

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. 4. OCTOBER 1979

CONTENTS

Editorial and Note	93
Ordination: Aspects of a Tradition								
by <i>John Huxtable, M.A., D.D.</i>	94
English and Canadian Presbyterians in Taiwan, 1895-1925: A Brief Survey								
by <i>A. Hamish Ion, M.A., Ph.D.</i>	107
Review Article: <i>The Diary of James Clegg . . . 1708-1755</i>								
by <i>Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.</i> ,	112
Reviews by <i>Stephen Mayor, R. Buick Knox, A. N. Cass, John Huxtable,</i>								
<i>Clyde Binfield,</i>	117
Accessions to the Library	123
Our Contemporaries	124

Editorial

“Ordination: Aspects of a Tradition”, originally delivered in London, on 8th May 1979, as the Society’s Annual Lecture, marks Dr. Huxtable’s first *presidential* contribution to our Journal. We also welcome Hamish Ion’s survey of thirty years of Presbyterian missionary endeavour in Taiwan; foreign missions too often enter the Journal by a back door. Dr. Ion is a Canadian who has a Fellowship at the Centre of Japanese Studies at Sheffield, and is currently at Doshisha University, Kyoto.

Exigencies of space mean that Alan Sell’s article on Henry Rogers must, in company with several reviews of important books, be kept over to the next issue.

Note: Dr. Nuttall’s newly published calendar of the correspondence of Philip Doddridge will be reviewed in a later issue. The 250th anniversary of Doddridge’s ordination is being celebrated in other ways, and from 23rd March to 18th May 1980 there is to be a commemorative festival in Northampton, to include services, exhibitions and lectures at Doddridge and Commercial Street United Reformed Church, local museums and the University Centre.

ORDINATION: ASPECTS OF A TRADITION

Some years ago a former President of this Society and I assisted in an ordination in what was then a Congregational Church in Bournemouth. That was on a Saturday. On the following day we started our journey back to London. But where should we go to morning service? Very diffidently, at least I think so, I remarked that I had sometimes wished that I could worship in Winchester Cathedral; and I was agreeably surprised when this was promptly agreed. When we parked the car as near to the Cathedral as we could, the crowds already making their way to the Cathedral were large enough to suggest that something special was to happen; but we did not know what it was until we were well within the building and as comfortably seated as a cathedral ever makes possible. Very soon we realised that this was to be an ordination, too, presided over by the suffragan Bishop of Southampton. Two ordinations on successive days: different ordinations; or was the difference one of outward form only? Beneath the different rituals was there an identical intention and reality?

That episode sharpened a question that had often been in my mind; and it has recurred often since. What do we mean by ordination to the Christian ministry? To whom is ordination applicable? How and by whom is the rite properly performed? By whom will it be recognised when it is done? All these questions are a considerable part of the large change of ecumenical discussion; and those of this party and of that will readily explain why this or that is the right understanding and practice of ordination and make some claim to provide historical and theological justification for their preference. All will make some claim to find ultimate justification in Scripture, understood in each case in the light of a particular tradition. What the New Testament writers would make of some claims made on the basis of their writings it would be worth a king's ransom to know; but we are not in a position to pay that price. In any case, it is not our present purpose to enter into any ecumenical argument. Rather we are to look at some of the evidence concerning a particular tradition. Those of the Congregational Way had certain convictions about the Church and therefore about the Ministry, what it was and who should be admitted to it, and how. It is important in passing to note the *order* of that sentence, which I am sure represents the conviction of those we are considering: church and ministry. What you believed about ministry derived from your convictions about the Church; and our fathers in the Faith would not have understood, still less approved, any attempt at ecclesiastical reconciliation which treated ministry as if it were a separable and even isolated element in the Church. Still less would they have understood or approved the notion that some new form of the Church could be designed simply by arriving at some fresh understanding of the ministry.

About ordination in Congregational Churches it may be said without fear of contradiction that the power of ordination rested in the local church, often described in the earlier documents as "a particular church". This consisted of a fellowship (usually covenanted) of committed believers who were Orthodox Dissenters. According to the Savoy Declaration (1658)¹ such particular Churches are "intrusted with power" from the Lord for their "carrying on that Order of Worship and Discipline, which he hath instituted for them to observe with Commands and Rules,

¹All references to the Savoy Declaration are from A. G. Matthews, ed., *The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order*, 1658, 1959.

for the due and right existing and executing of that Power” (Article IV). Such Churches consisted of Officers and Members. These Officers are to be chosen and set apart by the Church. They are Pastors, Teachers, Elders and Deacons. Article VI expressly says that “besides these particular Churches, there is not instituted by Christ any Church more extensive or Catholique entrusted with power for the administration of his ordinances, or the execution of any authority in his name”. These particular Churches were in fact in communion with other such Churches, as this Declaration makes clear in subsequent articles; but what precisely was the nature of this communion in practice as well as in theory did in fact raise some questions and cause some tensions. What, to instance an illustration which is of particular relevance here, was the part to be taken, if any, by the Pastors and Messengers from neighbouring Churches in an ordination? Or was it in order for a particular Church to ordain its Pastor without either reference to or the presence of these neighbours?

It is to try to track some of the answers to these and kindred questions that this paper is intended.

Anyone who studies earlier ordinations in the Congregational tradition must at once remark on the length of the proceedings and the thoroughness of the examination of the candidate. Whereas in this century we have been content to receive the leaving certificate of an approved college or be provided with some other commendatory evidence, hear the candidate deliver a relatively brief and sometimes unduly autobiographical statement of faith, and hear his (or her) answers to the formal questions put by the presiding minister, to those of an earlier generation our practice would have seemed skimpy and even slipshod.

Consider, for example, the ordination (probably in 1674) of Timothy Jollie and John Chorlton. This was remarkable for one thing in that Presbyterians and Independents shared in the ordination. Dr Robert Halley says that “on these occasions several candidates were usually ordained in the same place.”² On this occasion those responsible for the ordination began their work on the first day at 10 a.m. After prayer, the candidate(s) preached a sermon before “a considerable congregation”. The people then retired, and the ministers examined the candidate in logic, philosophy, languages and divinity. Through some oversight apparently no Latin thesis had been prepared. Instead the candidate had to engage in an extemporaneous debate on whether all candidates for baptism should be baptised, and the inference is that this discussion was conducted in Latin. This, says the record, continued until 6 p.m. “and that was enough for the first day”. At 7 a.m. on the following day, the ministers resumed their work. Two of them prayed and Mr. Heywood gave the charge.

This was an ordination in which Presbyterians and Independents shared, and so far, it is recorded, the Presbyterian usage was followed; but at a certain point the Presbyterian ministers retired, only the Independent members remaining. “In their absence an officer of the Church read a letter of dismission from the church to which Mr. Jollie had belonged in London; thereafter the members formally called him and expressed their concurrence”. The services on that second day occupied about twelve hours.

That short digression to show that the Independents had opportunity to follow their consuetudinary practice must not divert our attention from the thoroughness of the examination to which candidates were expected to submit. It sometimes

²R. Halley, *Lancashire, its Puritanism and Nonconformity*, 1869, Vol. ii, pp.249 et seq.

happened that sermons and other utterances at ordinations were subsequently printed and published; and such as I have seen are evidence of the exhaustive nature of this examination. The confession of faith by John Angus, when he was ordained at Bishop's Stortford on October 26th 1748, runs from pages 19-44 and deals with twenty-nine points of doctrine.³ Five years earlier (October 27th 1743) at the ordination of Thomas Gibbons at Haberdashers' Hall, London, the confession of faith covers pages 17-34; it also deals with twenty-nine points of doctrine.⁴ No doubt these young men had been trained at a recognized Academy; but the ordaining ministers and the Church on whose behalf they were acting were not taking it for granted that the candidates were therefore sound in the faith. They needed to hear for themselves not only that the candidates believed themselves to be called to the ministry; they needed also to know whether they truly held the faith once for all delivered to the saints and would be sound preachers of the Gospel.

