

THE
JOURNAL
of the

UNITED REFORMED CHURCH HISTORY SOCIETY

(incorporating the Congregational Historical Society, founded 1899, and the
Presbyterian Historical Society of England, founded 1913)

EDITORS: Revd. Dr. R. BUICK KNOX, M.A., B.D., and
Dr. CLYDE BINFIELD, M.A.

VOL. 2. No. 2. OCTOBER 1978

C O N T E N T S

Editorial	29
Scottish Influence on the English Churches in the Nineteenth Century by David M. Thompson, M.A., Ph.D.	30
Methodism, the New Dissent and American Revivalism by Richard Carwardine, M.A., D.Phil.	46
Our Contemporaries	54
Review Article: Donald Davie's <i>Gathered Church</i> by Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.	55
Shorter Reviews	58

Editorial

We welcome to the Council of our Society, as Treasurer, Mrs. Jeanne Armour, an active member both of our Society and its Presbyterian predecessor.

This issue contains two articles by members of the Society. Richard Carwardine lectures in American history at the University of Sheffield. David Thompson, of Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, delivered the Society's Annual Lecture at Southport, on 8th May 1978. His lecture is reprinted here. Both articles are valuable reminders that "English" denominational history is virtually boundless.

Two of our reviewers might be singled out, as from beyond our immediate bounds. James Atkinson is Professor of Biblical Studies at Sheffield; Christopher Holdsworth is Professor of History at Exeter, and an editor of the Journal of the Friends' Historical Society.

We regret that limitations of space have forced us to hold over many reviews until later issues.

SCOTTISH INFLUENCE ON THE ENGLISH CHURCHES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

On New Year's Day 1840 George Cubitt, the Wesleyan Methodist Assistant Connexional Editor, wrote to Jabez Bunting as follows:

A few days ago, I looked over two pamphlets on the *Scottish Church Question* by Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Dunlop (Advocate). I expected little more than controversial references, but I found expositions of *general principles* of such deep interest and importance that I resolved to send you my copies the first opportunity.¹

Three weeks later Thomas Arnold wrote to a friend on a similar subject: Holding this doctrine (of the Royal Supremacy) as the very corner stone of all my political belief, I am equally opposed to Popery, High Churchism, and the claims of Scotch Presbyteries, on the one hand; and to all the Independents, and advocates of the separation, as they call it, of Church and State, on the other; the first, setting up a Priesthood in the place of the Church, and the other lowering necessarily the objects of Law and Government, and reducing them to a mere system of police, while they profess to wish to make the Church purer.²

The proximity of these two letters is a coincidence, for the two pairs of correspondents involved are in no way related: their common concern, however, is significant, and it is the purpose of this lecture to explore the issues involved.

I

Too often the history of England in the nineteenth century is called British history, and this is as true of church history as it is of any other branch of the subject. It has two consequences, neither of them very satisfactory: one, which has been particularly true of Welsh or Irish history, is that the history of the other nations in the United Kingdom is considered as it affected the history of England; the other, which has been more true of Scottish history, is that the history of one nation is considered in isolation and not related to the wider British scene. But the Scots were not confined to Scotland. Much is made in English history these days of the effects of Irish immigration in the nineteenth century. In 1841 1·9% of the population of the English counties had been born in Ireland, and in 1891 it was still 1·6%. The corresponding percentages of people born in Scotland were 0·6% in 1841 and 1·0% in 1891. Put the point another way: in 1891 over a quarter of a million people born in Scotland lived in England, and the total population of Scotland was only four millions. The history of the Presbyterian Church of England is only one aspect of the wider story of Scottish migration.

The Scottish influence in nineteenth-century British theology is obvious.³ John McLeod Campbell, Thomas Erskine of Linlathen (who influenced F. D.

¹W. R. Ward ed., *Early Victorian Methodism*, Oxford, 1976, p. 237.

²A. P. Stanley, *Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold*, single volume edn., London, n.d., p. 373.

³See e.g. D. J. Vaughan, "Scottish Influence upon English Theological Thought", *Contemporary Review* xxxii, 1878, pp. 457-73.

Maurice) and W. Robertson Smith are familiar figures. A. M. Fairbairn and P. T. Forsyth are two men of clear importance in the Congregational tradition. Less well known perhaps is the influence of Edward Caird on William Temple, though that influence was not peculiarly Scottish. Another fact that is probably not often realised is that our general interpretation of nineteenth-century British theology is still largely based on the picture painted by Principal John Tulloch of St. Andrew's in his *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century* (1885).⁴ In a rather different context, it is interesting to note Tissington Tatlow's view that the development of a concern for social questions in the Student Christian Movement can be traced back to the writings on the prophets of men like George Adam Smith of Glasgow.⁵

Yet although it is interesting to compile a list of influential Scotsmen, ultimately the historical significance of this will depend on whether their Scottishness serves any explanatory purpose. Does it make sense to say that McLeod Campbell's theory of the atonement is Scottish, or that it depends on a distinctive Scottish tradition? Edward Caird was clearly a Scot, but Dr. George Davie regards him as an Anglophile rather than a bearer of the Scottish tradition in England: his admiration of Hegel and his support for the specialised study of the Classics were held to be alien intrusions in Scotland.⁶ A number of influential Scots do not necessarily add up to a Scottish influence.

But there is at least one area of nineteenth, and indeed twentieth, century church history where the Scottish experience has been extremely important not only in Scotland but in Britain as a whole. That is the relationship between Church and State. It involves the questions of voluntaryism and establishment, but ultimately it is a question about the nature of the Church and the sovereignty of the State. The way in which this question is posed has changed significantly in the last sixty years, but as an issue it is still not quite dead.

My starting point is the oddity of the fact that in 1838 a group of Anglican laymen invited Thomas Chalmers, one of the leading Church of Scotland ministers of the day, to London to lecture on the principles of Church Establishment. The nonconformist response was an invitation in 1839 to Ralph Wardlaw, a Congregational minister in Glasgow, to give a course of lectures in reply. Historians of the Church of England do not normally pause to consider the significance of the invitation to Chalmers: but when one remembers the significance of the work of Bishop Blomfield and Sir Robert Peel in reforming the Church in the 1830s, or even the publication of Gladstone's *The State in its Relations with the Church* in 1838, it is clear that it would not have been impossible to find an Anglican to defend the principle of establishment. Equally, in view of the relative weakness of Scottish dissent by comparison with English, why should a Scot be invited to put the opposite point of view?

The exchange had an ironic sequel. Five years later Thomas Chalmers

⁴Reprinted with introduction by A. C. Cheyne, Leicester, 1971, p. (7).

⁵T. Tatlow, *The Story of the Student Christian Movement*, London, 1933, p. 339.

⁶G. Davie, *The Democratic Intellect*, Edinburgh, 1961, pp. 84-87.

led the group who seceded from the established Church of Scotland to form the Free Church of Scotland. Chalmers himself made it quite clear that the leaders still held to the establishment principle:

. . . though we quit the Establishment, we go out on the Establishment principle; we quit a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one. To express it otherwise—we are the advocates for a national recognition and national support of religion—and we are not Voluntaries.⁷

But the Disruption nevertheless was one of the triggers for the formation in England of the Anti-State Church Association (later the Liberation Society) under the inspiration of Edward Miall: and the Disruption was also significant in starting a movement among Wesleyan Methodists towards a more critical view of existing establishments. The correspondence of Jabez Bunting makes the sympathy of leading Wesleyans for the Free Church case abundantly clear and the 1843 Address of the Wesleyan Conference to its societies, drafted by Dr. Osborn whom Benjamin Gregory described as "the stoutest defender of the Establishment in the Conference,"⁸ declared its adherence to the one great principle of the Disruption, namely

That it is the right of every Christian church to claim in matters which are plainly, and in their very nature, spiritual and ecclesiastical . . . an unfettered freedom of acting according to those deliberate convictions which it may have been led to form . . . by the Laws of Christ contained in the Holy Scriptures.⁹

Wesleyans did not become Voluntaries either, but there was here begun the transition from nonconformity or dissent to free churchmanship: the use of the term "free church" to describe nonconformist bodies derives, of course, from the name taken by the Free Church of Scotland in 1843.

III

The point to be stressed here is that it is the second quarter of the nineteenth century that sees the emergence of the establishment issue in English church life. This was relatively novel for English nonconformists. Establishment as such had not been an issue in the seventeenth century—even the false church from which the separatists wished to separate was not false primarily because it was established.¹⁰ Presbyterians in England naturally supported the principle of establishment, and more interestingly Congregationalists in New England saw few problems with it. In the early eighteenth century Isaac Watts condemned any National Church as unscriptural, but Philip Doddridge was prepared to accept a civil establishment of religion, together with its compulsory support.¹¹ By the end of the eighteenth century we find a rather more

⁷W. Hanna, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers*, Edinburgh, 1852, iv, p. 348.

⁸B. Gregory, *Side Lights on the Conflicts of Methodism*, 1827-52, London, 1898, p. 351.

⁹*Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference*, 1843, Collected Edition, ix, p. 555.

¹⁰The issues then are set out in G. F. Nuttall, "The First Nonconformists", in G. F. Nuttall & O. Chadwick, *From Uniformity to Unity*, 1662-1962, London, 1962, pp. 157-59.

¹¹See E. A. Payne, "Toleration and Establishment: I", *ibid.*, pp. 263-64.

trenchant tone in a pamphlet written by the Baptist, Robert Hall, in 1793:

Turn a christian society into an established church, and it is no longer a voluntary assembly for the worship of God; it is a powerful corporation, full of such sentiments, and passions, as usually distinguish those bodies; a dread of innovation, an attachment to abuses, a propensity to tyranny and oppression.¹²

This is an anticipation of the tone of nineteenth century radical dissent. But it is significant that this pamphlet was provoked by Bishop Horsley's attack on dissenters in the wake of the French Revolution, and it is symptomatic of the polarisation of views which took place in the 1790s. Hall's remained a minority view in dissent, even in the 1820s when the pamphlet was reprinted. The reprinting provoked an attack on Hall in the *Leicester Journal* and Hall replied in kind. In the course of a passage arguing that national churches were not authorised by Christ, the great Head of the Church, and would therefore be rooted up, he remarked:

I have used the term *great* Head of the church, by way of distinction from that *little* Head which the church of England has invented, and on which, whether it be a beauty or deformity in the body of Christ, the Scriptures are certainly as silent as on universal suffrage and annual parliaments.¹³

In a footnote to this, Hall's editor, Olinthus Gregory, has written, "I know of no passage in the works of our author which presents, in my judgement, so gross a violation of good taste as is here exhibited." Hall's *Collected Works* were published in 1831, so the footnote is itself revealing.

