

Anglican Evangelicalism: The State of the 'Party'

COLIN BUCHANAN

In my inaugural lecture as principal of St. John's in April 1979, a lecture which was published in *Churchman*,¹ I made passing reference to 'four tidal movements' which have manifested themselves within Anglican evangelicalism in the post-war years. They could only be mentioned there in passing, but my intention here is to expand them, to give them deeper roots in English church history, and to explore more fully the roles and character of Anglican evangelicalism five years on from that inaugural lecture. To a considerable extent this essay will be a personal perception, and the analyses I offer are placed upon the table for others to correct and adjust. We stand very near to the history recorded, the sources are often personal experience, and the perspective is particularly liable to be distorted by that closeness.

The Anglican evangelicalism which was the strongest single force in the Church of England in the third fourth and fifth decades of the last century symbolically reached its peak with the archbishopate of John Sumner (1848–62) and the long reign at CMS of Henry Venn the younger (1841–72). The second half of the century can now be seen to be a period of decline – not a decline so much in numbers as in morale and confidence. Numbers were there, Colleges were being opened, bishops appointed, books written, Moody and Torrey invited over, the unevangelized world penetrated for the gospel, and new tasks undertaken. But that half-century saw the anglo-catholic movement, which had appeared as a disloyal fifth column when it first began, attain a respectability that evangelicals reckoned it never deserved and should never have gained. Somewhere in the late 1860s and early 1870s the centre of the Church of England put up its sword, and acknowledged catholicism as a valid Anglican insight. Evangelicals were left to fight alone. They duly fought, but with a growing sense of desperation. The Public Worship Regulation Act 1874, far from being the point where discipline was reasserted, became instead the point from which it was clear that the law could not be and would not be enforced against anglo-catholicism. The last legal battle was the case against the Bishop of Lincoln in 1890 – but even there the tenuous legal point established in their favour by evangelicals was honoured only in the breach by anglo-catholics, and within a few more decades

virtually the whole Church of England came to think that 'Eastward position' was the Prayer Book's own requirement!² The writings of Ryle (who has just found a new biographer in the recently retired Archbishop of Sydney) represented a most trenchant form of 'stand fast by the old ways', but the ground was already disappearing on which the stand could be made, and the call to be true to the past itself betrayed a growing fear of changes in the future. The dynamics of the Anglican scene were already telling evangelicals that any changes in law or liturgy or doctrine were *bound* to be changes for the worse – and this conviction drew them more and more into a defensive huddle.

If the second half of the nineteenth century saw Anglican evangelicals ground by the upper millstone of anglo-catholicism, then the lower millstone was a growing theological liberalism. Let it be Arnold, or Darwin, or *Essays and Reviews*, or the forerunners of modernism, the trend towards a liberal view of scripture, an optimism about the human future, and a relatively indifferentist approach to theology all conspired together to make evangelicals fear the Anglican future all the more. By the turn of the century they felt themselves not only surrounded, but actually borne down, by the Pharisees, who added ceremonial and formalistic burdens to the word of the Lord, and Sadducees who denied the force and power of it. It is also worth noting that this kind of analysis betokened the fact that evangelicalism had become a distinctive doctrinal position in the Church of England. Arguably, a hundred years before the evangelicals had been those who *really* believed what everyone else *purported* to believe. Now, the controversies of the nineteenth century had marked them out as conservative of a tradition from which others on either flank were departing.

The account above points to a demoralization by the beginning of the twentieth century. It is hardly surprising that the tendency was for the party to go half-underground. It began to find its most characteristic expression in the Keswick Convention, or even in the esoteric literature of Brethrenist eschatology or British Israelitism or other forms of Dispensationalism. It ceased to be actively engaging the theological literature of the times. It began to distrust the theological teachers and teaching in the universities. It shrank into itself. Liberalism was slowly taking over in Methodism and the other Free Churches also, and the outlook on the biblical front was bleak. If the last churchly writer of the line of Goode and Ryle was Nathaniel Dimock (who died around 1912), so the last conservative scholar to write in an above-ground way about the Bible was James Orr (not an Anglican, but at least an ally), who died about the same time. Michael Ramsey's book *From Gore to Temple*, which by its title covers the years from 1889 to 1944, does not even *notice* an evangelical Anglican writer, let alone find one to treat with respect. The great theological