Any reader of these accounts of earlier ordinations would also note the frequent use of a strange phrase. Often it is said that the minister had been ordained "over" the Church and that the members are expected to "obey" him.

The Rev. George Porter, who had been a Proctor in the University of Oxford when John Owen was Vice-Chancellor, was minister at Clare, Suffolk. It was said of him that "he could not approve that the ruling of church officers should be by popular suffrage; or that the people should govern their officers. And yet he held that the people had just rights and privileges which must not in the least be infringed; and that therefore the due satisfaction of the church could and ought to be sought by every wise and just governor." In a word, he held that it was the pastor's and elder's part to rule, and the people's to obey; but both "in the Lord". He took notice that this was thrice commanded in one chapter, Hebrews xiii 7, 17, 24.⁵ At Thomas Gibbons's ordination in 1743, the sermon by Dr. John Guyse refers almost *en passant* to the duty of the people to "receive the Instructions and Admonitions, which he from time to time, may deliver to you in the Name of Christ, and according to his Will", and to "submit to him in the Lord".⁶ "In the Lord" is no doubt the clue to the way in which this is to be understood, or at least came to be understood, as two quite separate statements made in 1834 and 1861 indicate. At the ordination of Samuel Davis at Needham Market (18th April 1834) the charge delivered by the Rev. E. Henderson has a penultimate paragraph which reads, "It is, therefore, your duty to teach the disciples to observe all things, whatsoever Christ hath commanded, and jointly with them, to yield a ready, universal, and uncompromising compliance with the requirements of his will. No force is to be employed but the force of truth; no authority is to avail but the authority of the Redeemer; no yoke is to be imposed but his, which is easy; and no burden is to be laid on the shoulders of his followers but that which he sanctions, and which he has pronounced to be light".⁷ At the ordination of John B. Figgis at Brighton, Samuel Martin of Westminster preached on Hebrews xiii 17, "obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves", and described the obedience required as "a free following of the leader,

³J. Guyse, *Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Reverend Mr. John Angus*, 1748, pp.19-44. The bulk of such references come from the collection of ordination sermons formerly at New College, London, and now at Dr. Williams's Library.

⁴J. Guyse, *Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Reverend Mr. Thomas Gibbons*, 1743, pp.17-34.

⁵*Congregational Magazine* 1828, pp.345, 572.

⁶J. Guyse, *Collection of Seventeen Practical Sermons*, 1756, p.314.

⁷E. Henderson, *Pastoral Vigilance*, 1834.

whether his leading to be quite in harmony with the wishes of those whom he guides or not"; but he is so to lead "in accordance with all the precepts of our Saviour". After citing appropriate Gospel passages, Mr. Martin said, "Let us then put aside the idea of domination which might seem to be, but is not required. Implicit obedience and absolute submission are here entirely out of the question", for obedience is rendered to the leader not as a man but as a servant of Christ; and he claimed that "this renders the obedience spontaneous and easy"⁸

It must be admitted at once that such a way of speaking of a minister's authority would nowadays be most unwelcome, especially to those who are apt to stress the "democratic" nature of Congregationalism and who tend at their worst to regard the minister as little more than a lay leader of the congregation. On the other hand, the more one hears and reads of some of the ministers in the hey-day of late Victorian and Edwardian Nonconformity, the more evident it is that some ministers, especially those influenced by such "giants" as Joseph Parker, exercised an autocratic authority such as a prelate might envy. They expected obedience and brooked no contradiction. If we regard both these extremes as aberrations, what are we to make of the original assertion that a minister was ordained "over" the Church and that he was to "rule" it?

We may begin by remembering that hierarchy in any form of corporate life was easily acceptable in the seventeenth century. Would it not have seemed quite "natural" for there to be those who should exercise authority in the State? Why should it not be so in the Church? If within the Established Church that authority was wrongly exercised, our Fathers did not apparently seek to abolish all authority but rather to see it better and more regularly exercised.

That general observation needs to be qualified at once by remembering that both minister and people were deemed to be equally under another authority; the Word of God. In a way that is now much less familiar the minister and his people were students of the Bible, digging together, to use P. T. Forsyth's phrase, in the same quarry. As the minister expounded the Scriptures and sought to show the pattern of faith and life which should be consequent upon its teaching, he was, so to say, leading his people in a quest in which they also were involved. While he would be recognized as exercising his ministry faithfully, they were duty bound to follow him; but if, whether in doctrine or practice, he should err, his authority was surely deemed to have ceased, or at least to be open to question. We may look back with some distaste and even amusement in some cases at the arguments about faith and practice which took place, and we may think that the points at issue were so fine that the conflict was scarcely worth the powder and shot expended; but for those involved the ultimate issue was important. Were the people being rightly led? Was the minister faithful in his calling? Were the people dutifully to follow when they were unconvinced that his leading was faithful? If the word "obey" is understood in a persuasive sense and if the response to the minister's leading was to be in the nature of willing consent, we can the more readily understand what our fathers were talking about in this context; and it may be that there is here something about the ministry, both in the exercise of it and the expected response to it, which we would do well to emulate.

⁸Discourses delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. John B. Figgis, Brighton, n.d., pp.28 et seq.

Before I come to the main issues which I wish to raise, there are two quite important matters which I mention now because they are of interest to those who wish to understand how ministry was understood by Congregationalists in an earlier day. I raise them as questions which one whose primary interest is theological would wish to put to the historian.

It is well known, for instance, that it often happened that a Church would call a man to its ministry and that his ordination would take place quite a time after he had served the Church as a preacher. The purpose of this interval was, presumably, to "taste the spirit" of the young man and to make sure that he and his people suited one another; and in view of the fact that long, and sometimes life-long, pastorates were frequent, this was no doubt a prudent measure. One instance of this is found in the life of Thames Harmer of Wattisfield, Suffolk. He was born in Norwich in 1715, and was educated under "the learned Mr. Eames". In 1734, when still only nineteen years old, he was chosen to succeed Thomas Wilkes who had died about a year earlier. We read that Harmer was chosen "with great unanimity and affection"; yet although he came to live among the Wattisfield people, "he absolutely refused to undertake the pastoral care till he should arrive beyond the age of the laws of the country have thought fit to make the limit of childhood".⁹ It was evidently a successful settlement, for he remained at Wattisfield until his death on November 27th 1788; and his writings display his learning and explain the wide influence that he had. But what was his status between his coming to Wattisfield and his ordination? Did this mean that no observance of the Lord's Supper took place in this interval? This may well have been so, since it was widely, if not universally, held at that time that only the Pastor of the Church should preside at the Lord's Table. If so, did Harmer perform most if not all other pastoral duties as a sort of "lay pastor" or "probationer"?

These are interesting questions in themselves; but they are the more so in the light of some remarks by Isaac Watts made to a man who had not been ordained as pastor "and yet seemed somehow to be", as we would say, "in the ministry". Thomas Scott of Lowestoft had been a fellow student with Watts, and is described as "a constant preacher" at Lowestoft for about eighteen years; but the people there were not a separate Church and he was not pastor. What, then, was he? In a letter dated November 1st 1709, Isaac Watts offers an opinion: "You speak of yourself and the rest of your order (i.e. unordained ministers) as wanting a name. I think you are ministers of Christ and ordinary evangelists. A person whose gifts have been approved by a Church of Christ, and its elders, who devoted himself solemnly and publicly to the work of the Gospel, who is thereupon sent forth by the elders and brethren of a Church, with a word of exhortation and prayer, is, in my opinion, a minister of the Gospel." Watts goes on to suggest that such a person "has authority to baptize"; but, he goes on, "the Lord's Supper being an ordinance of communion with one another, etc., seems to require a more particular union to a single Church; but if any are otherwise minded, I shall not be angry with 'em. Note, if there are no elders in a Church which sends forth a minister, it is (at least) prudentially necessary to have the approbation and assistance of neighbouring ministers, if such can be had".¹⁰ This last remark is an interesting illustration of the communion of Churches which was a feature of Congregationalism in this period and is in fact a

⁹J. Browne, *History of Congregationalism and Memorials of the Churches in Norfolk and Suffolk*, 1877, pp.471-3.