Generally, however, the political strategy of nonconformists in the early nineteenth century was to concentrate on the demand for religious equality and civil rights, as in the campaign for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts which was successful in 1828. At this time a belief that the establishment was wrong in principle did not lead to a campaign against it. The establishment was attacked in this period by political radicals: but the attack was on corruption and abuses, as in John Wade's *Extraordinary Black Book*. Religious grounds were secondary.

IV

The situation north of the border was different. Seventeenth century dissent in Scotland was Episcopalian or Roman Catholic, and English non-conformists found little support. In the eighteenth century, however, a series of secessions took place, beginning with the deposition in 1728 of John Glas, who believed that the church should have no bond with the state.¹⁴ The most significant of these groups was the Secession Church, which began in 1733 with Ebenezer Erskine's protests against patronage in the Church of Scotland (reintroduced in 1712).¹⁵ The Relief Church, which began in 1752, was also

¹²R. Hall, "An Apology for the Freedom of the Press", *Collected Works*, ed. O. Gregory, London, 1831, iii, p. 145.

¹³Ibid., p. 192.

¹⁴Confirmed by the General Assembly in 1730: A. L. Drummond & J. Bulloch, *The Scottish Church 1688-1843*, Edinburgh, 1973, p. 46.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 41-44.

critical of interference by the civil magistrate in the Church.¹⁶ These views were developed and amplified in the early nineteenth century. At the end of the eighteenth century the Evangelical Revival in Scotland led to the growth of both Scottish Congregationalists and Scottish Baptists, who also adopted a voluntaryist position.

It was not until 1829, however, that open controversy flared up in what became known as the "Voluntary Question". In that year the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act was passed, and this prompted a sermon by Andrew Marshall of the United Secession Church in Glasgow on the iniquities of national establishment. The argument was that as conventional reasons for establishment required the establishment of the religion of the majority, in Ireland this would necessarily lead to the establishment of Roman Catholicism. The only ground on which this could be resisted was that the whole concept of a national church was contrary to scripture.¹⁷ The atmosphere of the Reform Bill crisis, the concern for popular rights involved in it and the fact that the political effects of the Reform Bill were more radical than in England, all lent force to the ecclesiastical issue. Voluntary Church societies were formed in Edinburgh and Glasgow, in which all dissenters joined, and they became the models for similar societies in England later. The centenary of the Secession Church in 1833 provided an additional opportunity for commemoration.

But it was the problem of church extension which really made the question a sensitive one. As in England the Church was struggling to respond to the problems created by the rapid growth of towns as a result of the industrial revolution—changes which meant that by 1830 half the Scottish population lived in the central lowland belt. Parliament was even more reluctant to grant money for church extension to the Church of Scotland than to the Church of England. Whereas the Church of England received £1½m in 1818 and 1824, the Church of Scotland merely received help for new churches in the highlands in 1824. Church extension in Scottish towns in the 1820s depended largely upon voluntary effort, and because of the difficulty of subdividing parishes there was the same danger as in England that chapels built by voluntary effort would be handed over to dissenting churches if the established church could not take them. The existence of these chapels of ease was a constant reminder to reformers like Chalmers that the establishment was not in fact fulfilling the purpose for which it was intended.

In the early 1830s the Evangelical party secured control of the General Assembly and sought by a series of measures to establish a popular voice in the choice of ministers and also to facilitate church extension. An official church extension scheme was launched by the Assembly in the hope that if the Church showed its commitment by raising a significant sum, Parliament would top it up. £200,000 was raised between 1834 and 1838 and nearly 200 new churches were built.¹⁸ But the voluntaryists lobbied the government

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 59-62, 150-1.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 221.

¹⁸Hanna, *Life of Chalmers*, iv, p. 32.

against making grants to the established church on the grounds that the new churches were unnecessary if dissenting accommodation were taken into account, and that existing churches were not full anyway. The government appointed a Royal Commission and on the basis of its report in 1838 the government resolved to make no grant for the towns and offered only limited assistance towards a possible scheme in the highlands.¹⁹ The policy probably owed as much to the weak parliamentary and financial position of Melbourne's whig government as to active opposition to establishment as such, but it was a cruel blow to the Church of Scotland. When Chalmers accepted the invitation to give his London lectures in April 1838, it was at the very time when Scottish voluntaryists were lobbying the government against the Church of Scotland. His lectures, which were on church extension as well as establishment, were part of the Church's response.

By 1838, however, the Voluntary Question had spread into England as well. The radicalism of Robert Hall's position has already been noted. This became more common in the 1820s (though it was still a minority view) and owed not a little to the many Scots in the English dissenting ministry, particularly in Congregationalism. From the beginning of the century Scots had been settling in Lancashire, and they generally went to Congregational rather than the increasingly unitarian Presbyterian chapels. Thomas Kennedy, R. S. McAll and Robert Halley were leading Lancashire Congregational ministers who were either Scots or sons of Scots. One historian even went so far as to say that early Manchester Congregationalism was "enveloped in a Scotch mist."²⁰ William McKerrow, who was in Manchester from 1827, was largely responsible for raising the establishment question there in the 1830s and this culminated in a large public meeting in 1834. McKerrow had been a colleague in Scotland of Andrew Marshall.²¹ So it was not long before Voluntary Church societies on the Scottish model were formed south of the border. The issue fastened on was that of church rates. In 1836 a Church Rate Abolition Society was formed and in February 1837 a conference of some 320 people gathered in London to discuss the matter. But the attempts of Lord Melbourne's government to reform church rates in 1834 and 1837 failed, and radical dissent became noisier on the subject, with some raising the question of the establishment as such.

This question was, of course, also under discussion in the Church of England itself. Some liberal Anglicans, such as Charles Lushington, were in favour of disestablishment on political grounds.²² These were found supporting the more moderate dissenting societies at the end of the 1830s: Josiah Conder's Religious Freedom Society and the Evangelical Voluntary Church

¹⁹G. I. T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain 1832-1868* Oxford, 1977, pp. 117-18.

²⁰J. Waddington, *Congregational History: Continuation to 1850*, London, 1878, p. 51.

²¹W. R. Ward, *Religion and Society in England, 1790-1850*, London, 1972, pp. 130-32.

²²Machin, *Politics and the Churches*, p. 102.

Association, both formed in 1839.²³ The Tractarians were at least in principle prepared to contemplate disestablishment in order to assert the rights of the church against an invading state, though after the crisis of 1833 this element in their thinking receded in importance. But the defence of apostolic succession in the first tracts was intended to provide a basis for the claims of the church which was independent of its position as the national establishments. Such questioning called forth new defences. Gladstone, who became a high churchman whilst at Oxford in the 1820s, defended the existing church-state relationship in his book of 1838 by invoking the principle of the moral personality of the state: but it fell on stony ground. More typical were those prepared to defend a reformed establishment on more utilitarian grounds. It was a society drawn from this group, the Christian Influence Society, which invited Chalmers to London to lecture on the principles of church establishment: this is therefore the Anglican background to the invitation. The six lectures seem to have been a glittering success, given to packed audiences, including, it was reckoned at least 500 peers and members of parliament.²⁴ Certainly they were sufficiently successful for the London Dissenting Deputies to feel the need of a public reply. In April and May 1839, at their invitation, Dr. Ralph Wardlaw, the Scottish Congregationalist and teacher of Livingstone, delivered a series of lectures in reply to Chalmers, which were also attended by large audiences including some M.P.s but largely composed of what Wardlaw's biographer calls "the earnest, thoughtful, practical middle class".²⁵ It seems likely that the invitation was given to Wardlaw because of the cooperation between the Deputies and the Scottish dissenters in 1838, and because Chalmers's lectures were seen as part of that Scottish campaign.²⁶

V

If the arguments of Chalmers and Wardlaw are compared it is immediately apparent that the two are poles apart. Chalmers's lectures breathe the language of political economy: Wardlaw devotes two lectures to the Bible before turning to other arguments, and he dismisses most of Chalmers's case as being beside the point. This tells us a lot about the thought of the two men.

In the preface to the volume of his *Collected Works* which contains these lectures, Chalmers stresses two points: one is the rebuttal he offers of Adam Smith's arguments against establishment; the other is the way he defends establishment on the grounds of the mission of the church.²⁷ Both are characteristic.

It is perhaps often forgotten that it is in the last part of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) that the utilitarian argument against establishment

²³Ibid., p. 107 : c.f. D. M. Thompson, "The Liberation Society, 1844-1868" in P. Hollis ed., *Pressure From Without*, London, 1974, p. 213.

²⁴Hanna, *Life of Chalmers*, iv, pp. 36-40.

²⁵B. L. Manning, *The Protestant Dissenting Deputies*, Cambridge, 1952, pp. 389-90; W. L. Alexander, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw*, Edinburgh, 1856, p. 380.

²⁶Manning, *Dissenting Deputies*, p. 441; Alexander, *Life of Wardlaw*, p. 376.

²⁷T. Chalmers, *Collected Works*, xvii, "On Church and College Establishments", Glasgow, n.d., pp. v-xvi.

is first rehearsed.²⁸ John Locke had first distinguished between the aims of church and state in terms of truth and utility. Warburton in *The Alliance between Church and State* (1736) had followed this argument and suggested that, all other things being equal, the state could determine which sect to support by supporting the majority. Smith, however, questioned the utility of establishments in both education and religion and argued, in line with the rest of his book, that free competition was the surest guarantee of utility, and probably of truth as well. Established religion thus came under the condemnation of all monopolies. William Paley in *The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785) accepted Adam Smith's criterion of utility, but justified an episcopalian establishment in entirely non-theological terms, giving three reasons: it helped to secure "tranquillity and subordination" among the clergy; is corresponded with "the gradations of rank in civil life"; and the same fund produced more effect, "both as an allurement to men of talents to enter into the church, and as a stimulus to the industry of those who are already in it, when distributed into prizes of different value, than when divided into equal shares".²⁹ Now although Chalmers was a noted political economist, it was not likely that he could accept either Smith's position or Paley's defence of an episcopalian establishment. So instead of following Paley's retreat, he meets Smith on his own ground. Free trade in religion is not possible, according to Chalmers, because supply is regulated not by demand, but by effective demand: and in the case of religion demand has to be created. The argument is neat, and in its own terms effective.