names of this period, such as Gore, Henson, Bicknell, Quick, Temple, and Ramsey himself are mostly 'liberal catholic' in their stance, and none is evangelical. There was no evangelical Anglican to write serious commentaries or useful works of doctrine, and have them published by recognized religious publishers. Library catalogues and publishers' lists alike reveal that for fifty years the books did not exist. The dearth of creative thinking was total. It can be illustrated from the memories of many still living today.³ Evangelicalism survived through the self-sufficiency of its well established '*ecclesiola*' position – evangelical theological colleges, evangelical funds for training and for providing curates, evangelical patronage to sustain parochial traditions, and evangelical home and overseas missionary societies to provide reinforcement and motivation for evangelical effort. But there was no intellectual challenge to the trends established in the rest of the church. The *ecclesiola* was a ghetto. The evidence was that those ventured outside it did not usually come back. It was a risk therefore to be avoided.

The seedbeds for a postwar revival lay in odd initiatives of the pre-war years. Undoubtedly one such was the foundation of the 'VPS' camps by E.J.H. Nash ('Bash'). The pre-war schoolboys were the post-war leaders. Another initiative was the formation in 1938 of the Biblical Research Committee (loosely attached to the IVF) with a clear desire for an academic integrity which would not evade hard questions, but would strive to meet the intellectual challenges of the times head-on.⁴ Whilst few of these were Anglicans the implications were bound to affect Anglican evangelicals as much as others, and it is noticeable that two honoured names of Anglican evangelicals appear at the founding in January 1945 of Tyndale House Cambridge, the research centre sponsored by the Biblical Research Committee – the Rev. G.T. Manley⁵ and Col. J.N.D. Anderson.⁶

We come now to that 'first phase' of postwar evangelicalism I charted in my inaugural lecture. It was a two-tier thrust, and in part the tiers seem independent of each other. But they grew in confidence and vitality from encounter with each other. Very simply, there was a growth in scholarship and a growth in ordinands. The growth in scholarship came straight from the work of Tyndale House and the Biblical Research Committee noted above. The IVP produced and implemented a coherent programme of publishing, all of it intended to repossess the intellectual arena. The steps towards this came fast – and *The New Bible Commentary* (1951) and the *New Bible Dictionary* (1962) were the most notable products of the policies. The former of these achieved enough notice in non-evangelical circles to gain the distinction of refutation. But that is noted below. The emergence of serious literature about the Bible had an invigorating effect upon the men and women of those years. Perhaps their position did have academic respectability! The persons themselves came through the

ancient universities, usually with war service or National Service behind them, and often with VPS experience behind that. One of the characteristic features of their experience was that they were convinced of their gospel, which had often been harshly tested and found sufficient during their time in the armed forces. The OICCU and the CICCUC had soaring numbers in the 1950s. And a great proportion of them were Anglican. Their Anglicanism had of course a public school background. It was sustained in their post-conversion Christian lives by the tag that the Church of England is 'the best boat to fish from'. They reckoned that the Prayer Book and Articles were generally on their side, and they went to work with simple faith and simple slogans – most notably, the 'A-B-C' gospel.⁷ They were glad that others were producing literature. They were tremendously heartened by Billy Graham in 1954 and 1955.⁸ They took courage, and often the actual form of words, from his 'The Bible says . . .'. Billy Graham's converts (thousands of them) swelled their ranks. Billy Graham's dealings with mitred and crowned heads suggested they need not be quite so separatist. And Billy Graham's stance on the Bible, which so heartened them, led to a public debate on 'Fundamentalism' which occasioned that first attempt to write a book to *refute* the evangelical position on the Bible, instead of the mere dismissal of it with a sneer.⁹