¹⁰T. Milner, *The Life, times and correspondence of Isaac Watts*, 1834, pp.231-2.

modification of the strict form of Independency. Of greater interest, however, is the existence of a ministry which was seen as wider than the pastorate of a particular Church; but ordination, it seems, was confined to the pastoral office, while the evangelists, if that is the right way to describe them, were not ordained, but some kind of commissioning service, as we might call it, was thought appropriate and possibly "prudentially necessary". I suppose that Acts xiii, 1-3, which describes the sending forth of Barnabas and Saul, might have been cited as a precedent; and Watts's argument could well have been used when later in the century the London Missionary Society sent evangelists overseas.

In the Savoy Declaration (1658) there are to be detected two emphases in Congregationalism which it was always rather difficult to hold in balance. On the one hand, there is, of course, a clear statement of Independency. Particular Churches are each of them the seat of the power which Christ has been pleased to "communicate to his Saints" (Art. V); and we have already noted the Officers which each of them should have. The essence of the call of a Pastor "consists in the Election of the Church, together with his acceptance of it, and separation by Fasting and Prayer" (Art. XII). Ordination without the consent of the Church "doth not constitute any person a Church-officer, or communicate Office-power unto him" (Art. XV). In none of these articles is there any suggestion that the appointment of such officers, particularly of Pastors, had anything to do with other Independent Churches; and it could be argued that a particular or local Church could ordain a pastor without the presence or participation of representatives of other Churches. On the other hand, Articles XXV, XXVI and XXVII say that such Churches ought "to hold communion amongst themselves for their peace, increase of love, and mutual edification" (XXV). In case of difficulty or differences it is according to the mind of Christ that messengers from such Churches may meet together in a Synod or Council but it is emphatically stated that Synods are not "entrusted with any Church-power . . . or with any Jurisdiction over the Churches . . . or to impose their determination on the Churches or Officers" (XXVI). To use language which came into use in this century, such authority as these Synods might have was regarded as "ministerial" rather than "magisterial". I am not sure how useful this language really is, apart from its reminder that the Independents were very clear that such Synods had no jurisdiction; rather, their deliberations were to be truly weighed by the Church to which the advice or admonition was addressed, who would rightly be expected to consider seriously whether in this deliverance it detected the guidance of the spirit.

Since this paper's concern is with ordination and not church order as a whole, I remark that in practice the communion of these Churches seems to have been much more a reality than the sparse wording of *Savoy* might suggest. A. G. Matthews in the Introduction to his 1959 edition of *Savoy* and Geoffrey Nuttall in an important section of *Visible Saints* (1957) give ample evidence that it was precisely at ordinations that this communion of the Churches became most manifest.¹¹ It was always clear that it was the local Church that had the power of ordination; but great care was taken that this power should be used with the evident approval of neighbouring ministers and Churches; and one supposes that the withholding of such approval would have been taken as a serious if not fatal inhibition.

Yet the tension between what the local Church had the power to do and how much heed it should take of its neighbours was not always easily solved; nor was the balance between them always easily maintained. It seems that a very Independent line

¹¹G. F. Nuttall, *Visible Saints*, Oxford 1957, pp.90 *et seq.*

was taken in the mid-seventeenth century in some part of East Anglia. The Churches in Yarmouth and Norwich, for instance, were unpersuaded that they should assist in an ordination at Alby. William Bridge of Yarmouth had been to help "the saints in and about Alby", and the Church at Yarmouth declared that it would live in fellowship with that at Alby, which was formed between April and October 1651. Two years later, in July 1653, Nathaniel Brewster settled as pastor at Alby. In the June of that year the Church at Yarmouth was invited to send some elders and Mr. Bridge to be present at the setting apart of Mr. Brewster; but after some debate, this could not be agreed as this had not been "desired by or granted to other Churches in like case".¹² In 1656 the Church at Bury St. Edmunds was to hold an ordination; and the Church at Norwich declined to attend the ordination since this was "an affair the management whereof properly belonged to themselves, and considering the unanimous concurrence of that Church therein, considered it not necessary to appoint messengers." They said that they could add nothing to the furtherance of this business. The Church at Yarmouth in this instance said that they had not been given adequate notice of the ordination, but sent a letter of greeting. It looks, therefore, as if at that time the Churches at Norwich and Yarmouth considered ordination to be so completely an act of the local Church that it was not necessary for elders from other Churches to be present; yet this ordination of Thomas Taylor at Bury St Edmunds was attended by messengers from Coggeshall, Sudbury, two Churches in Ipswich, Wattisfield, Rattlesden, Pulham and Hapton.¹³ Since it is known that these two Churches in Norwich and Yarmouth were not in the least unwilling to consult with one another where that was necessary or to advise and help Churches when asked to do so, it can only be concluded that they did in fact believe that their assistance at an ordination was unnecessary, and that ordination was a matter in which the local Church had full authority to act. Nearly all the evidence I have seen, however, suggests that most, almost all, other Churches differed from them in this respect, since it is hard to find instances of any Church that did not seek and receive messengers from neighbouring Churches at ordinations.

It is important to notice, however, what the presence of such representatives did and did not imply. The right and authority of the local Church to carry out the ordination was not questioned: messengers were present as witnesses. It was believed that their presence added nothing to the ordination itself, apart from an expression of good will and the promise of continuing communion. There are several statements which suggest that this attitude continued to be held. At the ordination of John Fell, an introductory address by John Angus included the remark that "on this solemn and joyful occasion, you have invited pastors and messengers from neighbouring Churches, to be witnesses of your faith and order, in chusing and setting apart to the pastoral office amongst you, our reverend and worthy brother".¹⁴ Similarly, John Conder in his sermon at the ordination of John Stafford as co-pastor with John Guyse on May 11th 1758, remarked that it was the custom of Congregational Churches at the setting apart of a brother to pastoral work to invite "Ministers and Messengers of other Churches in the same communion, to behold their order, to be witnesses to their faith, and to join issue with them in the solemnities of such a serious and weighty occasion": but he added that "such a ministerial convention is not necessary to convey office-power, or to render ordination valid, but it affords a fit occasion for explicitly asserting the communion of Churches".¹⁵

¹²Browne, *op. cit.*, p.299.

¹³*Ibid.* p.398.

¹⁴J. Angus, *Introductory Discourse . . . delivered at the Ordination of John Fell, 1774*, p.6.

¹⁵J. Conder, *Sermon preached . . . at the Ordination of the Reverend Mr. John Stafford, 1758*, p.85.

Such an understanding of the role of neighbouring ministers and messengers in ordination has, it is thus obvious, a long history. It is not to be assumed, however, that no other view of the matter was possible or was ever held. In Philip Doddridge's *Works* there is an account of the fashion by which Protestant Dissenters ordain ministers.¹⁶ This he had been "earnestly desired" to provide by "a pious and learned clergyman of the Established Church" in order that it might "obviate some mistakes" and promote "mutual candour" among Christians of other denominations. What Doddridge describes is remarkably similar in all essential respects to what we have been considering and with which indeed we are ourselves familiar; but there is, it seems, a different accent in it from what we have so far noted. He writes that "pastors who are to take part in the public work (i.e. of ordination) proceed, at the appointed time and place, to consecrate him (the person offering himself for ordination) to it and to recommend him to the grace and blessing of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ". Doddridge includes the laying on of hands, and he goes on to say that by this act of ordination those taking part do not "pretend to convey any spiritual gifts, but only use it as a solemn, and expedient, though not absolutely necessary designation of the person so set apart". We may take the more note of what Doddridge says because he remarks that ordinations "so far as I have been witness" have been carried out in this order or something very near it. Similarly, an account of the ordination of Isaac Smithson at Harleston, Norfolk, (November 11th 1755) reports that the ministers of Yarmouth and Norfolk — evidently the Churches in these places had changed their minds — proceeded to set him apart to the work of the ministry "by prayer and imposition of hands".¹⁷ Note that the *ministers* are the only officiants mentioned.

