own Foreign Office and Ambassador were brought in. The United States Consul-General in Bukarest represented vigorously, at an appropriate time, the deplorable effect of Baptist ill-treatment on American opinion. Archbishop Temple wrote to the Orthodox Patriarch of Rumania. I myself had an interview with the late Archbishop Germanos who told me frankly how much he regretted the attitude of the Orthodox Church in that country, and would make such representations as he could, but that he had no authority. (So far as authority goes the Orthodox Church is almost as divided as Protestantism). Rushbrooke went out again and again, once taking with him T. R. Glover, who shook the Rumanian minister of state concerned by telling him he belonged to the seventeenth century. And they thought they were so modern! That was the sort of problem that saw Rushbrooke at his best. He mastered his brief. He knew the facts and could present them courteously but firmly. *Suaviter in modo; fortiter in re*. There were some successes and many disappointments. The main thing was that our support heartened our people in their struggle for religious freedom and equality.

I liked to watch him as we sat in conference with local Baptist leaders. Though my knowledge of German was not good enough for me to follow everything in the conversations, I got the gist of them, and he made sure that I should seize the main points. His good humour, common sense and his emphasis on fundamentals and the supreme motives usually carried the day. I came to understand their problems and his. For over twenty years we worked in the same building. When he was home I saw him nearly every day. He liked to discuss points that arose. He would come in with some irritating, but half-amusing story of the gullibleness of some of our friends. Money contributed at his request for a specific purpose and sent on by him had been used for something else. They still needed it. What were they to do? He would be stern and rebuke them for misuse of funds, only to be met with a reply that when the money arrived some other necessity appeared more urgent and they thought God would wish them to use it for that. He would spread out his hands and say: "They simply have no idea of what we call commercial honesty. What can I do with them?"

Yet they relied on him. They would refer to him as "our father." He was indeed a father-in-God to them, a bishop in the

truest sense, a trusted and honoured friend in spite of the periodical *kopfwaschung* to which they said he treated them.

Perhaps the sense of the way they depended on him personally made it difficult for him to let others do what they might. In their weakness, sometimes helplessness, they leaned heavily on messengers and advisors from this country. Charles Byford, until the first world war and then his subsequent breakdown in health made his further service to them impossible, had courageously broken much rough ground in the Balkans, Austria, Hungary, Russia and elsewhere. His pioneer work and valourous spirit are not nearly so well understood and appreciated as they ought to be. Everett Gill and W. O. Lewis, too, have been faithful and wise counsellors and had carried relief and a rich sense of fellowship to those who sat in the darkness of the first post-war aftermath. The bonds were more personal than official. Rushbrooke as Commissioner for Europe soon realised this and worked for them as if they were his children. One of his keenest regrets arose from the fact that, though he had tried in two or three brief visits to Russia under the auspices of the Nansen Relief Organisation to help Russians of all classes and creeds, he was never allowed to re-enter Russia. I was with him when he called at the Soviet embassy or consulate in Warsaw expecting to find a permit for us both to go on to Moscow—but on some excuse it was refused. He was bitterly disappointed but his protests availed nothing. It was a shabby return for what he had done.

In spite of the lack of appreciation in some quarters and scant success in others it cannot be doubted that he fell in love with his work and that, when he was appointed Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, it satisfied an immense desire and gave him keen satisfaction. He grew into his task and was proud of it. His contacts with America and his reception there gave him confidence and a feeling of authority. He thought he was speaking for the Baptists of the world, and was at first inclined to regard the Alliance as a world-wide Baptist Union. Those who knew American Baptists were not surprised that this did not go down well at first. They were not having any super-Baptist body or super-denominational official and insisted that he should report regularly and step by step to the secretaries of their various conventions as well as to our own Union. His good sense and scrupulous care henceforth to make sure that he had authority to speak and act enabled him rapidly to acquire the full confidence of all who mattered.