Whilst the ordinands from this phase were offering themselves for the ministry in the 1950s, all unbeknown to them a second phase was coming to birth within them. In my inaugural lecture I called this the 'neo-puritan' movement. In its Anglican dress it undoubtedly stemmed from Jim Packer's studies at Wycliffe Hall in the years 1949–52, when he worked for his doctorate on the soteriology of Richard Baxter. No Anglican had identified so completely with the Puritans for centuries, but a slowly developing and gestating movement was coming the birth, and it became a visible 'school' when Jim Packer joined the staff at Tyndale Hall Bristol in 1954. Alec Motyer at Clifton was of similar conviction, and a junction was effected with the independent evangelical tradition represented by Martyn Lloyd-Jones at Westminster Chapel, and in the period from the mid-fifties through to the second half of the sixties, this was a force to reckon with in the Church of England. It cared not for public schools or a simple gospel. Jim Packer apparently made his first appearance in print in an attack upon 'Keswick theology' (pietism and second blessing).¹⁰ Its characteristic note was a call for a whole theology of life, a systematic approach to the revelation of God, and a thoroughgoing basing of life upon theological principle rather than pragmatic concerns. The Banner of Trust Trust was founded to fuel this movement with high octane theology from the seventeenth century.¹¹ Francis Schaeffer and Cornelius Van Til equipped it with apologetics. By 1960 there were Church of England ordinands going in quantities to the Bristol Colleges to imbibe this heady air, instead of to the Oxbridge ones

where public schools ordinands tended to ignore the teaching which was on offer, and to concentrate rather on schooling the next generation of converts in the OICCU and CICCU in the principles of the VPS camps and gospel. The second phase of evangelicalism was issuing a clear and uncomfortable challenge to the first.

The third phase could not be long delayed. My lecture dubbed it the phase of the 'ecclesiology folk'. I suppose I number myself amongst them, and thus earmark myself as a man of the sixties. It does at least mean I can give a sympathetic account of this phase. The phase began on a formal point, which we can imagine being addressed by one man to another within the neo-puritan phase, in other words this question: if we believe that a full-orbed theology ought to govern the whole of our lives, ought it not especially to govern our *church* life? The ecclesiology folk began from a fairly thorough neo-puritan theology, but, instead of continuing to test the foundations, were impatient now to build new and contemporary buildings upon them. They were folk who wanted *policies*. They wanted their theology to be *applied*. They were convinced Church of England persons. They were interested in reforming the Church of England instead of merely harking back to the Articles and Prayer Book. They emerged through John Stott's Eclectics' Society.¹² They took over the Keele Congress in 1967.¹³ The statement from Keele, agreed by the great majority of the thousand participants bore testimony to the innovatory character of their thinking, especially in relation to worship and ecumenism. They began to work at the meaning of mission in terms of the reform of society as well as the conversion of the individual. They took the structures of Church life seriously. They recognized that ethics should be on the evangelical agenda.¹⁴ And the more reflective of them began to unearth a science previously undreamed of among them – hermeneutics. In my lecture I suggested, perhaps not over-seriously, that the various phases 'peaked' in Anglican evangelicalism at eight-year intervals. If this is accepted as an hypothesis, then we must use our hindsight, and suggest that, beginning from near the end of the war, phase one 'peaked' in 1952, phase two in 1960, and phase three in 1968. Such peaks cannot easily be recognized at the time, so only hindsight can do the mapwork. And a fourth phase awaits us.

The charismatic phase took *its* origin with the ecclesiology people, and it is traceable in the Church of England as far back as 1962.¹⁵ Unlike other parts of the Anglican Communion, the Church of England found its evangelicals turning charismatic, and hardly a non-evangelical 'got the blessing' in the Church of England till into the 1970s. The first proponents had a hard time. The previous phases had successively worked *away* from any experiential test of conversion, and here were evangelicals doing a complete *volte-face*, and insisting that experience of the Spirit, often described as the baptism of the Spirit, was *the* characteristic mark of the Christian, or at least of

the 'renewed' one. The experience was preached up by the charismatics, whilst still being gently scouted as normative by the earlier phases (which were of course all three still in being and flanking charismatics on every side). The Keele Congress in 1967, captive to the ecclesiology folk, did not give the charismatic movement so much as a dismissive mention. History would not acknowledge that the phase had begun. But there, in the heart of the previous phases, it flourished and grew and distanced itself from them. It meant a reversion to pietism, a recoiling from the involvement with the world which had been dawning at Keele. It roused very strong emotions. And it came across, at least in my life, as at its apogee in the early to mid-seventies. That was the period in College when charismatic students were most likely to huddle in a corner for their own special exercises, most prone to go through the polite motions of listening to advice from staff about curacies, whilst the glazed look in their eyes betrayed that in fact they would take their real guidance from other more trustworthy (more Spirit-filled?) sources. And, if we can continue our eight-year 'peaking' schema, this phase 'peaked' among Anglican evangelicals in 1976. But we must sound ourselves a word of caution – our schema must be reached inductively, and it may not be as neat as the eight-year rhythms suggest. There is nothing revealed by God about such rhythms, and they cannot be imposed on a history which will not sustain them.