When I said that a somewhat different accent was to be detected in Doddridge's descriptions of ordinations, I was noting his assumption that the ordination would be conducted by pastors. It is not said that only ministers may officiate; and it seems to have been always asserted that ministerial action in ordination did not convey any special grace or any succession. One is led to wonder what was in mind. It is easy enough to see what they thought they were *not* doing. It is also clear that all were agreed that the pastors and messengers from neighbouring Churches expressed the good will of those whom they represented and thus made real the communion of the Churches. Yet this apparent emphasis on the part to be played by ministers in ordination must have been thought to have some significance. Thomas Davidson at the ordination of John Fell in 1770 addresses his "dear brother" thus: "you have this day given yourself to the Lord, and his honourable service in the work of the Gospel, by your brethren in the ministry, to whom I think this properly belongs".¹⁸ If we ask what "properly" means in this context, it may be that the clue to the answer is to be found in the exhaustive theological examination to which I referred earlier. Since these ministers were clear in their minds that they were not conveying any succession or ministerial grace, they must, I suggest, have seen themselves as the guardians of the faith; and perhaps we may assume that the representatives or messengers from neighbouring Churches would not have been ready to share in the ordination if there had been any dissatisfaction expressed about the young man's

¹⁶P. Doddridge, *Works*, 1802-10, Vol. III, pp.225-7.

¹⁷*A Sermon and Charge delivered . . . at the Ordination of the Reverend Mr. Smithson, at Harlestone in Norfolk, 1755, p.25.*

Smithson is said to have given "very proper and loyal answers" to the questions put to him. The fifth question was: how are you affected to the Protestant Succession in the present Royal Family of the House of Hanover?

¹⁸J. Angus, *op. cit.*, p.21.

soundness in the faith. This sort of reasoning is suggested in a sermon preached at the ordination of Moses Alway (1747) by Dr. B. Stevenson.¹⁹ While he argued that ordination by other ministers was not absolutely necessary, since in certain circumstances "this cannot conveniently be had", Dr. Stevenson believed that it was necessary in what he called "a lower sense" both for the sake of order, "and to prevent conceited intruders and those who are utterly unqualified, from venturing upon this sacred work". For these reasons, admission to the ministry should be a matter of public cognizance and the ordination conducted by "others, who were in the same order".

There was, then, a somewhat undefined relation and therefore possible tension between the notion that the power of ordination lay with the particular Church and that alone, and the apparently widely held view that it was good, if not absolutely necessary, that representatives, ministerial and lay, from neighbouring Churches should be present. There was also the conviction evidently held by some that the act of ordination properly belonged "to your brethren in the ministry", no doubt only after the candidate had been duly called by the local Church.

Further illustration of the possible tension between the local Church and the communion of churches is to be found in the writings of Thomas Harmer of Watisfield. It was agreed on all hands that no one could be ordained to the ministry except he be called to the pastorate of a particular Church. But what if in the course of the years he were called to the service of some other local Church? Did he need to be re-ordained? Was he in fact no minister out of his own Church and congregation? In strict logic of the Independent position there could be but one answer. Yet the fact that it came to be widely held that ministers should be present at ordinations and that the act of ordination properly belonged to "your brethren in the ministry" suggests that at least in that respect their ministry had a wider than a purely local recognition, and that a minister who removed from one charge to another would be recognized (the word "inducted" is our modern use) as a pastor, and not ordained again, though no doubt instances could be found, though I have not noted any, of the more strictly Independent line being followed.

A somewhat similar point is to be noted from Harmer, who recalls that two Congregational Churches in Suffolk scrupled to have the Lord's Supper administered to them by any of the neighbouring ministers in the time of a vacancy in the pastorate.²⁰ (In view of recent discussions in our own time, it is perhaps worth noting that it was never suggested by any body that an unordained member of the Church might preside at the Lord's Supper). Of this scruple Thomas Harmer says that "nothing can be more idle than this". "They call neighbouring ministers to baptize infants, and to preach to them — so they may, if they please, call them in a sermon devoutly to think over the sufferings of the Son of God, but they must not do it at the Lord's Table: in both cases there is a showing forth of the death of the Lord, and that only". He says that it seems that Churches with such scruples apparently do not believe that the pastor of a particular Church preserves his character in all places or that if some extraordinary service is required outwith his own Church he is entitled to render it. As over against such scruples Harmer records that the Church at Watisfield frequently had the Lord's Supper administered to

¹⁹B. Stevenson, *The Validity and Regularity of the Ministry exercis'd amongst the English Protestant Dissenters, 1747*, p.18.

²⁰These and subsequent references come from T. Harmer, *Remarks on the Ancient and Present State of the Congregational Churches of Norfolk and Suffolk, 1777*, pp.134, 172-5, 179.

them by ministers of other Churches and of other denominations during the long vacancy between July 1687 and 1696. For good measure, he adds that he has even known the Lord's Supper administered by the pastor of another Church in the lifetime and in the presence of the proper pastor; "very infirm indeed, but his health not so broken that he could not have performed the solemnity" — according to Harmer, Norwich was the place where this happened and none other than Dr. Doddridge the "administrator" — his word, not mine. It was Harmer's opinion that this matter of the Lord's Supper in vacancies was more of a problem in rural areas where vacancies were more prolonged than in London, where he says Churches were never for long vacant; and in any case, there it was easily possible for a Church temporarily without a pastor to unite occasionally with another. Precisely what weight to put upon this remark it is difficult to determine, since it is well-known that the Mark Lane Church in London, which was vacant for about two years before the arrival of Isaac Watts as pastor, did not observe the Lord's Supper throughout that period because it had no pastor. Truly the Church could and did exist without a pastor; but it could be held that it was not in sufficiently proper order without one for it to be right for the Lord's Supper to be administered. Whether the Mark Lane people occasionally attended elsewhere for the Communion Service I do not know; but the evidence, as far as I know it, suggests not. Here, again, we see some tension between those who understood the pastor to have authority only within his own Church and those who believed that in certain circumstances and when invited to do so, he might minister in other Churches than his own. It is not clear to me that Harmer was altogether right to think that this was more a rural than a London problem.

A somewhat different issue is raised when we come to consider what was sometimes a thorny problem within the Congregational tradition: in ordination should there or should there not be included the laying on of hands? The *Savoy Declaration* apparently assumed that this would normally be included in the act of ordination but allowed that an ordination which did not include it would in no way be called in question. It is difficult to trace how this in fact worked out in practice, and such records as I have been able to see do not provide any conclusive evidence.

We may begin to consider this issue by noting a complaint by Thomas Harmer, who was in sympathy with the Agreement of 1691, though he was sorry that what was said in this Agreement about ordination was ambiguous, since it did not precisely define what it meant by the words "due ordination". "They say that it is ordinarily requisite that Pastors or neighbouring Churches should concur (i.e. in the ordination), but do not explain what concurrence means". Nevertheless, he goes on to say that among Congregational people "that concurrence has been almost universally expressed by the laying on of hands of the elders of the neighbouring Churches, in solemn prayer over the person thus set apart to the Pastoral office; and it is a rite so ancient, so universally practised by other denominations, and so graceful, that I cannot but wish that it may be generally practised in succeeding times in these two counties (i.e. Norfolk and Suffolk) as it has been in the past, and that it may be adopted in those districts in which it has not been wont to be observed by our Congregational Brethren". Later in his argument, Harmer makes the interesting point in support of what he believed about the laying on of hands (and this strikes me as a rather "modern" point) that part of the value of the rite is that it "more sensibly affects" the people since God has so made us that we are more affected by actions which strike the senses than by abstract ideas. Nevertheless, he laments that this good custom has been discontinued in many Congregational Churches elsewhere; "and it is little practised, I am very sure, among Churches of that denomination in London".