As an administrator he was conscientious and thorough, bringing to his work real enthusiasm and a great ambition for the Alliance as a means of mobilising and expressing Baptist opinion,

disseminating information about our doings, and focusing sympathy so as to make it effective in help to hard-pressed fellow-believers. He was always jealous for our good name and eager that Baptists should have full credit for what they achieved. To some of his friends his zeal sometimes appeared excessive. Though he never became either in conviction or sympathy a narrow sectarian, he fought hard for his own people. When, toward the end of the second world war, I was asked on the initiative of Dr. William Paton, and with the full concurrence of Archbishops Lang and Temple, to become chairman of the Inter-Church Committee for Christian Reconstruction in Europe, which was set up by the Churches of this country and not, as Iremonger in his *Life of Temple* says, by the British Council of Churches, which would not at first accept responsibility for such a task, I found myself not a little embarrassed by the unanswerable plea of Rushbrooke that the large amount of money collected by the Union from British Baptists should be earmarked, except for a small "token contribution" to show our sympathy, for needy Baptists. To some of my fellow-workers of other denominations it seemed strange that, while Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians canalised their generous gifts through our joint committee, the chairman's own denomination should give so little. American Baptists were sending vast sums for Baptist relief to the Continent, and I even had protests that Baptists were getting more than a fair share. I had to do a great deal of explaining but it was not too difficult. Rushbrooke and I were able to co-operate whole-heartedly, even though some of our British Baptists were disappointed that we did not give in the same way as other denominations. Our trouble was, of course, that, with help reaching our Continental friends from United States sources, it would have been hard for them to understand no direct help coming from us. In the raising of our fund I had his close co-operation, and he felt as keenly as anyone our disappointment through the difficulty of exporting money at that parlous time for our national finances. His knowledge of local conditions and needs was of great value to our Continental Committee in our disbursements, which, for the reason given, had to be spread over a long period. He was an admirable committee-man, though not so good a chairman because he was so full of information that he was inclined to treat us to a lengthy speech on every agenda item, and, being in the chair, nobody could pull him up!

When he acted as secretary he gave me much amusement, which he shared, by writing out the minutes beforehand. They then served as the chairman's agenda and later, with a few verbal amendments, were duly entered!

He liked drawing up resolutions, usually an amiable vice. His clear head was of value in making their import unmistakable. He always mistrusted Temple's gift of getting around difficulties by drafting statements or resolutions which brought opposing opinions together, sometimes with the result that varying sections afterwards discovered they meant different things by them. For many years our Council, through the officers, delegated to him and me the duty of concocting resolutions for the Assembly and for other purposes. These I drafted in the first instance, after finding out what other Christian bodies were saying or not saying. They were then sent up to him to be "vetted." We had some lively discussions and a lot of fun. Now and again I would tease him by sending up what I called my "naughty boy drafts," in which, to find his reaction, I would write exactly what I thought and would like to say. He reacted all right! He came bursting into my room, dumped the document on my desk with a "You can't say that!" I knew it as well as he did. He soon saw through my joke and henceforth would laugh heartily when I broke out. My method had at anyrate the advantage of making the issue clear. Then we really got down to the job of writing something which would express the denomination's conviction and at the same time, would get a virtually unanimous vote so that we could follow it up by appropriate action in representations to the Government or the Press.

I cherish with real satisfaction the memories of the times we spent, and the things we did, together. He was good company. Dr. Payne has done full justice to his public work as a minister of the Gospel, which he always way, and as a Baptist leader, to his platform and pulpit abilities and to his published books and addresses. He was an admirable speaker, with a wealth of material. His embarrassment was in selection. His style was plain and forceful, a little clipped in utterance, but he fully realised the value of the "rising inflection." To listen to him was easy, even when he was making one of his lengthy reports to a World Congress. His speeches took more out of him than always appeared, and I have seen him moist and dripping after a major effort, eager to get away by himself (not always easy) and have a bath.