In the years 1974–77 a real *rapprochement* was effected between charismatics and their evangelical relations left over from the previous phases. One symptom of this was a personal drawing close to each other (without abandonment of principle) of, for instance, John Stott and Michael Harper. Another symptom was the appearance of Tom Walker in the Grove Books' list.¹⁶ A third was the agreed doctrinal statement from a joint working party in 1977, *Gospel and Spirit*.¹⁷ And a fourth was the way in which the Nottingham Congress, the second NEAC, was planned for April 1977. Charismatics were on the planning committee, and amongst the speakers. The charismatic constituency laid plans for no competing conferences that Easter time, and charismatics came in force to the Congress. At it, an honest conjunction was effected.¹⁸ Since that time it has been far more possible than ever before to describe oneself in the Church of England as 'evangelical-cum-charismatic'. Some of the distinctiveness of charismatics has been lost – they cannot quite now revert to thinking of the rest of us as somehow defective. But some of it has been gained and spread amongst folk like me. Whilst not 'card-carrying' we have become willing fellow-travellers. An 'openness' has dawned in most unexpected places.

We find ourselves now in 1984, just eight years on again from my last 'peaking' of a 'phase'. What phase has been stealing the place of the charismatic movement? What is it to be post-charismatic? What trends

do we discern in the years since the Nottingham Congress of 1977? Firstly, we must recognize the slightly imprecise use of the word 'peak' which is involved here. My 'peaks' consist, I reckon, of a combination of rising numbers, rising confidence, and the greatest possible distinctiveness from the phase which preceded it. The schema of an eight-year gap between each of the peaks has an element of the artificial about it, and, in any case, is the luxury of the historian, for none could have mapped these peaks out clearly whilst *in* them. and within my use, any one component of a phase – e.g. rising numbers – could be continuing whilst the other two were waning.

Secondly, it is a clear consequence of the analysis that *all four phases are still with us*. It is not that the exponents have come and gone – it is rather that any gathering of evangelicals has the character of an archaeological dig. It is not that the oldest present represent the oldest phase, for spiritual and theological formation does not seem to work like that. But it is often possible to detect who is speaking out of a standpoint which feels as though it were formed in the forties, or fifties, or sixties. Not all evangelicals can be so labelled and with many it would be stretching credibility to insist on it. but it *is* there in many.

Thirdly, the rise in numbers over the last quarter of a century is an important key to self-understanding. In the late fifties, the total number of clergy, or parishes, or representation on diocesan or central church councils, was relatively very low. It was easy to think that 'they' were organizing the Church of England to squeeze out evangelicalism. In my inaugural lecture I pointed out that a shared persecution complex was a helpful non-theological factor in giving a party its 'identity'.¹⁹ (Other similar features were a common liturgical ethos – North side, hood and scarf, and leavened bread – and a common set of social taboos – no smoking, drinking, gambling, or dancing – along with a use of extemporary prayer unknown at that time elsewhere in the Church of England). The persecution complex is now a very odd phenomenon to find – though we do find it. Without it evangelicals have been free to explore and to take risks.

This can be demonstrated more fully. When evangelicals were less than 10 per cent of the Church of England, and located their Anglicanism in the foundational documents of the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, then, when their Independent evangelical friends said to them 'Why do you not discipline and eject teachers like, say, Barnes (or, in the early sixties, John Robinson)?', the answer was 'We believe in such discipline, but do not have the power to exercise it.' This left the apologia clear at the point of theory, though unsatisfactory at the point of practice. It betokened evangelical Anglicans as knowing what to do if they were less than 10 per cent (defy the platform's persecution), and what they *would* do if they became more than 50 per cent (run the others out!). But of course it gave them no guidelines for how to progress from less than 10 per

cent to more than 50 per cent. And it is *this* factor which has been at work in the rise in numbers here under discussion. Nearly 50 per cent of those ordained to stipendiary ministry each year currently come from the evangelical colleges. The effect on the *total* numbers and strengths in the Church of England has been massive. How have evangelicals had to conduct themselves in this unaccustomed experience?