We must remember that Harmer writes about the Churches he knows in Norfolk and Suffolk and tells us what he believes to be true of the London Churches; and there is no reason to suppose that the Churches in other parts of the country were in different case. One source of evidence on this matter is the *Evangelical Magazine*, which for some years reported ordinations, largely but not only in Congregational Churches. As with many more recent journals, such reports vary in the detail provided. I have searched through scores of reports without being able to reach a precise conclusion. It was in 1794 that the *Evangelical Magazine* first reported such ordinations. Among the entries for that year is the ordination of David Ford on July 17th 1794 at Long Melford, Suffolk, and it is explicitly stated that the minister of Dedham offered the ordination prayer with the laying on of hands. In 1795 (August 5th) William Gould was ordained at Ebbesbourne by "prayer and the laying on of hands", while in the same year (August 18th) William Hoddy was ordained at Bildestone, Suffolk, and it is equally explicitly said that Samuel Lowell of Woodbridge "engaged in the ordination prayer, which was conducted without imposition of hands". It has to be said that Bildestone was of Independent and Baptist allegiances; but it is not to be inferred that the lack of imposition of hands was necessarily due to Baptist participation, because in 1799 an ordination at Leominster is recorded, which was undoubtedly Baptist and without any Independent admixture, in which it is plainly recorded that "Mr. Francis of Horsley prayed the ordination prayer with imposition of hands". In 1796 there were two ordinations of missionaries, one at Holywell Mount (July 26th) and one at Haberdashers' Hall (August 9th), and in both cases it is clearly stated that the imposition of hands took place. In both these cases there is a special interest. "Two such ordinations have seldom occurred in which Episcopalians, Seceders, Anti-Burghers, Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists all unite". It is not so stated, but one infers that this was one of the first ordinations to service with the London Missionary Society.

It would be tedious to cite more instances, the more so since in a majority of the reports no mention is made of the imposition of hands. Did those who did not mention it assume that of course it did take place? Or was it assumed that it did not? If anything is clear, it is that the instances where a specific mention is made, one way or the other, occur in various parts of the country; so that it looks as if we may not argue that there was a regional preference for the use or disuse of the imposition of hands. One may ask what influence might be due to the Principal of the Academy at which the man to be ordained was trained. John Pye Smith, for example, at an ordination at Newport, I.O.W., on May 25th 1808, said in his introductory address that while the right of election of Pastors rested with particular Churches, "in an ordinary and regular way, the *ordination* or *setting apart* of such persons to the pastoral office is the work of other pastors or elders, called in Scripture 'the Presbytery', or eldership, and it is to be performed with solemn prayer and the laying on of hands".²¹ No doubt the influence of such a notable scholar would have some influence on his students. That, however, leads to another question about which I have found no evidence: when it was decided to include or to exclude the laying on of hands, with whom did the decision rest? With the candidate who was to be ordained? With the Church over which he was to be ordained? With those who were to preside at the ordination? Or did all these agree what form the service should take?

²¹ *Discourses delivered at the Solemn Separation of the Revd. John Bruce, 1808, p.3.*

There is at least one indication that the candidate knew nothing about it at all. When Thomas Craig was ordained at Bocking, Essex, on October 12th 1802, the imposition of hands did not take place, though he did not know that this would be so until he entered the place of worship.²² It looks as if he had expected it, and perhaps even wished it. Evidently the decision was taken by others, though there is no indication who these others were. Nothing much can be built on a single instance; but I think we may assume that some decision was taken by "others", who ever they may have been, since it is incredible that it was left to chance whether or not to lay on hands, for the arguments for or against the rite were so strongly argued that it is in the highest degree unlikely that those conducting the service would not have known what they were doing (or not doing) and why. In the address at Newport by John Pye Smith, he was quite clear why he thought the laying on of hands was a proper custom, and, like many others who shared his point of view, he was clear what the rite did not imply and what in his judgement it did. He said, "We use this rite of the imposition of hands, not with the pretence of conferring any qualifications, powers, sanctity or indelibility of character: but merely because we consider it as a scriptural mode of solemn designation to office".²³ Earlier Thomas Harmer notes some objections to the rite which were alleged in what he described as "modern times". Miraculous powers or gifts were conveyed to men in the apostolic age and these gifts have now ceased; and he quotes one objector as saying "they do not lay hands for they have nothing to give". Harmer argues against such objections and cites such passages as Acts iii, 1-3, which he believes do not describe the conveying of miraculous powers, nor does the passage suggest the superiority of those who laid hands. Rather, he thinks, that those who laid hands were mentioned as equals, though the idea of priority of reception may be present; and moreover, he feels that we ought not to "scruple if an older man lays his hands on a younger's head in a time of particular solemnity". On scriptural grounds as well as those of good custom Harmer argues that the rite should be used. That there were others who took the same line is clear in a sermon I found, about which I have discovered neither the author's names nor the date of its deliverance; but the preacher defends the custom and expresses his "admiration" that this decent, venerable rite should "in our age" — would that I knew which that was — "be discarded by some who would like to be thought to keep close to Scripture: for aught any thing I can see, we might as well discard the observance of the Lord's Day as the ordination of ministers by Fasting, Prayer, and the Laying on of Hands". On August 9th 1749 John Sheldon was ordained at Canterbury, and William Langford preached the sermon, in which he defended the use of this rite on the ground that it had been translated from the Jewish Church to the Christian to signify the separation of persons ordained to the ministry and the fervent desire of their brethren that the blessing of God might rest upon them. "We pretend not . . . to convey any spiritual grace, authority . . . but we make use of this ceremony because it is a scriptural mode of admitting men to sacred offices, and of commending them to the benediction of God".²⁴

Many other similar expressions could be cited from the evidence I have examined, but all would have agreed that the lack of the laying on of hands would not have rendered an ordination invalid: Doddridge's words "though not absolutely necessary" suggest perhaps that he himself would have been reluctant about the

²² *Introductory Discourse . . . Address . . . Sermon . . . delivered on the Solemn Separation of the Rev. Thomas Craig, 1802*, p.27.

²³ *Discourses . . . John Bruce* (ut. sup.), p.3.

²⁴ W. Langford, *Reconciliation to God, the Great End of a Gospel-Ministry*, [1749], p.16.

omission; and it may be supposed that this way of thinking would have influenced a good many who were responsible for services of ordination.

When we try to see why some avoided this ceremony, I have found it harder to come by actual evidence, which is not to say that it does not exist; but much can be inferred from the objections against which those who supported it argued. There is, however, a note in a *Short Biography of Robert Halley* by his son from which we learn that he was ordained at St. Neots on July 11th 1822. Dr. Pye Smith took part in the service. Halley, it is said, would hardly allow the word "ordination" to be used for he felt that the nature of the rite might be mistaken, and he appears to have been particularly opposed to Presbyterian notions which "have unhappily crept into some people's heads". Throughout his life, we learn, Dr. Halley did not greatly change his views on this matter and always objected to the laying on of hands as likely to suggest the transmission of some supernatural powers or occult influence. In later years, his son says, he came to attach considerable importance to the service, "as a public confirmation by the Church of its previous act" (i.e. in calling its pastor) "and as a brotherly recognition by neighbouring ministers and Churches of their pastor commencing his ministry".²⁵ When James Davison was ordained at Rochford, Essex, on December 11th 1805, there was in fact a laying on of hands; but in the introductory address by Samuel Douglas of Chelmsford an eloquent account is given of what the ceremony did not mean. "But it may be asked by some, For what purpose are all these ministers now assembled? Have they dominion over the faith of this Church? Can they convey miraculous gifts, or ministerial furniture? Or are they deputed by the Church to instate into pastoral office? To all these enquiries, we answer NO. We reject, we detest the thought; we claim no authority; we are all brethren; our meeting here today is an expression of approbation, both of our friend, and the proceedings of this congregation; and to unite in hearty prayer with this people". An even more revealing word was spoken by Dr. Henry Allon at the ordination of Theophilus Lessey at Barnsbury Chapel, Islington, on 7th December 1852. There is no note whether there was or was not any laying on of hands; but two remarks of Henry Allon are worthy of note here. He said that the ministers and pastors of other Churches were there "at the conjoint request of our brother and of the Church . . . simply to recognize the relationship thus formed; to pray for the constant and exceeding blessing of the great Head of the Church upon it. . . . We are here as elders in the ministry and in the pastorate, simply for advice; not as a spiritual legislature or ecclesiastical conclave, to constitute a relationship or to confer authority". Then follows this comment: "our popular notions of ordination what it is and what it does, are so vague and indeterminate, and therefore so various" that what he says can only be taken as supporting "the view taken here". What Thomas Harmer would have said about that is best left to the imagination.