Chalmers also modifies significantly the definition of what constitutes an establishment:

To realise our idea of an Establishment, it is enough that there be legal security for the application of certain funds to the maintenance of Christian worship or Christian instruction in a country; and this in whatever way these funds may have originated.³⁰

The question of an establishment is thus separate from state support for the Church. This definition enabled Chalmers to argue that most voluntaryist churches were in effect establishments, because they had designated funds: it also enabled him to argue that

Although the church should receive its maintenance, and all its maintenance from the civil power, it follows not that it therefore receives its theology from the same quarter; or that this theology should acquire thereby the slightest taint or infusion of secularity.³¹

It is easy to see on this basis how Chalmers could lead the Free Church of Scotland out at the Disruption as a protest against unwarrantable interference by the state with the church, and yet stick to his principles of 1838. His

²⁸A. Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, ed. J. R. McCulloch, Edinburgh, 1839, book v, ch. 1, pts. iii & iv, pp. 353-67 (espy. pp. 355-56 and 367).

²⁹E. Carpenter, "Toleration and Establishment: II" in Nuttal & Chadwick *From Uniformity to Unity*, pp. 310-14.

³⁰Chalmers, *JWorks*, xvii, p. 196.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 197.

argument for the state support of the establishment rests on different grounds:

We, the advocates of a National Establishment, hold it the duty and wisdom of every State, thus to undertake for the education of the great family under its charge, and to provide the requisite funds for the fulfilment of the enterprise.³²

It is, in other words, an extension of the duty to provide for education.

A second point to note in his argument, because of its relevance to Andrew Marshall's sermon, is the part played by popery. Voluntaryists frequently contrasted the post-Constantinian church with the pre-Constantinian to the disadvantage of the former and explained the contrast by reference to establishment. Chalmers argued that what happened to the church after Constantine was the result of popery, not establishment. He turned Marshall's reference to Ireland against him by suggesting that Ireland illustrated the consequences of the failure of the establishment to do its missionary duty because of undue sensitivity over attempting conversion; and he contrasted Luther and the Reformers favourably with contemporary dissenters because they fought against errors of faith, and were not just concerned with the machinery of the church. Chalmers thus found it fairly easy to suggest that Parliament might be trusted to distinguish truth from error by supporting Protestantism, Ireland again being invoked as a warning.³³

Chalmers' weakest argument came over the question of which Protestant group to support. He framed the question in terms of reasons why the government should not change the choice of sect to be established; he fairly easily showed that the government cannot support all; and said that it should support that with the most effective organisation—a territorial ministry. This he claimed was a more rational basis than the factitious argument from apostolic succession; and lest dissenters felt hurt, he concluded by saying that the differences between them and the establishment are so insignificant as to be no cause of separation—"the caprices, or whimsical peculiarities, in which, through the very wantonness of freedom in this land of perfect toleration, men have chosen to bespot themselves"³⁴—nevertheless, if dissenters wished to stay out, he did not mind and a vigorous dissent was healthy for the establishment anyway. It is not difficult to see why such an argument should arouse dissenting antagonism.

The second aspect of his lectures as a whole which he stresses is the mission of the church. An establishment is the only way in which churches will be provided for poor areas, because voluntary churches cannot thrive there. Here he drew on his early parochial experience in Glasgow. It is a vital part of his argument that an establishment must be territorial: every part of the country must be the direct responsibility of some clergyman. This he had used as an argument to determine which church should be supported by the government: it also explains why the Free Church began with the intention

³²*Ibid.*, p. 259.

³³*Ibid.*, pp. 289-308.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 348.

of a territorial ministry, however this worked out in practice later. Furthermore it is a reminder of his concern for the Church Extension scheme at the time of his lectures.

Ralph Wardlaw's response moved on very different ground. The essence of his argument is also contained in a sermon preached in 1832 at an earlier stage of the Voluntary controversy. He and Chalmers had, in fact, argued in public long before in 1817, when they were involved in a discussion over the merits or otherwise of voluntary benevolent associations for poor relief in Glasgow.³⁵ Wardlaw's main criticism of Chalmers was his treatment of the whole question as though it were merely one of machinery. In Wardlaw's view, establishments were "destitute of the authority of Jesus Christ—a human innovation on the divine constitution of the church".³⁶ Though he was confident that he could base a successful argument on the inferior ground of expediency—both by abstract reasoning and reference to church history, and also on the principles of justice—he maintained that the proper ground was biblical, which Chalmers had totally ignored. This echoed his criticism of Paley in 1832:

Persons who on other occasions have pleaded, and pleaded ably, for an appeal on all religious topics to the one standard of faith and conduct—"to the law and to the testimony", have, on this, confined themselves to principles of expediency, and calculations of political economy, with hardly an allusion to the Bible, any more than if no such document were in existence. We protest against this.³⁷

Thus in 1839 he devoted two lectures to considering the Old and New Testament evidence, pointing out that arguments were usually based on the Old Testament. In 1832 he had pointed out that this entailed assuming the identification of church and nation, something which was accepted, following Hooker, in England, but hardly in Scotland.³⁸ The New Testament, however, was entirely silent on the subject, and it was dangerous to equate any arguments from expediency with the divine law. Moreover, again on the basis of the New Testament, he argued that "the *Voluntary Principle* is thus in harmony with the *genius* of Christianity. Every thing compulsory is opposed to it."³⁹ More aggressively he argued that if the state did choose to support a church, it was bound to be involved in questions of faith, because confessions of faith became the terms of establishment and the Church's power to alter its creed and formularies then became dependent on the consent of the state.⁴⁰ Here we have an early reference to the problems posed for theology in the Presbyterian churches by the Westminster Confession. Again, the other face of establishment was persecution—here he cited examples from the history of

³⁵Alexander, *Life of Wardlaw*, pp. 179-81.

³⁶R. Wardlaw, *National Church Establishments Examined*, London, 1839, pp. 58-59.

³⁷R. Wardlaw, *Civil Establishments of Christianity tried by their only authoritative Test, the Word of God*, Glasgow, 1832, pp. 5-6.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 13-14.

³⁹Wardlaw, *National Church Establishments*, p. 238.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 18-19.

dissent—and perhaps most interestingly Wardlaw argued that the union of church and state engendered a tendency to Hobbeism,

a tendency, that is, to consider religion as little if anything more than a state-engine, an instrument in the hand of the civil magistrate for maintaining good government, and giving the sanction of a superstitious fear to the laws.⁴¹

Some of Paley's arguments were clearly in mind here: but it is interesting to reflect that Thomas Arnold, in the passage cited at the beginning of this lecture, maintained that voluntaryism led in this direction.

Wardlaw was also able to point out the danger of a collision between church and state in Scotland because of the decision of the Court of Session in the Auchterarder case in 1838,⁴² and he cruelly argued that the Church of England was *the establishment* of the country:

Were there no other than the Church of Scotland, with its presbyterian parity, its limited patronage, and its destitution of mitres and of lawn, of ecclesiastical places and prizes, the secular government would hardly regard the principle of an Establishment as a point worth contending for.⁴³

VI

Such controversy is good knockabout stuff: but what is the long term significance of this particular debate, now half-forgotten? Wardlaw proved to be the shrewder judge of events. When Sir James Graham retorted to the Church of Scotland's Claim of Right in 1842 that "the State employs the Church on certain terms as the religious instructor of the people of Scotland",⁴⁴ he was living up to Wardlaw's picture of establishment, not Chalmers's. The result was Disruption. Nonconformist resistance to the education clauses of Graham's Factories Bill in the same year led first to their withdrawal, and then to the formation of the Anti-State Church Association. On the whole too, Edward Miall followed the priority attached by Wardlaw to arguments against establishment based on the lack of biblical authority, rather than those based on political expediency: though Anglicans at the time and some Anglican historians since presented the case for disestablishment primarily in political terms.⁴⁵ English nonconformity thus joined in the Voluntary movement which had begun in Scotland.

Equally significant, however, are the consequences of the debate for the way establishment was defended. As has been indicated, Chalmers defended the spiritual autonomy of the church in his lectures, and when forced to choose between that and establishment he chose spiritual autonomy. Similarly, his arguments about the relevance of establishment to church extension became increasingly attractive to Anglicans, even though no British government provided any money for church extension after 1840. The Revd. Abraham Hume

⁴¹*Ibid.*, p.332.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 354: in this decision the Court of Session overruled the General Assembly of the Church as to who the rightful minister of a parish was.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 329.

⁴⁴*Parliamentary Debates* (3rd Series), lxvii, col. 385, 7 Mar. 1843.

⁴⁵cf. E. R. Norman, *Church and Society in England 1770-1970*, Oxford, 1976, p. 192.

of Liverpool wrote extensively on the necessity of establishment, and particularly church rates, to serve the poor and supported his case by analyses of religious statistics showing the failure of voluntaryism in poor areas. "The abandonment of church rates is the abandonment of the poor", he declared.⁴⁶ Developments in English education in the 1850s and 1860s proved his argument, and the Education Act of 1870, in making general provision for rate assessment where necessary, took the first steps towards a new state establishment in education to replace the Church.

Both of these developments pointed in a different direction from the traditional English justification for establishment, which depended heavily on Hooker's argument that church and state are but different aspects of the same polity. Thomas Arnold was really reasserting this point in the letter quoted earlier:

I look to the full development of the Christian Church in its perfect form, as the Kingdom of God, for the most effective removal of all evil, and promotion of all good; and I can understand no perfect Church or perfect State, without their blending into one in this ultimate form.⁴⁷

This was the basis of F. D. Maurice's Christian socialism and the reason why he broke with the Tractarians in 1835 over Pusey's tract on baptism. And in a real sense it underlay much of the thought of William Temple, although with Temple it was more an ideal to be aspired to than something already realised. But this is the significance of the inclusion of compulsory religious education in the 1944 Education Act.

Wardlaw, however, criticised the identification of church and nation; and he knew that whilst the Church of Scotland would always assert a spiritual responsibility for the nation, it would not accept a simple identification of the two. Interestingly the only point at which voluntaryists wished to assert an identity between church and nation was in respect of property. It was important for their argument that church property was really national property, otherwise Protestant governments at the Reformation could legitimately be charged with deliberate robbery in seizing the revenues of the Church of Rome:⁴⁸ the consequence of arguing that church property was national property was to make the case for disendowment as well as disestablishment.

The theological consequences of the rejection of Hooker were developed by later nonconformists. Andrew Fairbairn was not a convinced voluntaryist while in Scotland, and was prepared to defend the Church of Scotland as a national church.⁴⁹ But as Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1883 he was more outspoken, yet not inconsistently with his earlier position:

The ultimate grounds, I will not say of our Nonconformity, but of our

⁴⁶Report of the House of Lords Select Committee on Church Rates: *Parliamentary Papers*, H.C. 1859 (2), v, pp. 155-56.