Theologically, they have had to come to terms with a comprehensive church. Previously this was simply regrettable – a phenomenon of which the unprincipled centre of the Church of England made a virtue. But the Keele Congress began to change evangelicals to taking a similar view. However, a comprehensive church does not have to be viewed in a wholly static way. It *can* be viewed eschatologically, as holding together organically those who name the name of Christ, and holding them together for their mutual reformation and for the pursuit of the truth. This kind of framework of thought justifies working together with all sorts of Anglicans for all sorts of ends. It justifies settling (e.g. in liturgical revision) for all sorts of less-than-wholly-satisfactory formulae in an interim way. It may still necessitate opposition to some specific factor in existing church life in proposed reforms.²⁰ It may even include some limited role for doctrinal discipline. But it will be clear that evangelicals functioning on such premises will have so learned to love others during the progress from 10 per cent to 50 per cent of the total number, that they will have no programme for other than continued dialogue when they reach that 50 per cent. Evangelicals are not now therefore unco-operative and paranoid – rather they are highly integrated into the synodical and organizational life of the Church of England. This in turn is at variance with the wobbling-on-the-edge-of-secession of many in the early sixties (or, by a curious parallelism of others from the charismatic stream tempted towards the purity of the house church movement).

All this gives evidence of evangelicals struggling with an unfamiliar ecclesiology, and struggling all the more because no-one has actually spelled out that ecclesiological position in cold print for them! It partakes of the nature of ill-formed gut-reaction, which is in principle a poor substitute for theology. But it is the present writer's contention that it is a *true* reaction, and that the unformed ecclesiological position (at which the paragraphs above hint) can actually be spelled out with consistency and relevance.

But in the meantime, pending that fuller ecclesiological mapwork, it is clear what tasks have to engage the energies of evangelicals. Firstly, their writings and utterances must abandon any thought of the ghetto. It was an instructive and illuminating moment in my own life when in early 1968 David Paton (then secretary of the Missionary and Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly (MECCA – the parent

of the present Board of Mission and Unity)) said to me: 'All in Each Place (which had been published in 1965, edited by Jim Packer, and criticizing the old Anglican-Methodist scheme) is the first urbane writing by evangelicals I have seen.' Urbane! Yes, urbane – in the sense that it looked at positions other than those of the writers very calmly, acknowledged partial truth in them, put up tentative as well as assertive points against them, and gave little hint of being frenetic or judgmental or paranoid. It was a book to convince the non-evangelical, not just a reinforcement of the convictions or prejudices of evangelicals.

This reflection exactly matched the post-Keele needs of a growing force in the Church of England. Evangelical authors, agencies, and activities, ought to be bending themselves to the reform and improvement of the whole church. Their style ought to be open-ended in exploration and enquiry. As evangelicals have emerged from the ghetto, so their opportunity to influence the whole church has come. I would like to think this is the role that Grove Books (almost the only evangelical Anglican publishing venture that exists in England) has fulfilled since the various series of booklets began on the last day of 1971. I am certain it is the role that *Anvil* must fulfil. Ideologically, the coming to birth of *Anvil* has been precisely in order that evangelicals can address the whole church.²¹

Secondly, evangelical Anglicans have to remain in close touch with each other. The last ditch has a certain compacting effect – when you stand shoulder-to-shoulder or back-to-back you are certainly close to each other. When you come out of the last ditch going *forwards*, you may start to fan out and lose touch. If you blame the other fellow for this losing touch, then the separation becomes institutionalized – whereas in fact the loss of closeness and a common persecution complex is simply a function of the changed context. Old soldiers never recover the comradeship of the trenches we are told. True – but we would not want to recreate trench warfare in order to give it back to them. Evangelicals in the Church of England are wise to have created an over-arching Anglican Evangelical Assembly with a representative Church of England Evangelical Council to act as standing committee for it. The character of it is such as to keep evangelicals in touch with each other, even if, through diverse interest and diverse perceptions of the needs of the present time, they tend to pull at times in divergent directions. Personally, as one who has been a member of the Assembly but is not closely involved in the running of it from CEEC, I treasure a hope that the Assembly will find that *Anvil's* breadth and concerns exactly match those of the Assembly and some link between the two will be formed.²²