This evidence suggests that we may suppose that those who omitted the laying on of hands in ordination services would have done so because they were so conscious of the way in which this rite could be misunderstood that they judged the omission justified and wise; and whatever our own mind on the matter may be, this is an attitude which can be understood and respected. It may be added here that we need not doubt that those who rejected this ceremony felt the more justified in its omission as Tractarianism increased within the Established Church. Some, at least, would have felt that there was greater need to avoid what might be misunderstood; but into the examination of that matter we cannot go here, since the latter part of the nineteenth century falls beyond the scope of the evidence I have had opportunity to examine.

JOHN HUXTABLE

²⁵R. Halley, *Short Biography of Robert Halley*, 1879, pp. xv-xvi.

ENGLISH AND CANADIAN PRESBYTERIANS IN TAIWAN, 1895-1925: A BRIEF SURVEY

Taiwan is unique in the history of Protestant missions in the Japanese Empire before 1945, in that English and Canadian Presbyterians were the only resident foreign Protestant missionaries to undertake work among its native population.¹ The English Presbyterian mission in south Taiwan (founded in 1865) and the Canadian Presbyterian mission in north Taiwan (founded in 1872) began as missions within the Chinese sphere of missionary endeavour. The ceding of the island in 1895 and its subsequent occupation and colonization by Japan changed this.

Serious external and internal difficulties beset mission work in Taiwan in these years. By the end of the nineteenth century European supremacy and civilization was being questioned in the Far East, and that applied especially to Christianity as a western religion propagated by westerners. For the British missionary enterprise the new century marked the beginning of retrenchment after the great missionary expansion of the previous hundred years. In Taiwan itself the Chinese intellectual tradition and the pace of modernization undertaken by the Japanese colonial administration, particularly after 1905, were external factors which hampered Christian growth. There were internal difficulties too, especially the fact that the missions were under-staffed and poor. And there were always the missionary's personal problems, caused by the conflict of living and working in an alien culture.

The earlier experiences of Presbyterian missionaries in Taiwan under Chinese rule had been similar to those of missionaries on the mainland in the late nineteenth century. The Chinese intellectual tradition, marked by dislike and distrust of foreigners and their religion proved to be an insurmountable barrier to Christian propagation. Similarly the man in the street was generally unfriendly to missionaries and unsympathetic to religious beliefs which ran counter to the "highly superstitious and eclectic religious proclivities of the general populace"² On their side, such missionaries as were able to attract converts from the lowest classes viewed the Chinese *literati* with suspicion as being chiefly to blame for the lack of popular response to the Christian message. Difficulties were inevitable in a situation where missionaries, confident in their own civilization and religious beliefs, were confronted by a society that was equally arrogant. Both sides, the western "barbarian" and the "heathen" Chinese alike, had to learn accommodation. The late nineteenth century saw the slow development of missionary knowledge of China and its people, and of missionary methods; but there was still not that identification of Christianity with popular aspirations which might overcome the barriers reared by intellectual tradition and cultural conflict.

In 1885, after thirty years of work, the English Presbyterian mission, with its main centre in Tainan, had 1,445 adult members³. In 1896 the Presbytery of South Formosa was formed and the first two Chinese pastors ordained. The Canadian Presbyterian mission, with its main centre in Tamsui, had some 1,000 converts in 1895; it was not until 1904 that the Presbytery of North Formosa was formed.

¹After 1895 various *Japanese* Protestant Churches worked among the newly arrived *Japanese* residents.

²The author is grateful to William J. Richardson for this observation. See also, William J. Richardson,

"Christianity in Taiwan under Japanese Rule, 1895-1945", unpublished Ph.d. dissertation, St. John's University, 1972.

³Edward Band, *Working His Purpose Out: The History of the English Presbyterian Mission 1847-1947*, Taipei edition 1972, p.121.

In 1912 the Synod of Formosa was established. Both missions engaged in evangelistic, medical and educational work. Their achievements before 1895 had included the introduction of western-style education and medicine, the spread of literacy through the utilization of romanized Fukien dialect, and the beginning of social work among the blind. Neither should their literary work (especially that of William Campbell, who wrote a history of the seventeenth-century Dutch missionary presence in Taiwan)⁴, be under-estimated, for it spread knowledge about the island in England.

All this had been achieved in an island in which education was virtually unknown, disease rampant and banditry rife, whose eastern half, moreover, was inhabited by head-hunting aborigines in an almost constant state of war with the Taiwanese Chinese. Although between 1895 and 1915 there were some 99 local uprisings by the Taiwanese against the Japanese, the Japanese Government-General was able to establish law and order⁵. Even though the aborigines continued periodically to revolt after 1915, aboriginal areas in eastern Taiwan were separated by a garrisoned guard-line from the rest of Taiwan and gradually subjugated. Japanese colonial rule was equated with modernization. By 1945 the Taiwanese had attained the second highest living standard after Japan in east and south-east Asia.⁶ The Japanese authorities improved agriculture and developed industry and financial institutions. They improved public health and medical facilities. A widespread system of elementary schools was organized. But it was a policy directed towards the assimilation of the islanders, seeking to replace Chinese culture and language with Japanese, and therefore fiercely resisted by the Taiwanese Chinese.

The Presbyterian missionaries were generally sympathetic to Japanese rule because it established law and order and brought material benefit to the island. The nature of Japanese rule, however, was oppressive. The powers of the police were virtually unlimited. Summary justice was utilized extensively to suppress any Taiwanese uprising. The peaceful movements which emerged after 1915 for the establishment of a Taiwanese Parliament and political rights within the context of the Japanese Empire met with no favourable response.⁷ In short, the Taiwanese were without political rights. In Korea Canadian Presbyterian missionaries were among the most outspoken critics of Japanese colonialism. In Taiwan there was little such criticism and no missionary contact with political movements; Taiwanese political activism was not church inspired. The lack of missionary comment about social and political affairs in the island points to a lack of knowledge about trends outside the immediate Christian community. Whether this was due to the narrowness of missionary interest or to the effectiveness of the colonial government's control of information is difficult to say. In 1906 an English Presbyterian missionary noted that "every resident in the island, not excepting foreign missionaries, were ticket-of-leave men who had been bound over to keep the peace".⁸ This gives some indication of strict surveillance by the Japanese.

⁴William Campbell, *Formosa Under the Dutch*, London, 1903.

⁵Edward I-te Chen, "Japan: Oppressor or Modernizer?: A comparison of the Effects of Colonial Control in Korea and Formosa", *Korea Under Japanese Colonial Rule* (edited by Andrew C. Nahm), West Michigan, 1973, pp.251-260, p.259.

⁶Edward I-te Chen, "Japanese Colonialism in Korea and Formosa: A Comparison of its Effects upon the Development of Nationalism", unpublished Ph.d. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1968, p.330.