⁴⁷Stanley, *Life of Arnold*, p. 373.

⁴⁸*Examination of the Equity and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Establishments*. Voluntary Church Association: Edinburgh, 1832, pp. 25-27.

⁴⁹W. B. Selbie, *The Life of Andrew Martin Fairbairn*, London, 1914, p. 75.

existence as Free Churches of Jesus Christ, are theological and religious, not political. Our reasons for dissenting from the Church of England are too fundamental to be merely or mainly ecclesiastical. We dissent because we believe that she fails adequately to interpret and realise for the people of England the religion of Christ.⁵⁰

But even this statement is set in the context of an argument that the Free Churches are part of the national life and the national religion. Similarly when he argued that "an Established Church is not free enough to obey its own truth, it too much depends on man's law to make him feel the authority of God's", he was making a more subtle point than appears at first sight.

An Established Church (he continued) is more of a static, but a Free Church more of a dynamic force in society . . . the first is satisfied with what is, but the other strives towards what ought to be the ideally perfect State, where all men may exercise the power to use the rights they have won as citizens, to realise as persons the image of God, and as peoples His kingdom of heaven on earth.⁵¹

This is a subtle turning of the Mauricean argument: the Free Churches because of their love of liberty express the true nature of the Kingdom of God better than the Established Church; thus arguments for a national religion should rightly lead to a Free Church position. This whole line of argument is very typical of late nineteenth-century Free Church confidence.

In a rather different tone we find P. T. Forsyth making a similar point in the preface to *The Work of Christ* (1910). He quotes Kierkegaard:

"For long the tactics have been: use every means to move as many as you can—to move everybody if possible—to enter Christianity. Do not be too curious whether what they enter is Christianity. My tactics have been, with God's help, to use every means to make it clear what the demand of Christianity really is,—if not one entered it."

Then he comments:

The statement is extreme; but that way lies the church's salvation—in its ante-Nicene relation to the world, its pre-Constantinian, non-established, relation to the world and devotion to the Word. . . . the church has nothing to live on but the cross that faces and overcomes the world.⁵²

VII

The century after 1838 saw a convergence of the positions of Chalmers and Wardlaw. English nonconformists began to develop a more catholic understanding of the Church, which culminated in the Free Church Unity movement of the 1890s. Such a development could not leave voluntaryism unaffected. In Scotland the pendulum swung to and fro. By the 1870s the Free Church of Scotland was moving away from the establishment principle and closer to the United Presbyterians—heirs of the Secession: this strengthened

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 136 (italics mine).

⁵¹*Ibid.*, pp. 141-42.

⁵²P. T. Forsyth, *The Work of Christ*, Fontana edn., London, 1965, pp. 35-36.

the disestablishment movement in Scotland, and also made possible the union of the two churches in the United Free Church in 1900. The resistance of the pro-establishment minority in the Free Church, however, and their legal success in 1904 in securing title to all the property of the former Free Church (on the ground that the union was a breach of trust) provided a startling reminder of the limited freedom that "Free Churches" in fact enjoy. Moreover when union negotiations between the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church began in 1909, the question of the form of the national recognition of religion was a crucial issue. The solution to this problem was embodied in the Articles Declaratory of the Church of Scotland in Matters Spiritual, which were given the force of law subject to the consent of the Church by the Church of Scotland Act of 1921.⁵³ The Declaratory Articles had been prepared by the Joint Committee as a sufficient statement of the Church's freedom.

These Scottish developments were important for the Church of England too. Moves towards self-government in the Church of England began with the resumption of regular sittings of the two Convocations from the 1850s and the establishment of unofficial Houses of Laity in each province after Archbishop Benson's initiative in the 1880s. In 1903 these were all combined to form an unofficial Representative Church Council. It is perhaps not without significance that Arthur Balfour, who was a Scot, was more inclined as Prime Minister to take the work of this Council seriously than previous Prime Ministers had been. In 1899 he had written to a friend:

I am not only not an Erastian, but I have a strong dislike to Erastianism. If it were possible (and perhaps it may be possible) to give the English Church the full autonomy possessed by the Scottish Church, I should like to do it.⁵⁴

Balfour was always proud of the part he was able to play in Scottish church life through the Churches (Scotland) Act of 1905, which rectified the anomaly of the Free Church case and gave the Church of Scotland liberty of interpretation of the Westminster Confession.

Those who pressed the case for internal self-government in the Church of England had the Scottish precedent very much in mind. When Lord Halifax and Viscount Wolmer pressed the idea on Randall Davidson in 1913, they knew how the Scottish union conversations were developing.⁵⁵ The Scottish proposals were referred to in the *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State*, 1916,⁵⁶ which recommended the setting up of a Church Assembly with delegated powers of legislation. Davidson was reluctant to make any move until after the war was over, but on 28 October 1918, Wolmer wrote to him as follows:

There is one feature of the Parliamentary situation which seems very important to me, and that is that about this time next year, or earlier, the Scottish Presbyterians will be coming to Parliament for an Act recog-

⁵³ 11 & 12 Geo. V, c. 29.

⁵⁴ B. E. C. Dugdale, *Arthur James Balfour*, London, 1936, i, pp. 277-78.

⁵⁵ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 3rd edn., London, 1952, pp. 956-57.

⁵⁶ London, 1917, pp. 198-200.

nising Scottish reunion on the basis of Establishment and complete autonomy. That would seem to be a very strategic moment for the Church of England to put her much more modest claim in too. I might add that some of us in the House of Commons are taking steps to keep in close touch with the Scottish Presbyterians who are mostly very sympathetic towards us. We are also doing our best to obtain a rapprochement with the Nonconformists in Parliament.⁵⁷

In this Wolmer had considerable success and I have argued elsewhere that this should not be underrated in explaining the success of the Enabling Act in 1919, particularly in view of initial government opposition.⁵⁸ In steering the bill through parliament Randall Davidson stressed efficiency and common sense, not high church claims. Is it fanciful to see the ghost of Chalmers beside him? It is certainly more plausible than to see the ghost of Keble. The Enabling Act set the Church of England on a course which in recent years has brought it a General Synod, similar to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and in 1974 a Doctrine and Worship Measure, which effectively replaced the Reformation Acts of Uniformity as the basis of the Church's worship, giving the Church of England a similar freedom in that area to that secured by the Church of Scotland in the Declaratory Articles of 1921.

The Scottish influence which I have been trying to trace is essentially a concept of the independence of the Church which reflects a Scottish rather than an English idea of sovereignty.⁵⁹ In 1898 Lord Balfour of Burleigh summed up an essay on "The Scottish Establishment" in these words:

The two points to which it seems to me important to direct notice are that the State recognizes a jurisdiction as inherent in the Church, and while adding to it and providing means whereby it can be carried into effect, does not profess to confer it *ab initio*; and further, that within her sphere the Church of Scotland possesses legislative power to regulate her own affairs as may from time to time be necessary without reference to any external authority whatsoever.⁶⁰

This reflects the difference between the English and Scottish Reformationsthe one achieved by statute using the doctrine of the omniscience of parliament, the other recognised by statute after already having taken place. Moreover the Scottish parliament had a lesser role in the constitution than the English parliament before 1707. Legally, of course, ecclesiastical measures passed by the Church of England under the Enabling Act procedure still derive their authority from their approval by the Crown in Parliament: as such they are included in the annual list of statutes, unlike the acts of the General Assembly of the Chuch of Scotland. But in so far as parliament has

⁵⁷Davidson Papers, Lambeth Palace Library: "Church and State" file: Wolmer to Davidson, 28 Oct., 1918.

⁵⁸"The Politics of the Enabling Act (1919)" in D. Baker, ed., *Studies in Church History*, xii, Oxford, 1975, pp. 383-92.

⁵⁹H. J. Laski, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty*, London, 1917, pp. 27-68.

⁶⁰C. Gore, ed., *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, 2nd edn., London, 1902, p. 100.

only the power to accept or reject, and not to amend, a significant change has taken place. H. A. L. Fisher was quite right when he told the Home Affairs Committee of the War Cabinet in 1919 that the Enabling Bill "was a very important measure and very controversial, destroying as it did the Elizabethan and Caroline settlements."⁶¹ It is a rather curious fact that many Anglicans even today do not fully grasp the significance of the change, and probably many would be surprised to be told that since 1974 there are only two clauses of the Act of Uniformity of 1662 that are still on the Statute Book.⁶² When Hensley Henson criticised the Enabling Act for making the Church of England into a sect, he had put his finger on the important point, but he had pointed in the wrong direction.

Successive Anglican reports on Church and State have repeated that the "Scottish solution" is of no help in England. Eric Kemp argued in 1960 that the Church of England deserved a similar measure of self-government to the Church of Scotland.⁶³ The Chadwick Report of 1970, whilst acknowledging that their recommendation on worship (substantially embodied in the Doctrine and Worship Measure) bore a distinct resemblance to the Scottish establishment, said that they had not recommended an imitation of Scotland because the circumstances of the two countries were different.⁶⁴ The differences are indisputable, but it is nonetheless clear that in principle there has been a definite move in the Scottish direction. The Free Churches too have moved. Ernest Payne in 1952 spoke for many nonconformists when he said that he did not think the Free Churches should continue to press for immediate disestablishment of the Church of England.⁶⁵ A Free Church Federal Council report of 1953 was prepared to welcome state *recognition* of religion.⁶⁶ Pure voluntaryism, like pure independency, has not existed in the major Free Churches for nearly a century anyway. Various of the Free Churches have realised in recent years the constraints imposed on them by the fact of parliamentary sovereignty, particularly in ecumenical affairs. Neville Figgis was one of the earliest writers to see the significance of the principle when he remarked that the conception of spiritual freedom involved in the Free Church of Scotland case of 1904 was not merely the claim of the Free Church: "It is the notion of every religious sect which claims for itself toleration. None can really admit that its entity is derived from the State."⁶⁷ Indeed it is significant that moves towards the reunion of the Church have exposed the significance of this question more sharply than anything else this century.

⁶¹Cabinet Papers, Public Record Office: CAB 26/1, H.A.C. 30 § 2, 28 May 1919.

⁶²viz. clause 10 (amended) and clause 15, the former allowing only those who have been episcopally ordained priest to hold benefices and the latter requiring a bishop's licence for those who preach: the Acts of Uniformity of 1549 and 1559 were also repealed.

⁶³E. W. Kemp, *Counsel and Consent*, London, 1961, pp. 210-11.