But to know the real man we must see him at leisure. Dr. Payne refers to his reticence. He did seem aloof to most people and I never heard anyone call him by his Christian name. Yet I think I came to know him and his mind fairly well. Given the opportunity he could open out in a wonderful way. Recollections surge as I think back. The intangible barrier would melt like mist before the sun at a touch of affection or appreciation, and he could

speak movingly of the deep things in his heart. I remember a discussion we had on the Holy Communion. It seemed at first as if he took a simply Zwinglian view. I said frankly that, if the service were not something much more and much bigger than an *aide-memoire*, I thought a crucifix more helpful. "This is My body . . . this is My blood" surely means more than remembrance. He promised he would write down for me more fully what it meant to him, but it was near the end of his life and he was very busy. The full statement never came, but his little pamphlet on *Christian Ordinances and Christian Experience* shows that he accepted it as the declaration of the Gospel and an expression of the brotherhood of the Church, a source of gladness and inspiration.

One day he came into my room as I was dictating the programme for one of our meetings. I had no hymn-book by me and I simply gave my secretary the first lines of the hymns I wanted *and the tunes*. He told me to go on while he sat down. When I had done he said: "I wish I could do that." Then he asked me if I had heard the joke about the man with so little ear for music that he only knew the National Anthem because people stood up. I laughed and then he told me that it was literally and accurately true of him. He felt it as a great deprivation because both his wife and daughter, Mrs. Forbes Taylor, were accomplished musicians with a great love for Bach, of whom he had heard me speak with enthusiasm, and he understood not a note and felt shut out.

We were speaking once about immortality and then he told me of his life's great tragedy, the loss of his young first wife, Kate, after childbirth, and the subsequent death of their boy, and the surprising words with which he finished the story were: "Since then I have never doubted immortality and it took away from me for ever all fear of death."

Once I said to John Simon, in his room at the Foreign Office, after he had been tramping up and down like a caged lion, speaking about Hitler and the threat of war: "You seem to care a lot about peace." "Care about it?" he blazed out passionately, "God knows I do!" Then, rather daringly, I said: "I wish you'd speak like that on the platform." He looked hard at me for a long time and then, "Yes, I know. You're perfectly right. But I can't. It may be all this arguing before judges, putting my cases legally, all in terms of reason. The more I burn inside the more I seem to freeze outside."

Was there a bit of that about Rushbrooke? The hidden fires were there but also some inhibition that made it hard for him to glow or melt in public, so that to many he seemed, quite wrongly,

austere and self-contained, the level-headed, shrewd man of affairs.

Looking across the years I feel that perhaps he was more hungry for friendship than he seemed and I wish I had shown him more of the affection I felt. But, except on such occasions as I have indicated, I found it hard to break through. It may be the fault was mine.

I am sure we could have done more to help him if he had given us the chance. In honesty it should be said that he suffered from one defect of his virtues. His extreme conscientiousness combined with his sense of responsibility and his knowledge of the facts of the situation, seemed to make him keep all the strings in his own hands. It appeared impossible for him to delegate work and responsibility to others. It may have been due to the reluctance, common among reticent men, to put burdens upon them. We may be certain his motives were good, but it was a pity, for his own sake, that he never seemed to find the knack of using others to the full. Even when he was no longer secretary, and had become president of the Alliance, someone remarked that he was trying to fill both offices. A few of us have an unhappy feeling that this hastened, and perhaps caused, his lamentable breakdown and death so near what would have been his "greatest hour." Some of us urged that, in the state of Europe in 1947, it would be better either to hold the World Congress in Canada or the United States, or even to put it off for a year or two longer. I imagine two considerations weighed with him. He was in his seventy-seventh year and was anxious to discharge his functions as president. Further, he had already been president for eight years instead of the usual five and probably did not wish to seem to be clinging to office. He set his heart on "Copenhagen, 1947." Mrs. Rushbrooke was no longer at his side to warn and safeguard him, though he had all the loving care that his daughter, with whom he had made his home, could give. With all his might, and relying little on others, he set about the task, immensely difficult just then, of organising a World Conference. He attempted too much for his age and for any man obviously tired after the long strain and frustrations of the war. It might have been possible if only he had been able to let others take over much of the work, but that was not in his nature. We watched him anxiously. For many years he had suffered from a low blood-pressure, but over-work and the weight of the many problems that emerged when travelling and communications were so tiresome took too heavy a toll and quite suddenly he collapsed with a cerebral haemorrhage. Though everything was done that could be done the end came swiftly and he was taken from us within a few months of the event for which he had striven so hard.