Thirdly, evangelicalism, for all its numerical strengths, will vanish into history if it does not look to itself. All is not well. There is no properly tested tradition of spirituality with any vigour today. There

is little evidence (for all our emphasis on the Bible, all our books, and all our meetings) of any wide and deep doctrinal and creative understanding of the faith. There is great need at the point where we are supposed to be strong – evangelism. There is a growing *theory* that God's mission involves the whole of life, but little imaginative reaching into areas of work home and overseas where sacrificial endeavour is needed. Somehow, if our position is the truest expression of Christianity there is (which is what we presumably believe), we do not feel like a notably specially loving and sanctified group. We do not appear as that health-giving army of lay Christians which our ideology would seem to make folk expect. We are poverty-stricken in many directions, self-protecting in our own lives, and usually wholly undistinctive in the Church of England (or even the nation of England) today. We need a new touch of self-forgetting gladness to be serving Jesus Christ.

Fourthly, we have to keep an eye open to the future. We are ourselves in position to help *make* that future, but we also know God will be doing things we cannot now discern. Today's ordinand offers for an active ministry which may run beyond the year 2020, and neither he (or she) nor we know what the character of that ministry will be! At the Colleges we can only attempt to inculcate openness and flexibility in respect of ministry, whilst trying to give a firm grasp of enduring doctrinal foundations. If in 1984 we reach another period of eight years from the last 'peak' in the waves of a highly volatile movement, then that is perhaps especially a year in which to ask ourselves where we think we are going, where we think the Church of England is going, where indeed the world church is going. And if today is too early to abandon the label 'evangelical' (which, in my judgment, it is), yet the forward-looking goal to which we stretch ourselves is that by mutual reformation, by reunion, by growth in the understanding of God and his ways, we shall move – eschatologically, it may be – to the point where 'Christian' is itself a sufficient and self-explanatory title to bear. We work for that day.

NOTES

- 1 The lecture was delivered under the title 'The Role and Calling of an Evangelical Theological College in the 1980's' on 30 April 1979, and was later published (*Churchman* 94, 1980, pp 26–42) and is still available as an offprint from Grove Books under the same title.
- 2 The 'Lincoln Judgment' actually included the requirement that, if the priest at communion took the 'Eastward position', yet he should face the people for the consecration and the breaking of the bread within the narrative of institution – which, it is said, Bishop King, the subject of the Judgment, did observe faithfully thereafter, But no other anglo-catholic ever did, and soon all but the most diehard evangelicals not only adopted it, but thought the Church of England had always done things this way!