⁶⁴*Church and State*, London, 1970, pp. 65-66.

⁶⁵E. A. Payne, "The Free Churches and the State" in *Free Churchmen Unrepentant and Repentant*, London, 1965, pp. 72-73.

⁶⁶*The Free Churches and the State*, London, 1953, pp. 62-65.

⁶⁷J. N. Figgis, *Churches in the Modern State*, London, 1913, p. 37.

We began with two letters from 1840. Another letter to Jabez Bunting makes an appropriate conclusion. In February 1845, John McLean, Superintendent of the Edinburgh Wesleyan circuit, wrote as follows:

The extreme voluntaries on the one hand and the Established Church on the other are exceedingly anxious to set us and the Free Kirk by the ears; but I hope we shall *all* become more united.⁶⁸

If in the century since then the attitudes of the Churches have become more united, this is in no small measure due to the influence of a Scottish concept of spiritual independence, which offered a middle way between voluntaryism and an English style of establishment.

DAVID M. THOMPSON

⁶⁸Ward, *Early Victorian Methodism*, p. 318.

METHODISM, THE NEW DISSENT AND AMERICAN REVIVALISM¹

The later phases of the so-called "Second Great Awakening" in the United States, from the revival movement in the Burned-over District of New York in the 1820s to the millennialist excitement of the early 1840s, attracted formidable attention from English Calvinist Dissenters. In 1828 and 1829 a flood of Baptist and Congregational publications held up American religious prosperity as an inspiration and spur to domestic revival. The promptings of Henry Burder, Joseph Fletcher, John Angell James and William Orme within Congregationalism and of John Howard Hinton, Joseph Ivimey and John Neave amongst Baptists represented only the tip of the exhortatory iceberg.² A little later the visiting American, Calvin Colton, wrote his *History and Character of American Revivals* to satisfy British curiosity; the respected William Buell Sprague's *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* was quickly endorsed. Most spectacular of all was the impact of Charles Grandison Finney's magisterial *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, which first appeared in Britain in 1837; by 1840 various editions of this handbook by the high priest of American revivalism were "scattered like leaves of autumn all over the kingdom".³ Meanwhile both Congregationalists and Baptists had sent separate delegations

¹The author would like to acknowledge the financial assistance of the University of Sheffield Research Fund in the preparation of this article.

²Henry Forster Burder, *Pastoral Discourses on Revivals in Religion*, London, 1829; Joseph Fletcher, *On the Prosperity of Christian Churches, and the Revival of Religion* London, 1829; John Angell James, *A Pastoral Letter on the Subject of Revivals in Religion . . . submitted to the consideration of the Independent Churches in general*, 3rd ed., London, 1829; William Orme, *Discourses on the Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; Divine Influence, and its connexion with instituted means*, London, 1828; John Howard Hinton, *The Means of a Religious Revival: A Sermon*, London, 1829, a work much respected in America; Joseph Ivimey, *The Divinely Appointed Means for preserving a prosperous, or restoring a declining Church*, London, 1828; John Neave, *The Means of Promoting a Revival of Religion in the Churches*, London, 1828.

³John Keep to T. Keep, 5 Aug. 1839, John Keep Papers, transcriptions in Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio; John Keep to Gerrit Smith, 13 Nov. 1839, Gerrit Smith Miller Papers, Syracuse University Library, Syracuse, New York.

across the Atlantic to get first-hand accounts of America's evangelical prosperity⁴; and such influential American ministers as Asahel Nettleton, Heman Humphrey, Gardiner Spring, William Patton and (most effectively) Edward Norris Kirk devoted at least some of their time in England to advocating revival services along American lines. All these sources of encouragement produced amongst evangelical Calvinists in the later 1830s and early 1840s a widespread commitment to "protracted meetings" and special services.

This turning to America for evangelical stimulus can be variously explained. It can be placed in a longstanding tradition of transatlantic co-operation and dialogue between evangelicals optimistically pursuing the conversion of the world. It operated, too, in the context of the evangelical's sense of challenge from "Infidelity" and "Popery", and against a background of shifting theological thinking.⁵ Here I want to suggest a supplementary approach to understanding this reaction to American revivalism, one which turns for explanation to the relationship between evangelical Calvinists and Methodists. For it was from English Methodism as well as from American practice that Baptists and Congregationalists acquired much of their interest in newer revival measures. The different evangelical denominations often worked alongside and sometimes even in cooperation with each other. This encouraged a degree of deliberate copying—provided it did not over-strain theological tolerance or disfigure accepted practice. Here was a clear and striking parallel with the American evangelical experience; in the early decades of the nineteenth century on both sides of the Atlantic evangelical Calvinists were being driven by the pressure of Methodist success to consider a more aggressive evangelism.⁶

Baptists might have been expected to remain unaffected by Methodism. Not only were the stricter Calvinists in the denomination offended by Methodist Arminianism, but there was little overlap in the geographic concentrations of the denominations. With Methodism stronger in industrial or urban centres, in particular in the north of England, and with Baptist resources focussed in southern, more agricultural counties,⁷ there were areas where there was little interaction. Yet Methodists' ability to reach at least some of the poor in

⁴Andrew Reed and James Matheson, *A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the Deputation from the Congregational Union of England and Wales*, 2 vols., London, 1835; F. A. Cox and J. Hoby, *The Baptists in America; a Narrative of the Deputation from the Baptist Union in England to the United States and Canada*, London, 1836. See also, Francis A. Cox, *Suggestions designed to promote the Revival and Extension of Religion, founded on observations made during a journey in The United States of America in the Spring and Summer of 1835*, London, 1836.

⁵See Richard Carwardine, "American Religious Revivalism in Great Britain, c. 1826-c. 1863" Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1974, pp. 70-181; idem, *Transatlantic Revivalism 1790-1865* (forthcoming).

⁶Richard Carwardine, "The Second Great Awakening in the Urban Centers: An Examination of Methodism and the 'New Measures,'" *Journal of American History*, 59 (1972), pp. 327-40.

⁷James Matheson, *Our Country or The Spiritual Destitution of England Considered; and how far it can be supplied through lay agency, especially as employed by Congregational Churches*, London, 1839, pp. 31-37.

the north, in contrast to their own relative weakness there, led certain Baptists to adopt a more "methodistic" theology and practice.⁸ Sometimes the effects were far-reaching. William Steadman—as head of the Northern Education Society's college at Bradford—transmitted his admiration for an aggressive, muscle-flexing Methodism to a generation of young students who were to play a major rôle in Baptist efforts to evangelise the North; they included Charles Hill Roe and Charles Larom.⁹ Between churches, too, there were exchanges, especially at times of revival. Thomas Barker of Eccleshill testified to an experience common to other Baptists when he attributed the beginnings of his own revival to "a glorious change" already apparent in the neighbouring Methodist congregations.¹⁰

A similar feeling pervaded the parallel wing of Congregationalism. There were, broadly speaking, two emphases within Independency. On one side stood those churches which emphasised propriety in worship, conservatism in theology, and respectability in all things. They might be represented by young ministers, but they reflected the tradition of Old Dissent, often tracing their origin back to the seventeenth century and embracing the socially well-to-do. This was the case with the old meeting house at Norwich. Established under the Commonwealth, it became a socially important community in the eighteenth century, numbering amongst its members "men of money and position". Even its slight decline in the early nineteenth century did not affect its position as one of the wealthiest societies in East Anglia; everything continued to be conducted "with the greatest propriety on the part of the people", while Samuel Newton, their pastor, a be-wigged pipe-smoking autocrat, "ruled his flock with rather high handed notions of clerical authority."¹¹ This was the less aggressive, less evangelistic side of Congregationalism. It was in this soil that opposition to lay preaching flourished¹²; it was here that fastidious congregations objected

⁸Some Baptists, for example, made no bones about their admiration for the Methodist class-system and openly sought its adoption. *Baptist Reporter*, 6th ser. 2 (1843), pp. 67, 137, 249, which notes the tract by the Baptist evangelist, Bruton, *The Class System vindicated and recommended*.

⁹David Douglas, *History of Baptist Churches in the North of England, from 1648 to 1845*, London, 1846, p. 281; Olin C. Robinson, "Particular Baptists in England; 1760-1820", Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1963, p. 67; *Baptist Magazine*, 28 (1836), p. 295. During the 1830s Roe acted as the energetic secretary of the Baptist Home Missionary Society; later he settled as a pastor in Birmingham and, later still, emigrated to America. Larom was a central figure in the Sheffield revival of 1840. Eliza Roe Shannon, *A Minister's Life. Memoirs of Charles Hill Roe*, Chicago, 1900; Charles Larom, *Townhead. The History of the Baptist Church, assembling in Town-head Street, Sheffield*, Sheffield, 1870, pp. 14-15.

¹⁰*Revivalist*, 1834, pp. 251-52. Cf. *Baptist Reporter*, n.s. 1 (1844), p. 96, which spoke for many General Baptists when it said: "We had rather turn 'Ranters' at once, than become frigid, ice-bound baptists."

¹¹John Stoughton, *Reminiscences of Congregationalism Fifty Years Ago*, n.p., 1881, p. 6.

¹²James Matheson noted that the strongest prejudice against lay preaching existed in some of Congregationalism's "old and most respectable congregations", where pastoral authority was strongest. *Our Country*, p. 10.

to open-air preaching on the grounds that it was "not respectable".¹³ Its ministers were more likely to have been educated at the Stepney Institution or Doddridge's academy at Northampton and its successors than at Highbury; and through that education might have come a refinement and polish that stood in contradistinction to rough evangelism.¹⁴

In 1819 a second church was formed at Norwich, not through secession "but through the awakening effect of John Alexander's ministry. . . . It was a kind of revivalistic movement."¹⁵ Here was the other side of Independency—those churches that had been powerfully affected by or had grown out of the militancy of the Methodist Revival of the eighteenth century.¹⁶ It would be mistaken to categorise too rigidly: Congregational churches born in relative poverty through the care of an evangelical midwife, might well settle, with growing prosperity, into complacent, unevangelistic middle-age. Nevertheless, for many of this group of New Dissenters mission came before propriety, experiment before conservatism, aggression before respectability. Some suffered persecution of a kind well-known to Methodists in the cause of evangelism.¹⁷ Others found themselves more comfortably placed, but uneasy in their comfort. At Union Chapel, Islington, an "elegant structure" built by Episcopalian and Nonconformists jointly, Thomas Lewis expressed his regret at such finery: "Jesus Christ does not . . . require it—a plain building would have been better. . . . I feel my insufficiency—Oh, how ill-furnished, how unqualified, am I to appear before so respectable a congregation!"¹⁸ For these ministers education was seen as important only as a means to the end of conversion, and not as an end in itself.¹⁹ Doctorates of Divinity were to be rejected if they were simply for adornment.²⁰ In theology their moderate Calvinism might verge on Arminianism.²¹ In preaching they attacked the "wordy, unevangelical harangue", the cultivation of "an intricate and ornamental style of composition", especially by young ministers.²² Sermons should be colloquial, free from philosophical

¹³ *Congregational Magazine*, n.s. 8 (1844), pp. 788-89.