Many were the tributes paid to him. Baptists throughout the world knew they had lost a friend as well as a devoted leader, and for a long, long time his memory will be enshrined in their hearts fragrant and sweet, as of one who never spared himself in any task for the protection and succour of them for whose welfare he had accepted a responsibility from God.

Dr. Payne calls him "A Baptist Great-heart" in his sub-title. "Valiant-for-Truth" might be added. He was both, as readers of the book, and they should be many, will easily see.

If I have not dwelt on his work in and for the Baptist Union and the Free Church Council, it is because the book under review has thoroughly covered the ground. It may be warmly commended to younger as well as older readers. A mass of material has been most usefully compressed into a small compass so as to bring it within reach of all. It is a rewarding volume to read, and we are grateful for it.

The author does me the honour to quote some words from a tribute it was my privilege to pay at the Memorial Service held in the Baptist Church House. He "lit new lamps and kept the old burning." They will go on burning, for the fire in Rushbrooke's soul came from the altar of the Most High.

M. E. AUBREY.

A Short History of Rawdon College, by John O. Barrett. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 5s.)

The Northern Baptist Education Society, otherwise Rawdon College, has recently celebrated its terjubilée. To mark the occasion one of its sons offers us here an admirable short history which traces the story of the College from the days of Fawcett at Brearley Hall down to the present time and sets it against the background of social, cultural and religious development in Britain during the past 150 years. To have done this within the compass of 60 pages or so and in such an interesting manner is quite an achievement. Rawdon has sent into the ministry some 700 men, many of whom have distinguished themselves, and it has made an impressive missionary contribution. Others beside Rawdonians will enjoy this excellent brief account of the history of an institution of ministerial education which has ever sought to "unite the pair so long disjoined—knowledge and vital piety."

Notes

THE PITHAY CHAPEL, BRISTOL

DURING the early years of this century there stood in Bristol an ancient and interesting building with a stone over the doorway inscribed "Baptist Chapel." The first chapel on that site was built soon after 1650, and rebuilt in 1792. In 1817 the church removed to its new home in Old King Street.

Before the building of the Pithay Chapel, the first Baptist Church in Bristol, formed about 1641, had found a suitable meeting-place in "The Friars," buildings once belonging to a Dominican Priory. These very interesting buildings still stand, and have belonged for many years to the Society of Friends. When, however, the church desired a home of their own, they purchased a site in the Pithay, which had been used as "a sope house."

Their first minister, Henry Hinam, died in 1679. His successor was Andrew Gifford, who had been ordained two years earlier. He was a brave, ardent and intrepid evangelist, and preached in towns and villages around Bristol, so that he won the title "The apostle of the West." During the reign of Charles II he was imprisoned four times, three times in Newgate Prison in Bristol, and once in Gloucester Gaol.

In the library of Bristol College there is one of the letters which Gifford wrote from his prison at Gloucester. He died in 1721. It was his grandson, another Andrew Gifford (1700-1784), who presented the Tyndale Testament, and many other valuable gifts to Bristol College.

In 1723, the Church called John Beddome, the father of Benjamin, the hymn-writer. John Tommas (1724-1800) was pastor at the Pithay from 1753-1797. Towards the end of that period the old chapel was rebuilt and made larger. Even so, it was far too small when Thomas Roberts (1780-1841) came as minister in 1807. So in 1817 the first Baptist church in Bristol removed to Old King Street.

Afterwards the old chapel in the Pithay was used by a group of Congregationalists who had separated from Castle Green Church. These eventually removed to a new building. When they moved out, then another Baptist group moved in. In 1804 a group of forty-eight left the church at the Pithay Chapel and formed a separate church, later known as Counterslip. Just thirty years later, in 1834, a similar group of forty-two left Counterslip and found a meeting-place back in the Old Pithay Chapel, which they purchased for £800. They called a minister, Evan Probert, who soon filled the chapel to overflowing. So a site was secured in City Road, and the church removed there in 1861.