- 3 I have questioned, for instance, Sir Norman Anderson, and John Wenham, among others, and my impressions here are based in part on their accounts.
- 4 See the accounts in, for instance, F.F. Bruce, 'The Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research', *The Evangelical Quarterly* 19, 1947, pp. 52–61 and Douglas Johnson, *Contending for the Faith: A History of the Evangelical Movement in the Universities and Colleges*, IVP, Leicester 1979, pp. 297–299.
- 5 G.T. Manley was already elderly and has been described to me as one of the few who remained from before the turn of the century, who had treasured all along this hope of an 'above-ground' intellectual role for evangelicals.
- 6 Norman Anderson was the first warden of Tyndale House – and is with us and intellectually very active yet. See note 3 above.
- 7 Perhaps most characteristically expressed in the erstwhile 'Islington booklets' by a well known author.
- 8 'Billy' of course not only heartened evangelicals by this (unhermeneutical!) 'The Bible says . . .', but he also produced a tremendous growth in evangelical ordinands and lay Christians.
- 9 A.G. Hebert, *Fundamentalism and the Church of God*, SCM, London 1957 – the tone of which, while adversarial, is more in sorrow than in anger. It produced a highly adversarial and more-in-indignation-than-in-penitence reply from Jim Packer – *Fundamentalism and the Word of God*, IVF, London 1959.
- 10 "'Keswick" and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification', *The Evangelical Quarterly* 27, 1955, pp 153–167.
- 11 I well recall early cover *motifs* with tulips on, to symbolize the 'five points' of Calvinism. The meaning of T-U-L-I-P would be lost on virtually all Anglicans who were not in that phase at the time!
- 12 The original 'Eclectics' existed around the beginning of the nineteenth century, overlapping with the 'Clapham Sect'. The new ones were founded in 1955, and were in purpose meant to bring together evangelical clergy under 40 years of age. They have gone from strength to strength and are represented in the birth of this journal in the person of Pete Broadbent, the one editor who was not previously on the board of the old *Churchman*.
- 13 The respectable platform which had been planned was a series of definitive blasts by established speakers, which should re-proclaim the fundamentals of evangelical belief. Pressure from younger evangelicals led in Autumn 1966 (only a few months before the Congress) to the planning committee throwing in their hand, and asking a wholly different group (nominally convened by Jim Packer, but he was in the USA for the period of planning) to produce a different and participatory programme. The planning was done, and the draft statement produced in advance, by this group, consisting of Philip Crowe, Gavin Reid, Michael Green, and Colin Buchanan.
- 14 The first product of *this* thinking was Norman Anderson's *Into the World*, Falcon, London 1969. I would like to think that the 54 titles of the Grove Booklets on Ethics which appeared between 1973 and 1983 were also due to this.
- 15 See the report *The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England*, CIO, London 1981.

- 16 He wrote *Open to God* (no. 38, about his own parish) in 1975, and *Parish Leadership and Shared Responsibility* (no. 57) in 1978. Both are now out of print – but other charismatic authors have appeared in the list since.
- 17 This was published in *Churchman* 91, 1977, pp 102–113 and exists in an offprint originally published jointly by CEEC and the Fountain Trust, and now available from Grove Books.
- 18 This remark is not meant to imply that the only, the great, or the central, event of the Nottingham Congress was this ‘conjunction’. In fact the headlines at the time were stolen by Dr. Anthony Thiselton and his workshop on hermeneutics. If this article were solely a review of evangelicals and their attitude to the Bible, one would have to record that the battle for the authority of the word preoccupied them in the first two decades after the war, and the wrestling with the *meaning for today* in practical terms (i.e. the very characteristic of the ‘ecclesiology folk’ mentioned above) has seized scholarly minds since – even whilst the charismatic movement has tried to take Christians back to a very primitive hermeneutic. Interestingly, charismatics have been ready *both* to assert that the plain meaning of any text lied nakedly and univocally upon its surface *and* to allow any text to have any subjective application that comes home with inner force to the individual Christian. The story of the stealthy arrival on the evangelical scene of hermeneutics should be told elsewhere. It needs telling, as not all evangelicals have yet grasped it.
- 19 ‘Identity’ was a problem at the time – Dick Lucas had been referring to an ‘evangelical identity crisis’ stating that a wrong turning had been taken at Keele twelve years earlier, and Jim Packer had been writing about an ‘identity problem’. I am hopeful that this and the following paragraphs will explain *why* there was a ‘crisis’ – it was due to the very success of the last-ditch operations!
- 20 Thus evangelicals have in recent years regularly dug in their heels over specific proposals before the church – as, for instance, over Anglican–Methodist reunion, many features of liturgical revision, the form of the new declaration of assent, etc. – whilst still looking for a genuine reform to arise.
- 21 I am well aware that I write this on an English scene, and *for* an English scene. There are Anglican provinces not a thousand miles from England where evangelicals can (rightly or wrongly) *feel* persecuted, and thus adopt a ghetto mentality. To such beleaguered evangelicals, the thrust of this article may seem like simple betrayal. On the other hand, and actual changes in the theological and churchmanship climate in England over the last quarter of a century may give hope to others who are not yet experiencing quite the same release.
- 22 The January 1984 session of the Assembly noted the projected launching of the journal and asked that the 1986 Assembly should review how far this journal (and *Churchman*) was serving the concerns of contemporary Anglican evangelicalism.

The Rev Canon Colin Buchanan is Principal of St. John’s College Nottingham.