¹⁴ Education at Highbury "proceeded in lines laid by modern religious revivalism", Stoughton, *Reminiscences of Congregationalism*, pp. 11-14.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

¹⁶ Leaders of this movement, like William Roby in Lancashire, sometimes showed considerable hostility to older Dissent. *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, 43 (1830), pp. 225-31.

¹⁷ See, for example, John Sibree and M. Caston, *Independency in Warwickshire*, London, 1855, p. 320ff; *Congregational Magazine*, 12 (1829), pp. 332-33.

¹⁸ Thomas Lewis, *A Retrospect of the Moral and Religious State of Islington, during the last forty years*, London, 1842, p. 52; J. Burrell, *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Lewis, of Islington* London, 1853, p. 45.

¹⁹ *Congregational Magazine*, n.s. 9 (1845), p. 236.

²⁰ John Angell James refused such degrees from American colleges on at least two occasions. R. W. Dale, ed., *The Life and Letters of John Angell James: including an unfinished autobiography*, 2nd ed., London, 1861, pp. 256-60, 424-26.

²¹ Stoughton, *Reminiscences of Congregationalism*, pp. 51-53.

²² See, for example, *Congregational Magazine*, 10 (1827), p. 534; *Evangelical Magazine*, n.s. 10 (1832), pp. 293, 472-74; Andrew Reed, *The Advancement of Religion the Claim of the Times*, London, 1843, pp. 183-85.

speculation, direct and, if possible, extemporaneous.²³ There was great need for a more "earnest" ministry altogether, however "vulgar, ignorant, and methodical" it might appear.²⁴ These evangelical Congregationalists were also characterised by a lack of interest in tradition and denominational history. Hence their approach was more pragmatic than that of some of the older men, who disliked them.²⁵

It was to this group of hyper-evangelical Congregationalists that Methodist single-mindedness in soul-saving made the most successful overtures. A number of them had been weaned on Methodism, and the religious life of many more had been seasoned with Wesleyanism. Thomas Lewis, thirty-six years Congregational minister in Islington, had, after his "awakening" and conversion by Methodists in 1793, spent several years thereafter as a Methodist itinerant and lay preacher.²⁶ John Campbell spent over a year as a Methodist local preacher when a young man. Notwithstanding his later disillusionment with the "tyranny" of the Methodist system, he maintained great admiration for their evangelistic vigour.²⁷ John Angell James's life-long concern for "usefulness" and his sympathy, especially in his early ministry, for "excited religious affections", is partly attributable to the Methodism he knew in his youth. As a boy in Blandford, Dorset, he and his family belonged to an Independent congregation containing many of the town's "most respectable inhabitants" and "paralysed by respectability and dulness". His mother, critical of the "coldness and formality" of Congregational services, frequently took him to the Methodist meeting-room where she found "less polish, but more power".²⁸ Thomas Raffles and James Parsons were two others related to Methodism on their maternal side. John Liefchild represented those Congregationalists who had been active Methodists in their youth; Edward Baines showed an early sympathy for the Methodist New Connexion.²⁹

²³See the article on "American and English preaching" in *Congregational Magazine*, 15 (1832), pp. 353-67.

²⁴Andrew Reed, *An Efficient Ministry*, London, 1837, especially pp. 55-56.

²⁵Walter Wilson, *The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses, in London, Westminster and Southwark*, 4 vols. London, 1808-1814.

²⁶Burrell, *Memoir of Lewis*, pp. 7-13.

²⁷Robert Ferguson and A. Morton Brown, *Life and Labours of John Campbell*, D.D., London, 1868, pp. 24-25, 31-33, 59-62, 141; *Christian Witness*, 2 (1845), pp. 168-69.

²⁸"I set out in my ministry . . . with the idea of usefulness . . . deeply imprinted on my heart . . . I mean usefulness of one kind—that is, the direct conversion of souls." Dale, *Life of James*, pp. 7,21-23, 218-19. Throughout his life James was more ready than most Congregationalists to preach for Wesleyans, though his greatest regard was reserved for the Methodist New Connexion. *Ibid.*, pp. 596-97; William Guest, *A Tribute of Grateful Love to the Memory of the late John Angell James*, London, 1859, pp. 5, 14.

²⁹The movement of men such as Liefchild into Congregationalism prompts various questions about their motives. Did they leave Methodism for theological reasons, finding in modern Calvinism a more satisfactory interpretation of scripture? Were they rejecting a (Wesleyan) system of church organisation which they found too hierarchical and centralised? Was Methodism too "enthusiastic" for them? Did Congregationalism appear to offer them greater social status? Such questions deserve attention in their own right and a fuller treatment than can be given here.

Such experiences suggest that a large group of Independents were much more aware of Methodist practice and ready to absorb its lessons than is apparent from the bulk of Nonconformist literature. First, these more aggressive Congregationalists were cautious admirers of Methodist organisation. They supported demands for a Congregational Union to counter the centrifugal tendencies of the denomination, on the grounds that "Cohesion strengthens Methodism".³⁰ They were also envious of the Methodist class-system, for which Congregationalists had "unhappily" discovered no substitute. As John Blackburn argued, "The well-known efficiency of the private members of the Wesleyan Methodist connection is chiefly attributable to their frequent religious intercourse with their brethren at class and other meetings for christian fellowship."³¹ Secondly, they were prepared to admit the popularity of the inclusive, egalitarian appeal of Methodist Arminianism. They were aware that Calvinism despite its "modern" refinements, was in the popular mind still susceptible to distortion and misrepresentation as a doctrine that placed restrictions on the mercy of God and limited the operations of the Holy Spirit. Methodism taught concerned modern Calvinists the need to widen their appeals to sinners.³²

Thirdly, and most controversially, many were attracted by the fervent tone of Methodism and its single-minded making of conversion its primary end, often with little regard for social niceties (a fact made all the more emphatic by the vast numerical growth of the individual Methodist bodies). They learned uneasily of Congregational defections to Methodism, especially when the new loyalties were justified on the grounds that "The Independent ministers aim to preach doctrines, the Wesleyans to save souls." The warmth of Methodist worship that had attracted James's mother was still a powerful force three and four decades later, and Congregationalists noted the popular appeal of "thrilling music", "soul-piercing" appeals, audible congregational responses, "strange enthusiasms", and "boisterous excitement".³³ They were aware that the Methodist appeal to all the senses and the imagination, and not simply to the intellectual faculties, could be consistent with sincere, devotional worship. Accordingly, Congregationalists were urged towards revivalistic Methodism:

Methodism is a favourite with the public. . . . [E]ven the most boisterous and disorderly revival meetings, awaken in the popular mind more of admiration than disgust. . . . A man who has jested a thousand times about methodist conversions, if his conscience be touched, will run to this body, in preference to any other. . . . Should not we Independents do better, had we a few 'new measure men?' (to adopt a well-understood phrase).³⁴

Yet—and this is an important qualification—when the moment of decision arrived, almost all Congregationalists shied away from Methodist "enthusiasm" George Smith of Plymouth, despite his early work with the Tent Methodists of the Bristol area, rejected the idea of competition with Wesleyans, and argued

³⁰Stoughton, *Reminiscences of Congregationalism*, pp. 20-21.

³¹Congregational Magazine, n.s. 4 (1840), p. 768.

³²Ibid., n.s. 1 (1837), pp. 233-36.

³³Ibid., n.s. 8 (1844), pp. 342-44.

³⁴Ibid., n.s. 1 (1837), p. 236.

that "Our principles do obtain much of approbation and much of favour from the intelligent, educated, and thinking portion of the middle classes of society; and there is our stronghold."⁸⁵ Even Congregationalists sympathetic to Methodism found it hard to swallow its alleged revivalist rowdiness and irregularities. It was this in particular that had made "methodism" and "methodistic" into terms of abuse, and made even those who wanted Congregationalism to reach all strata in society reluctant to commit themselves to Methodist revivalism.⁸⁶

It was at precisely this point—where Methodism failed to provide an acceptable example of practical revivalism—that American revivalism secured an entry into the Congregationalist evangelical scheme. Until American revivalism made its major appearance in the late 1820s, Methodism, revivalism and irregularities in religion were generally synonymous amongst Nonconformists. "From the manner in which revivals have been talked about and promoted among Wesleyan Methodists", wrote William Orme in 1828, "I am afraid that a revival is considered by many something necessarily connected with fanaticism and extravagance".⁸⁷ John Angell James argued in the same year that in America "The subject [of revivals] is under no stigma of reproach", whereas in Britain a prejudice existed which "may have been produced by the noisy and disorderly scenes with which supposed Revivals have been attended amongst certain persons in this country",⁸⁸ a clear reference to both Methodist and Welsh revivals.⁸⁹ Many Nonconformists wanted a revival, "but then it is a quiet revival which would not offend against a refined taste. We do not wish to be ranked as enthusiasts, or to be shunned as fanatical by our respectable worldly connections."⁹⁰ For men like these, American revivalism offered an example of revivals—Calvinist revivals—which appeared to combine effectiveness with propriety. Nonconformists now had what they took to be an effective reply to the charge that revivals were equatable with Methodistic irregularity, for here was a new and successful brand of revivalism not yet tarred with the Methodist brush. No wonder that ministers like James, Lewis and Reed seized American example so enthusiastically; no wonder they were so eager to find authoritative rebuttals of Mrs. Trollope and other critics of American religion who were striking at the only contemporary examples of legitimate revivalism. They could not afford, if they were to do more than toy with revivalism, to

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, n.s. 4 (1840), pp. 775-76.

⁸⁶See, for example, George Redford, *Memoirs and Select Remains of the late Rev. John Cooke, forty-three years pastor of the Independent Church, Maidenhead, Berks.*, London, 1828.

⁸⁷Orme, *Discourses on the Holy Spirit*, p. 260.

⁸⁸*Evangelical Magazine*, n.s. 6 (1828), pp. 487-89.