When they moved out, yet another Baptist group moved in. In 1856 the pastor and deacons at Counterslip received a petition, signed by 483 names, begging them not to remove the young man, James Davis, who had come from Rawdon College to act as assistant to their aged minister, Thomas Winter, who resigned later in 1859. When this petition was rejected, a very large group separated and found a place of worship at the Coopers' Hall, in King Street, Bristol (not Old King Street) where they met for several years. Here James Davis was married to Miss Ainsworth. When, however, they heard in 1861 that the Pithay Chapel was vacant, they removed there, and here they found a home for some time. Owing to ill-health their minister, James Davis, left and removed to Tynemouth. The cause failed to thrive and so faded out.

During its last days this ancient chapel belonged to Messrs. J. S. Fry & Sons, Ltd., who used it as a box factory. During extensive renovations it was pulled down soon after 1906.

GORDON HAMLIN.

KATHERINE MANSFIELD

THE *Baptist Quarterly*, Vol. XIII (1950), pp. 253f., contained a number of details regarding the family of John Dyer (1783-1841), the first full-time secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, together with extracts from his diaries for 1823, 1827, 1836 and 1837. In a subsequent article (*ibid*, pp. 321f.) examples were given of the curious necrologies or obituary notes, which Dyer put at the end of his diaries.

Ten of Dyer's fourteen children survived infancy. Attention was called to the fact that his eldest daughter, Eliza, proved a woman of considerable ability and that her husband, Joseph Payne, became the first Professor of Education in England. The recently published life of Katherine Mansfield by Antony Alpers (Jonathan Cape, Ltd., 21/-) reveals the interesting and unexpected information that the important literary figure and writer of short stories was a great-grand-daughter of John Dyer.

Soon after Dyer's tragic death in 1841, one of his sons, Joseph, then a young man of twenty-one, emigrated to Australia, becoming a clerk in an insurance office in Sydney. There he married a Sydney girl, Margaret Isabel Mansfield (d. 1906), and a few years later was sent by his company to Wellington, New Zealand. It was one of his daughters, Annie Burnell Dyer (d. 1918), who became in due course the wife of (Sir) Harold Beauchamp (1858-1938) and the mother of a daughter, Kathleen, who as a writer adopted the pen-name "Katherine Mansfield."

The story of Kathleen Beauchamp (1888-1923), as told by Antony Alpers, is one of almost unrelieved sadness. She was, throughout her life, in rebellion against many elements in her New Zealand background. Escaping to England, where she had received part of her education, she became a fierce seeker after "experience," taking a considerable time fully to discover and develop her talents as a writer. Her relationship with her husband, John Middleton Murry, and her long struggle against ill-health have been revealed in detail through the publication of her letters and journal. Only for brief periods was she at peace with herself or her friends.

Antony Alpers insists that throughout her stormy and broken life she was at heart deeply religious. He suggests that her great-grandfather's introspective temperament, as well as his habits as a diarist, came out again in Katherine Mansfield. He also notes that in her stories she gave to her characters family names taken from the Dyer circle. Stanley and Linda Burnell in *The Prelude*, which appeared in 1918, bear one of her mother's names, which she in turn had inherited from Agnes Burnell, John Dyer's wife. Jonathan Trout no doubt owed his name to remembrance of family tales about distant relatives called Trowt. John Dyer's sister-in-law had married Thomas Trowt, one of the early Baptist missionaries to the East Indies (see *South East from Serampore*, 1945).

Baptists cannot claim many contacts with modern English literature. The link between John Dyer and Katherine Mansfield, though it spans four generations, is worth recording and we may be grateful to Antony Alpers for the discoveries he has made, as well as for his sympathetic study of a difficult and in many ways tragic figure.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

SAMUEL BAGSTER

When the Baptist church at Brown's Town, Jamaica was founded in 1834 it was presented with a pulpit Bible by Samuel Bagster, founder of the publishing firm of that name. With his hand-cut quill pen he inscribed it, "From this Bible may the Glorious Gospel of the Ever-blessed God be preached in all faithfulness and thousands yet unborn have eternally to rejoice the dawn of this auspicious day, August 1st, 1834."