⁷Edward I-te Chen, "Formosan Political Movements Under Japanese Rule, 1914-1937", *Journal of Asian Studies*, XXI, no. 3, May 1972, pp.477-498.

⁸A. B. Nielson to W. Dale, January 11th 1906, PCE Formosa Box 4 File 7 in the United Reformed Church Archives, London.

Undoubtedly, however, the Japanese officials were fairer than the previous Chinese administration in their treatment of missionaries, and the strict control of the Taiwanese by the Japanese police meant at least that missionaries could now go about their evangelistic work without fear of being mobbed or stoned. This evangelistic work took the form of travelling from a centre to the various chapels of the district. The missionary's life was one of constant coming and going. Campbell N. Moody, most fervent of English Presbyterian evangelists, and an exponent of open-air street preaching, attracting crowds of ever-inquisitive Chinese by a bugle call, was exceedingly energetic: in 1904 he preached in 900 of the 1,000 villages in the Chiang-hoa district of central Taiwan.⁹ He was clear as to the motive for his energy: "we have taken up arms, resolved that, come what may, we shall not lay them down till at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord the glory of God the Father".¹⁰ Open-air preaching was one of the most psychologically trying experiences for a missionary, for not only was there the difficulty of communication, but there was also direct confrontation with the scepticism of the crowd. It required a particularly strong personality. As the missions expanded there was a natural tendency to move away from this type of work. It was almost less demanding to work in a mission school or hospital or simply to visit established churches and mission stations. The missionary solely engaged in direct evangelism remained in a minority.

While the evangelistic thrust of the English and Canadian missions was directed toward the Chinese population, it was hoped that some work could be undertaken among the aborigines of eastern Taiwan. In 1911 it was resolved to begin such work.¹¹ One of the attractions of attempting to evangelize the aborigines, of whom there were some 120,000, was that their primitive society and religious beliefs were less of a barrier to the Christian message than those of the Chinese. Unfortunately, the two missionary societies were in no position to furnish men for this new sphere, and the First World War with its shortages of funds and personnel for any mission work halted attempts to begin new work. In 1921 A. B. Nielson, an English Presbyterian missionary, strongly opposed any work among the aborigines, convinced that neither English nor Canadian Presbyterians were in a position to undertake it and that the paramount duty of both missions was to the Chinese of Taiwan.¹² In 1923 Duncan MacLeod, a Canadian Presbyterian missionary, felt that the best policy was to appeal to the Japanese Christian Churches to take up work among the aborigines as part of their own home mission work.¹³ It was only after the Second World War that work among the aborigines was begun. It has proved highly successful.

After 1918 Presbyterian missions were hard-pressed to maintain their work. In 1919 there were 106 mission stations in the Presbytery of South Formosa under English Presbyterian jurisdiction; there were also some 20 congregations which had not been visited, some of them not for two years, and there were 42 stations where Christians met for Sunday worship without any settled minister or preacher.¹⁴ The

⁹Edward Band, *Working His Purpose Out*, op. cit., pp.136-7.

¹⁰Campbell N. Moody, *The Heathen Heart: An Account of the Reception of the Gospel Among the Chinese of Formosa*, Edinburgh, 1907, p.233.

¹¹Resolution, Tainan Missionary Conference, December 29th 1911, PCE Formosa Box 4 File 12 in United Reformed Archives, London.

¹²A. B. Nielson to J. P. MacLagan, December 23rd 1921, PCE Formosa Box 4 File 7 in United Reformed Archives, London.

¹³Duncan MacLeod, *The Island Beautiful: The Story of Fifty Years in North Formosa*, Toronto, 1923, p.36.

¹⁴*Report of the Foreign Missions Committee of the Presbyterian Church of England 1919.*

English Presbyterians could not now keep one missionary free from other duties in order to visit outlying mission stations and churches. In 1919 the total membership of the Presbytery of South Formosa was 10,500, served by seven male missionaries and seven WMA women missionaries.¹⁵ In 1925 Japanese sources gave the membership of the combined missions as 29,793 in an island with a population of 4,025,908.¹⁶ In view of the small number of missionaries (altogether some forty in 1925) it was unlikely that the Presbyterian Church could be expanded much further without considerable missionary reinforcements and greater financial resources.

Shortage of money was also a major problem for the English and Canadian missions in their educational and medical work. The question of whether it was the most critical problem is a moot point. A legacy of the nineteenth century was the plethora of small, down-at-heel missions throughout the Far East, of which the Presbyterian missions in Taiwan were two. In the late nineteenth century missions could function successfully on a shoestring budget and carry on effective educational and medical work, but the very success of this led to a missionary mentality which condoned the second rate. In Taiwan, where mission schools and hospitals had to compete with a comprehensive system of government schools and hospitals of high quality, the second rate was inadequate.

The educational work of the English and Canadian Presbyterian missions was significant in the sense that it offered a Christian alternative to the government system. In all there were 21 private schools for western education in Taiwan in 1925 with a total of 3,086 students.¹⁷ In the same year the public school system for Taiwanese instituted by the Japanese authorities had some 241,985 students.¹⁸ Seen thus the missionary contribution to education in Taiwan was insignificant.

Education was at the centre of the Japanese policy of assimilation. While the colonial authorities were not opposed to mission schools, they did not wish the influence of these schools to extend into non-Christian Taiwanese society, to constitute a serious alternative to their own system. For this reason the Japanese were unwilling to allow non-Christians to contribute money to mission schools and such schools had to comply with regulations establishing standards similar to those required of private schools in Japan and Korea. One of these regulations prohibited the teaching of religion in the school curriculum: Christian teaching had to be conducted outside school hours. This, of course, did not apply to the two theological seminaries maintained by the missions, which were outside the school system.

In their educational work missionaries were confronted not only by the difficulty of meeting government regulations but also by changes in Taiwanese aspirations. Mission schools had been conducted in Chinese, whereas in the government elementary schools Japanese was the chief subject taught. In 1912 Duncan Ferguson, who was in charge of the English Presbyterian Middle School in Tainan, noted that "no Mission School can take a worthy place unless it also produces Japanese-speaking graduates".¹⁹ To do this meant

¹⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁶Taiwan Sotokufu, *Taiwan Jijō, Taishō jūgo nen*, Taihoku, 1926, p.115.

¹⁷Taiwan Sotokufu, *Taiwan Jijō, Taishō jūgo nen*, op cit., p.143.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p.126.

¹⁹D. Ferguson to W. Dale, March 12th 1912, PCE Box 62 in the United Reformed Church Archives, London.

that educational missionaries had to be trained in Japanese as well as Chinese language, a significant burden when so many missionaries were poor linguists. Very few missionaries in Taiwan were able to read Chinese characters and even fewer had more than the barest knowledge of the spoken language. The addition of Japanese, which was now the official language of the colony, doubled their linguistic problem.

Thus the educational work of the Presbyterian missions, from being unrivalled in the late nineteenth century, by 1925 was seriously undermined by competition from government schools and by changes in Taiwanese society. Medical work was similarly hampered by competition from government hospitals.

The English Presbyterians maintained hospitals in Tainan, Takow and Chiang-hoa. The Canadians maintained a hospital in Tamsui which they later moved to Taipei. In the thirty years after 1895 at least one of these hospitals was always closed, because of the shortage of medical staff. In 1914 J. L. Maxwell, the English Presbyterian doctor at Tainan Hospital, noted how "we have fallen from the high promise of past days. We are not now giving the best to the service of Christ, and we should be laughed out of court anywhere but in a heathen land, where something very far from the best is still infinitely better than the natives possess".²⁰ The medical missionary in Taiwan had to make a double sacrifice in order to work in the island. The first was the acceptable one of leaving friends and country to work in the foreign field but the second was the embarrassment, if not indignity, of having to work in the most primitive of hospitals.