⁸⁹Welsh revivals had a reputation for irregularity, though a broad assessment of Welsh revivalism was hampered by a language barrier that prevented the reliable spread of information. Visits to Welsh churches by Baptist and Congregational deputations sought to remedy this. *Baptist Magazine*, 29 (1837), pp. 365ff; *Congregational Magazine*, n.s. 5 (1841), pp. 70-71, 728-33.

⁹⁰*Congregational Magazine*, 12 (1829), p. 316. Cf. James, *Revival of Religion*, p. 6.

let American revivals fall into the same sort of discredit associated with the Methodist variety.

Within a few years, however, by the mid-1840s, it had become clear that American revivalism could not sustain the rôle thrust upon it by these evangelical Calvinists. The exuberant confidence and high expectations associated with the adoption of the American-style "revival system" began to evaporate as Baptists and Congregationalists complained of an annually declining rate of growth. That "system" itself—in its "means" and theology—took most of the blame for the decline. Critics argued that the calculated use of new measures ("Bellows-blowing, and systems of mechanical apparatus", as William Jay called them) by an irresponsible revivalist simply wound the psychological mainspring of a gullible congregation to breaking point and drove scores of unprepared but easily excitable hearers into precipitate church membership. On the revivalist's departure, the spring snapped, excitement declined, "converts" relapsed into a less hopeful state than they had known before his arrival, and several years of church disequilibrium ensued.⁴¹ The annual accessions at Surrey Chapel, London, in the two years after the revival stimulated by the American revivalist Edward Norris Kirk in 1838 were the lowest of the next ten years and served to temper James Sherman's initial enthusiasm for the new approach.⁴² Thomas Pulsford, a Baptist hero at the height of the revival boom of the late 1830s and early 1840s, and an admirer of Finney and Kirk, later became something of an outcast from his own denomination.⁴³ At the same time reports of relapse and disorder in the American churches emphasised to Nonconformist traditionalists that the older pattern of steady, gradual growth was more stable and less harmful than the explosive American strategy.⁴⁴

The integrity of the new revivalism was further questioned by its seeming erosion of theological standards, especially by the sprouting of heretical views on the rôle of the sinner in conversion—a development more or less attributable to the fertilising effect of American revival theology. Of central importance here was Finney's *Lectures on Revivals*, which in the 1830s had become the most popular handbook of a new race of evangelists and had received the endorsement of some of the intellectual leadership of Nonconformity. George Payne gave it his qualified approval; John Angell James's preface to the special English edition enjoined caution but was essentially commendatory; John Harris, tutor at Cheshunt College, presented each of his students with a copy.⁴⁵ It was possible to see Finney as simply driving home in strong language

⁴¹ *Congregational Magazine*, n.s. 4 (1840), pp. 888-89; *Baptist Magazine*, 33 (1841), p. 57.

⁴² Henry Allon, *Memoir of the Rev. James Sherman; including an unfinished Auto-biography*, 2nd ed., London, 1863, pp. 279-82, 331-32.

⁴³ *Baptist Recorder*, 3 (1846), pp. 72-73, 286-87; *Baptist Reporter*, n.s. 4 (1847), p. 210.

⁴⁴ *Christian Witness*, 2 (1845), pp. 151-60, 438-88.

⁴⁵ George Payne, "Introductory Preface" to Charles G. Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, London, 1839, pp. v-vi; J. A. James, "Introductory Preface", *ibid.*, p.v.; *Oberlin Evangelist*, 18 June 1845.

the message of human responsibility then being argued by British authors like Thomas Jenkyn and John Howard Hinton. Finney's works would, it was thought, achieve much good by pressing on the sinner his duty and ability to repent immediately, at a time when the prevailing tendency of Nonconformist preaching and theology was "too scholastic, stiff and cold".⁴⁶ But views changed quickly once the drift of this theology became apparent. John Angell James, who in late 1840 thought that "responsibility can[not] be too much dwelt upon and pressed home", had in less than two years reached the conclusion "that our danger . . . lies in going over to the opposite extreme, to the neglect of Divine sovereignty".⁴⁷ The enormous influence of Finney's works, and his imitation by others, had given unprecedented circulation to the view that men could convert themselves. Finney himself may not have intended it, but his incautious language and the uncritical reading of his works had helped fashion an approach that in practice ignored, if it did not deny, the work of the Spirit. The early sympathisers with American revival theology withdrew from their exposed position. When James told the Congregational Union in October, 1843, that he regretted ever having given his imprimatur to Finney's *Lectures* he typified those who had earlier welcomed American-style revivalism as a means of avoiding the "enthusiasm" and theological crudities of Methodist revivals, but who had come with disappointment to see that the imported variety had dangers of their own.⁴⁸

RICHARD CARWARDINE

⁴⁶Baptist Magazine, 30 (1838), pp. 149-54; Dale, *Life of James*, pp. 283-84.

⁴⁷Dale, *Life of James*, pp. 283-84; Congregational Magazine, n.s. 6 (1842), pp. 790-93.

⁴⁸Congregational Magazine, n.s. 7 (1843), pp. 953f; Dale, *Life of James*, pp. 418-21.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES

Reformed World: Vol. 34, Nos. 5-8.

These issues continue the exposition of the Centennial Theme, "The Glory of God and the future of man", by observers from other traditions, and then give a report of the proceedings at St. Andrews and of the findings which emerged from the discussions in various workshops at the Consultation. As usual, there are also reports from various members of the worldwide Alliance of Reformed Churches.

The Baptist Quarterly: Vol. XXVII, Nos. 1-4.

In these numbers there are biographical articles on Thomas Lambe and Thomas Lambe, two Baptists who in the past have been mistaken for each other, and also on George William Gordon. There are also articles (including one by Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall) reproducing or editing or analysing various collections of letters to and from Baptists. Articles by C. F. Stell and E. B. Hardy deal with life in Baptist Associations. Dr. E. A. Payne contributes a history of the Downs Chapel, Clapton. The Editor has provided a massive catalogue of the flood of ninety-seven Baptist periodicals issued during the period from 1790 to 1865. There is a fascinating article on the Victoria History of the Counties of England by its editor, Dr. R. B. Pugh.

Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society: Vol. XLI, Parts 1, 2, 3.

These parts contain a variety of articles dealing with Methodism in E. Anglia and in S.E. Scotland. There is an important article by A. Raymond George on The Methodist Service Book.

Cylchgrawn Hanes (Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church of Wales), New Series, No. 1.

In this number the former distinguished editor, Gomer M. Roberts, hands over the reins to a young colleague, J. Ellis Wynne Davies, and the new series promises well. There is an article by H. R. Davies on Ebenezer Richard of Tregaron, and the new editor contributes a fresh assessment of the enigmatic John Elias. Dr. Edwin Welch contributes a collection of the letters of Thomas and Sarah Charles.

Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society: Vol. XVI, No. 3.

Among articles in this issue is an appreciation of George and Dorothy Tarrant and an enquiry into Irish non-subscribing Presbyterianism in the nineteenth century.

Presbyterian Historical Society of New Zealand. Our society is in correspondence with this society, and has received a copy of its Annual Lecture for 1976: D. G. Bound, *The Ministry of Rev. John Strachan Moir (1809–1895), First Moderator of the Wellington Presbytery*, pp. 24.

R.B.K.

REVIEW ARTICLE

A Gathered Church: the Literature of the English Dissenting Interest, 1700–1930. by Donald Davie. Pp. 152, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and Henley, 1978, £4.25.

The thesis of this book is that the Dissenters made a valuable contribution to English literature in the first half of the eighteenth century; but that there was then a steady and catastrophic decline into philistinism. The exposition is clear, intelligible and never solemn. Professor Davie has an enviable power to stimulate. Anyone would enjoy his book.

Watts and, to a lesser extent, Doddridge are held up as praiseworthy models of "simplicity, sobriety and measure", there being "a connection no less binding" "between Calvinism and 'classicism'" than there is "between Methodistical Evangelicalism and Romanticism" (25–6). "Enthusiasm" and evangelicism then swept over Dissent and swamped it, producing in Blake a pitiful martyr to "the democratizing of Scripture" (54); and in the nineteenth century, apart from the Unitarians, an eccentric such as the Sandemanian Faraday and the startling exception of Mark Rutherford (early a renegade!), Dissent became "as philistine as the Church had always said it was" (56–7).

Delivered as the Clark Lectures at Cambridge in 1976, three of the six chapters which make up the book were published in the *Times Literary Supplement*. A fourth appeared in these pages. To find fault will thus seem both impertinent and ungracious. The treatment of eighteenth-century Dissent is open to serious criticism, none the less.

Professor Davie describes "Wesleyanism" as a "very special form of Dissent" (4), which it never was, in the sense that either Wesleyans or Dissenters understood Dissent in the eighteenth century, and writes of "the Wesleyan movement" (9) as embracing Whitefield, who in fact sharply opposed it. He regards the Moravianism of Count Zinzendorf as "plainly related" (45) to the Ranters of Cromwell's time, which is plain rubbish. He says that the eighteenth-century Orthodox Dissenters "denounced millenarianism" (101), whereas the missionary societies they founded (like some of their missionary hymns which we still sing) arose directly from their millenarianism, which at the end of the eighteenth century was again as much a point of difference between Independents and New Presbyterians as it was between Independents and Old Presbyterians in the 1640s. On the other hand, Professor Davie cannot accept the New Presbyterians (or Unitarians) as "as much part of Dissent as their Calvinist forebears had been" (134), which, like it or not, they were.

Having thus fudged who the Dissenters were, and confused their various positions and inter-relations, Professor Davie presents Watts and Doddridge as representative of "firm and consistent opposition to Methodism from within Dissent" (43), distrustful of "enthusiasm" and skilful in "accommodation" to current rationalizing tendencies. The facts are otherwise. While during the eighteenth century the Presbyterians became increasingly "rational" and "accommodating" in response to one contemporary pressure, in response to another the Independents were increasingly "awakened" and "renewed"; and in the latter movement Watts and Doddridge were early leaders. Though cool towards Whitefield, Watts took a many-sided interest in the new evangelical stirrings—the more remarkable in one born as far back as 1674. He was friendly to the Pietists and commended Zinzendorf, who visited him at Stoke Newington. With Guyse, he published an English edition of Jonathan Edwards's *Surprizing Account* of the Great Awakening in New England. Watts also prompted Doddridge to write *The Rise & Progress of Religion in the Soul*.