Throughout the 120 years of the church's existence—during which the building has been repeatedly damaged by tempests and, in 1944, was unroofed by a hurricane—the same Bible has been in use. For the rededication of the building on August 1st this year, however, a new Bible, presented by Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., was flown out to Jamaica by air, its front cover a replica of the

original and with the first donor's actual inscription mounted within.

Samuel Bagster was born on December 26th, 1772, the second son of George and Mary Bagster, who came from Lyme Regis. George Bagster was a member of Andrew Gifford's congregation. He sent Samuel at the age of seven, to John Ryland's school and subsequently indentured him to a bookseller in the Strand. At 22 years of age Samuel opened his own bookshop at 81, Strand, and in 1797, married Eunice Birch, daughter of John Birch, a fellow-worshipper with George Bagster under Gifford. Twelve children were born to them, of whom the tenth was Jonathan, who was mainly responsible for compiling the now well-known and widely-used devotional book *Daily Light*. Their eldest son, also named Samuel, was a zealous supporter of the anti-slavery movement and printed many of its pamphlets and broadsheets. This probably accounts for the link with Brown's Town.

The Bible which Bagster presented was one of his own printing. A few years earlier he had challenged the power of the Privileged Presses and the restrictive operation of the Royal Patent relating to the printing of the Bible. In this effort he proved successful and in 1831, introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Howley), he presented a copy of his folio Polyglot Bible to William IV. Since that time he and his successors have continuously printed and published editions of the Authorised Version. Samuel Bagster died in 1851; his wife lived until August 21st, 1877, the day before her 100th birthday, a few months after she had been visited by Queen Victoria who, it is said, knelt at her bedside to receive the blessing of one of her oldest and most high-principled subjects. After 125 years in Paternoster Row, Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd. now occupy premises in Wigmore Street, W.1, from which their Bibles, *Daily Light* and other publications go out to the ends of the earth.

The Fellowship, by Guy H. King. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 7s. 6d.)

This is an expository and devotional study of 1 *John* by an author who has many other works of exposition to his credit. No doubt numerous readers will find the book helpful to their understanding of the epistle, and hard-pressed preachers will find it useful in preparing sermons and devotional talks. Is it necessary, however, to be so alliterative? The title of every chapter (14 of them) begins with the letter P. and we are told on the jacket that Christians have "a Forgiven Past, a Fearless Present and a Fine Prospect." Some may find this kind of alliteration an aid; but not this reviewer.

Reviews

Jesus and the Future, by G. R. Beasley-Murray. (Macmillan, 25s.)

Whatever one's views upon the subject of Eschatology, one cannot but be grateful to the author for so able and comprehensive a survey of the relevant literature. Dr. Beasley-Murray set himself to read every book of repute on the subject written over a period of about a century, a prodigious task, as a result of which we have as complete a survey as has ever appeared. The book demands, and deserves, concentrated attention. To say that it is far from light reading is no reflection on the author, but is a measure of the complexity of the theme and the closeness and thoroughness of the argument.

The sub-title shows that the compass of the book is limited to a critical examination of *Mark* xiii., with especial reference to the "Little Apocalypse" theory. The method adopted is akin to that of Schweitzer's *Quest*. The major portion of the book is occupied with a survey of the previous work, and the critical comments are pointers to the author's own views. Then follows his own examination of the Discourse and his conclusions.

The historical part is skilfully and lucidly done in three phases. The Little Apocalypse theory is shown to have its impetus in the scepticism of Strauss and its later developments are traced. Then we have an examination of alternative views which sprang from a dissatisfaction with this theory, and thirdly a survey of the more direct vindications of the authenticity of the chapter. The author has some acute observations to make which are impartially directed at both radical critics and also the more conservative, with whom otherwise the author confesses himself in sympathy.

The second section of the book comprises one lengthy chapter, devoted to the Theology of *Mark* xiii. and the relation of this section with other eschatological passages in the New Testament. Some of the acute difficulties in the Discourse are dealt with, such as the presence of Signs alongside a Declaration of the Suddenness and Incalculability of the End, and the relation of the Doom of Jerusalem and the Parousia.