According to Professor Davie, the attention paid to Watts as a poet, save by hymnologists or by historians of Dissent, whether fifty years ago or to-day, is nil. This is not the case. "In every age since that of Watts", A. P. Davis wrote in 1948 in *Isaac Watts: his life and times*, "there have been scholars who have found that Watts's poetry . . . is in the main well written and on occasion very good". Davis calls in aid not only Johnson, Cowper and Southey but in the present century Saintsbury, Cazamian and V. de Sola Pinto, with a dozen less well known writers in England, America and Germany. More recently we have had Dr. J. H. P. Pafford's fine edition of *Divine Songs* (1971).

As an example "of what Watts meant by 'sinking' his style" (29), Professor Davie points to Watts's use of the word "Plantation" in "We are a Garden wall'd around":

And all his Springs in Sion flow.
To make the young Plantation grow.

This he calls "a pungently topical allusion, historically resonant," to "Plymouth Plantation or the Plantation of Ulster". But plants are in the passage in the Song of Solomon (as is "plantation" in another, similar, passage, in Ezekiel xvii. 7): Watts is simply paraphrasing; and any smart *double entendre* would be exactly what he did *not* mean by "sinking" his style. What he did mean is evident from a letter to Doddridge in which he expresses satisfaction that Doddridge has accepted his advice "to reduce the Language" in *The Rise & Progress* "into easier Words and plainer Periods. . . . Some of our Servants do not Understand your Writings when they are read in the Parlour".

On another page A. E. Housman's judgment on four lines of Watts—"That simple verse, bad rhyme and all, is poetry beyond Pope"—is dismissed by Professor Davie as "*exactly wrong*" (35), since for him Watts's poetry is as classical as Pope's. This is perhaps to miss the point. The lines (which Professor Davie does not quote) are these, from Watts's "Cradle-Song":

Soft and easy is thy cradle:

Coarse and hard thy Saviour lay:

When his birthplace was a stable,

And his softest bed was hay.

Whether characteristic of Watts or not and however one may define it, surely there is a tone here that in terms of *The Name and Nature of Poetry* would justly appeal to Housman, and is at the other end of the gamut from Pope. In his introduction to *The Oxford Book of Christian Verse* (1940), in which both Watts and Doddridge have a place, Lord David Cecil writes of Watts's "spontaneous sentiment, a gift of song which raised his best hymns to the level of the true lyric". A. P. Davis, after thirty pages of careful, balanced and not untechnical discussion, sums up similarly. Watts's poetry "is the best lyrical expression of eighteenth century evangelicalism". "He put into verse the thoughts, emotions, hopes, and fears of the thousands of everyday Englishmen left outside by the religion of the Compromise". This is a sensitive judgment and a good deal closer to the title of Professor Davie's book, *The Gathered Church*.

Doddridge, again, had friends among the Pietists and was a correspondent of Zinzendorf, who rode out to St. Albans to meet him. Doddridge was praying for Whitefield as early as 1736, when Whitefield was still at Oxford, and was consistent (though not uncritical) in admiration of him, especially after the death of "that Miracle of Divine Grace" Colonel Gardiner, Doddridge's popular *Life* of whom was disliked by some precisely because of its "enthusiasm". Doddridge also supported both the village preaching at home and the missionary efforts overseas which in part sprang from the new impulses activated by Whitefield and were to transform Orthodox Dissent from within.

In view of these concerns it is of interest that Doddridge was an admirer of Gothic cathedrals, ruined castles and the "romantick & antique". It is also revealing that Blair's *The Grave* (1743), "the first and best of a whole series of mortuary poems", which "rests solely upon its merit as romantic poetry" (Gosse), was sent by its author to both Watts and Doddridge for their approval before it was published. Doddridge, like Watts, had a high regard for Pope.

In a verse in "Hark! the glad sound" he even tried his hand at conscious imitation. It is the verse which in *Congregational Praise* is starred as suitable for omission! Doddridge has his own note, and writes best when he gives it free rein. There is "classical culture" in his hymns, certainly. "But the greatness of Doddridge is this," as Dr. Routley wrote in 1951, "that he laid hold on Isaac Watts' soaring adorations and majestic visions and brought them down to earth so that, even more than in the hymns of Watts, they might become the property of the people". Doddridge is always celebrating the relationship between the converted soul and God, and his favourite themes are joy and rejoicing.

Professor Davie's grounds for including Blake among the Dissenters are left obscure; but if Blake has a place here, his tribute to Whitefield in *Milton* is worth noting:

He sent his two Servants, Whitefield & Westley: were they Prophets,
Or were they Idiots or Madmen? shew us Miracles-
Can you have greater Miracles than these? Men who devote
Their life's whole comfort to intire scorn & injury & death?

Whitefield, who as a philistine is to Professor Davie "one of the villains of our piece" (89), at least stuck to his last, which was preaching. Both his sermons and journals include passages of description and autobiography which for vivid immediacy owe no apology to anyone. Stoughton justly delineates him as "capable of packing up his ideas in short unmistakable sentences" and as "expert in the use of interrogatories, exclamations, and apostrophes": "his zeal knew no affectation".

Though they are not related to the text, Professor Davie's book is attractively illustrated by a number of photographs, mainly of eighteenth-century meeting-houses. There are more than thirty pages of vigorous notes and a full index.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL

SHORTER REVIEWS

The Saints of Scotland. By E. S. Towill. Pp. x, 148, St. Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1978. £1.95.

This is a beautifully-produced volume containing a series of brief articles on saints to whom one or more churches in Scotland have been dedicated. There are the famous figures such as Columba, Ninian, Cuthbert and Kentigern and there are also the shadowy figures who are little more than names on the scroll of history. The author gives guidance as to further reading and seeks to disentangle fact from legend. It does not profess to be a complete list; there is, for example, no mention of Kessog to whom several churches are dedicated. In this volume Mr. Towill will give as much pleasure to his readers as he did in his *People and Places in the story of the Scottish Church*.

R.B.K.

The Origins of European Dissent. By R. I. Moore. Pp. xi, 322, Allen Lane, London, 1977, £8.50.

Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus. By Malcolm Lambert. Pp. xvi, 430, Edward Arnold, London, 1977, £15.

The difficult study of unorthodox religious movements in the earlier middle ages has not been one to which English scholars have on the whole made a great contribution, although in Europe and America much has been written. But recently two considerable books have appeared from native authors which will last. R. I. Moore begins in the late tenth century and ends with the reaction of the establishment to the Albigensians in the early thirteenth century. This ground is but part of the field worked by Malcolm Lambert, as his title makes clear. Where they overlap there are many interesting contrasts of interpretation which those already familiar with the subject will enjoy. Mr. Lambert, for example, is more inclined to attribute the similarities between those heresies which appeared in the eleventh century to infections brought into Western Europe from the East, than Mr. Moore is. Their emphases, and possibly their sympathies, are different too. Moore is not primarily concerned with a history of heresy but with its connections with changes in society at large. This is not to suggest that he is a reductionist who would trace all changes in men's ideas to changes in their economic situation, but he is always looking out for shifts of power in society and to the lot of the people who supported unsound ideas. Lambert too is well aware of the weaknesses of interpreting heresies as movements of class protest, but he writes more for the standpoint of the establishment, describing heresy as "an elusive crime", or the taking of titles by Cathar bishops "an impudent imitation of Catholicism". His book will, however, prove an indispensable aid for the future since it is based on an astonishing range of literature in many languages. I suspect Moore's book will be read with more enjoyment; he tells a good story well (and some astonishing ones are involved), and again and again enlivens his discussion with a witty and pertinent phrase. The modern reader who happens also to be an adherent to the Reformed tradition which has its roots in the sixteenth century will find in both books much to ponder. So many of the views which turn up in the middle ages, a dislike of infant baptism and rejection of the mass, for example, seem familiar, but the context in which they occur is often strange. It is clear too that much of the heresy of the twelfth century developed in relationship with the drastic attempt which the orthodox church was making to reform itself, that movement so often called the Gergorian reform. Its drive to establish celibacy among the clergy, for example, included efforts to dissuade people from sharing in the sacraments administered by married priests, which in part was responsible for creating doubt in some minds about the sacramental system of the church. Here are themes which surely occur again in later periods, and which those who ponder radical reform may perhaps profitably consider. History may indeed never repeat itself, but the past does indeed show how the intentions of the best of men often have curious effects.

CHRISTOPHER HOLDSWORTH

Reformation, Conformity and Dissent. Essays in honour of Geoffrey Nuttall.
Edited by R. Buick Knox. Pp. 302, Epworth Press, London, 1977, £8.50.

This collection of essays in this Festchrift for Geoffrey Nuttall struck the reviewer in two ways. First for the interesting and fresh studies offered by the contributors, an impression one could have expected from such a distinguished group of scholars, yet which needs saying, for each essay has its own particular value, alike for student and scholar. The second impression was the happy testimony they bore to the impressive range of Nuttall's life work. One is reminded of Nuttall's own contribution not only to Puritanism and its ramifications in the Reformation and beyond, but also what his studies have meant to him in his ministry; a fine Biblical scholarship, a keen and sensitive historical insight, and above all that characteristic of true Puritanism, a disciplined life with clear-eyed devotion to Jesus Christ. The essays have a propriety in keeping with Nuttall's own contribution to the field over nearly fifty years of writing.

The essayists (from Britain, Europe and America) write in three main fields from their researches:— new and fresh insights into historic personages of the Reformation and Puritan eras; the consequences for the Reformation of the rise of national churches; and the ramifications of Puritan dissent. Geoffrey Dickens writes a splendid essay on Johannes Sleidan, and makes his fresh and incisive criticisms of Reformation historiographers. Owen Chadwick writes on the Elector Palatine, Frederick III, with his usual urbane wit, and throws an interesting light on Frederick's critical concern with the Reformation, as well as the development of Heidelberg as a Reformation centre. There are essays by B. R. White on Henry Jessey, by Basil Hall on Defoe, and by John F. Wilson on Jonathan Edwards, as well as by van den Berg who compares and contrasts William Ames and Petrus Serrarius.

Other essays handle localised issues, areas for which Dickens is constantly making appeals for detailed study. Thus we have Patrick Collinson on Suffolk, Tudur Jones on the Welsh Puritans, Vavasor Powell and Morgan Lloyd. Buick Knox provides a detailed and well-researched study of the bishops of the seventeenth century as preachers. Christopher Hill provides a sympathetic examination of what Occasional Conformity meant in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and Richard Greaves a fresh survey of the nature of the Puritan tradition.

As indicated earlier each essay is a worthy contribution in its own right, but collectively they bear a fine witness to the depth and range of Nuttall's own work and ministry.

The book is finely produced, with an index. It also has a splendidly natural photograph of Geoffrey Nuttall critically examining a text.

JAMES ATKINSON