Dr. Beasley-Murray defends the authenticity and the unity of the Discourse. On the former point the argument is weighty, especially as the relations of the material with other parts of the Gospels are considered. On the latter point, he is, perhaps naturally less emphatic and leaves room for alternative possibilities of

its final construction, while holding strongly the genuineness of the sayings. As he remarks, to deny the unity of the discourse is not of necessity to deny the genuineness of the sayings.

It is clearly shown that Colani's theory of an independent apocalypse of a Jewish type which has been later embodied in the Gospel arose not from a dispassionate analysis of *Mark* xiii. but as "the last stage of a developing emotional reaction to a theological problem propounded by agnostics." The strength of this book is that it does attempt to deal with the text itself. Faced with what is regarded as the indisputable fact of Our Lord's prediction of an imminent Parousia, he is prepared to accept its theological implication. His discussion of this problem is one of the most interesting parts of the book.

The author's survey shows the amazing contrast in views of the relation of *Mark* xiii. with the Jewish apocalyptic tradition, from the view that it is a conventional apocalypse of the Jewish type to the idea of Torrey—with which Dr. Beasley-Murray has much sympathy—according to which the differences from the Jewish type are such that we can almost think of eschatology that is not apocalyptic. Our author maintains, at any rate, that the motive in *Mark* xiii. and parallel Gospel sayings is edification, encouragement and entreaty rather than any apocalyptic panorama. We have referred to one or two of the many vital and interesting points; they are perhaps sufficient to indicate the worth of this book, which is an important contribution to the subject of New Testament Eschatology. Two minor errors have been observed. On p. 102 "twenty-five" should read "Fifteen," and on p. 127 we find "It is . . ." for "Is it . . . ?"

W. S. DAVIES.

Congo Background, by G. J. M. Pearce. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 4s. 6d.)

The B.M.S. has an excellent plan of sometimes sending a minister who is known to be closely interested in its work to see the work for himself. Mr. Pearce, who paid an extended visit to the Society's Congo field, has given us this interesting account of his visit. He knows how to write and the story is well told. Moreover, the author's cultural background, his acquaintance with literature dealing with the Congo, and his keen powers of observation enable him to write discriminating notes on the country, its people and customs, and the work of Christian missions. He thinks that more attention should be given to the evangelistic opportunities presented by the large towns, and to the aesthetics of church buildings. He writes discerningly on the problems that

arise with the transition of large numbers of Africans from village to urban life. It would have added to the value of his book if Mr. Pearce had said a little more about labour conditions in Angola and about the political backwardness of its people.

The Christian Life, by Paul Rowntree Clifford. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 2s. 6d.)

This is an excellent booklet. Mr. Clifford has in mind the intelligent lad or girl who is thinking of becoming a Christian. He sets out to describe the process of Christian commitment, and to bring out the significance of Baptism and Church membership and the essential faith of Christians, and then goes on to outline the way of Christian discipleship. There is a background of scholarship, but the booklet is attractively written. Something more might usefully have been said about Christian giving, and for any new edition more precise information about Baptists in Russia (p. 32) is now available.

J. O. BARRETT.

Job and His Friends, by T. H. Robinson. (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.)

In this book Dr. Robinson presents us with a most helpful introduction to the Book of Job. In the first chapter he reviews the qualities and theme of the book, following these with an account of the literary architecture of the book. In his third chapter, Dr. Robinson re-tells the story of the Prologue and Epilogue of Job, lighting up the brevity of the text with dramatic power. Here, surely, our great Baptist scholar is also a great preacher.

The fourth chapter suggestively depicts the character of the friends of Job, and the role they play in the poem. The fifth and longest chapter centres in Job, and sympathetically traces the story of his daring faith and of his longing for the presence of God. In the last chapter it is made clear that the real solution of the book is no other than Job's discovery of the presence of God. All who read this delightful book will be glad of it, and will rejoice that Dr. Robinson has written of so great a book, so simply, so reverently and with such insight.

G. HENTON DAVIES.

Owing to pressure on space a number of reviews have been held over and will appear in our next issue.