During the thirty years from 1895 the two Presbyterian missions in Taiwan made undoubted progress. Indeed, considering the small number of missionaries and their great difficulties, inadequate backing from home not least among them, they achieved a great deal. At the same time it became clear that early hopes that the island would be Christianized or at least strongly influenced by Christianity would not be fulfilled. The Christian movement was to remain small and its influence in Taiwanese society weak. The difficulties caused by the deteriorating political situation in the colony during the 1930's, as Japan passed from its era of "liberal democracy" to "fascism", should not hide the fact that even without this persecution Christianity in the island would have made little progress.

A. HAMISH ION

²⁰J. L. Maxwell, "The Mission Hospital of the Future", Tainan, February 1914, PCE Box 98 File 5 in United Reformed Church Archives, London.

REVIEW ARTICLE

The Diary of James Clegg of Chapel-en-le-Frith 1708-1755. Part I. Edited by Vanessa S. Doe. Derbyshire Record Society, Volume II, 1798. Pp. lii, 304. £8.

This is a genuine diary, recording the weather and the way of the wind, and written up daily, or soon afterwards. Since the publication of *Extracts* from it in 1899 by Henry Kirke, it has been known and quoted, but its publication *in extenso*, by permission of its owner, Major F. E. G. Bagshawe, after transcription, and study of the many themes it suggests, by the members of a class in the Division of Continuing Education in the University of Sheffield, is a major event for historians of Dissent.

After education at Rathmell by Richard¹ Frankland, whose death-bed he attended, and in Manchester by John Chorlton, James Clegg was ordained in 1703 at Malcoff, Chapel-en-le-Frith, and at first ministered there. In 1711 the congregation moved a mile or two away to Chinley, where a meeting-house was erected by gifts "amounting to £113.11.0, £53 of which was raised locally".² Here, despite overtures from Newcastle-under-Lyme and Knutsford, he remained till his death in 1755. The spiritual heir of "the Apostle of the Peak", as the ejected Vicar of Glossop, William Bagshaw (d.1702), came to be known, and of Bagshaw's nephew and biographer, the minister at Ashford-in-the-Water, John Ashe (d.1735), Clegg was for long the leading Dissenting minister in Derbyshire.

Bagshaw, who lived on his own estate at Chapel-en-le-Frith, had made Malcoff the base for an itinerating ministry. He "preached several Lectures on the other days of the week at Hucklow, Braddal [Bradwell] and Ashford; at [Stoney] Middleton, Chalmarton [Chelmorton] and Chalworth [Charlesworth]. In most of those places the People who had profited under his Ministry, form'd themselves into worshipping Societies; and he went amongst them as often as his Strength would allow, to help forward their Edification". "When he became less able to travel and labour", Ashe, who "about Midsummer 1696" was ordained by Bagshaw and others at Malcoff, "was call'd to preach one day in the Month at Hucklow, or Braddal, one day at Chalmarton, and the other two at Ashford",³ where he resided. From 1704 the London Fund, which from 1691 had voted £18 annually to Bagshaw "for Gospel work in the High Peak", voted the same sum to Ashe:⁴ till Ashe in turn grew infirm and "resign'd the Care of Hucklow, Braddal, &c. to others . . . Yet administred the Lord's Supper amongst his old Hearers in those places, and baptizing their Children as they had occasion".⁵ After Ashe's death Edmund Fletcher and Robert Kelsall were ordained at Chinley (27 July 1736), Fletcher to succeed Ashe at Ashford, with oversight of Stoney Middleton, and Kelsall as minister at Bradwell, with oversight of Hucklow.⁶ This is what lies behind Clegg's constant visits to Hucklow, Bradwell,

¹Not Benjamin, as p.xi and in the Index.

²These figures, from Clegg's manuscript autobiography, which is to be printed in vol. III of the present work, vary slightly from those reproduced from the Chinley Chapel register, then at Somerset House, in the late Reginald Mansfield's Manchester University M.A. thesis (1951), *The Development of Independency in Derbyshire from the Restoration to the Methodist Revival* (copy at Dr. Williams's Library).

³[James] Clegg, *Assistance in Preparing for Death and Judgment. A Discourse occasion'd by the sudden death of . . . John Ashe . . . A short account of his life . . . as an appendix to . . . William Bagshawe's book De Spiritualibus Peccis*, 1736, pp.57-8 (copy at D.W.L.).

⁴*Cheshire Classis Minutes 1691-1745*, ed. A. Gordon, 1919, pp.156, 155.

⁵Clegg, *Assistance*, p.86.

⁶For Fletcher, see F. Nicholson & E. Axon, *The Older Nonconformity in Kendal*, Kendal 1915, p.600; for Kelsall, *Cheshire Classis*, p.185: several of Kelsall's books are preserved in the Raffles Collection at Rylands Library, Manchester. For the later eighteenth-century history of the four congregations and erection of new meeting-houses at three of them, see *Protestant Dissenters' Magazine*, 1798, pp.401-13. Charlesworth had its own minister from 1716, Joseph Holland: *Cheshire Classis*, p.180.

Stoney Middleton and Chelmorton, to preach or baptize or to join with other ministers (as elsewhere) in "Double Lectures",⁷ which evidently resembled a *Missionsfest* with two sermons in modern Germany.

Clegg was also much "call'd abroad" in raising money for the erection of a meeting-house at Buxton. "Betwixt 4 and 500 were present" when it was opened on 15 July 1725, but the congregation caused him frequent anxiety. "Not one of them would subscribe or promise to contribute one penny" for the continuance among them of their minister, Richard Scholefield, who accordingly removed (15 April 1730); "that small society is reduced five or six of the most serious having died lately" (8 February 1731); "I know not how that place will be supplied or kept up" (22 June 1731); "we settled the affairs of that meeting on the best foot we could by ordering it to be united with Chalmorton" (25 September 1733); "agreed that Mr. Crowder should leave the place, the small congregation being lost and gone off" (1 October 1734). In 1738 the people at last settled down with a minister who stayed till 1755 (when he succeeded Clegg at Chinley), William Harrison.⁸

When in 1702 Clegg "was call'd to succeed" Bagshaw, Ashe "preached often for me", he recalls, "and adminstred the Sacraments all along till I was ordain'd".⁹ Ashe, who like Clegg had been educated by Frankland, baptized all Clegg's nine children (1705-24); and the two men remained fast friends till the day when Clegg enters "the afflicting tidings of the sudden death of my Dearest Friend and Brother Mr. Ash" (3 October 1735). Ashe had appointed Clegg an executor and bequeathed him a book of his own choosing.¹⁰ Within the month Clegg was twice occupied in "prizing Mr. Ashes Books", and in the following June "Mr. Ashes Books were sold by Auction the auction continued till midnight and we sat up late". Clegg also preached Ashe's funeral sermon, at which, with the addition of a memoir, he was later "hard at work revising correcting and transcribing" till he was "pretty much spent"; in March "the London carrier" brought it down "printed".

Clegg's visits to Gainsborough, to the minister there; Ambrose Rudsdell, and to "Madam Hopkinson", "my Dear Friend Madam Jackson", and her nephew Freeman Flower, otherwise puzzling because beyond his normal orbit, were it appears, owing to Ashe, who "once every year . . . paid a Visit to his good Friends in Gainsburrow",¹¹ and who dedicated *Publick-Spiritedness recommended* (1728) jointly to his own congregation and to Rudsdell's, naming Francis Hopkinson more particularly.¹² Clegg's first visit to Gainsborough, in May 1733, was in Ashe's company, and in June he met Mrs. Jackson again, at Ashford. Otherwise, apart from visits to Manchester and Rochdale, to see some of his children or his parents, he rarely went beyond Derbyshire and Cheshire. When he did go away, it was to meetings of ministers.

Between June 1728 and July 1736 he records his attendance at meetings of Derbyshire ministers, held usually at Derby, on ten occasions, generally without

⁷Clegg records taking part in Double Lectures, with one or other of ten ministers, at Ashford, Buxton, Chesterfield, Hucklow, Stoney Middleton and Wirksworth, and at Macclesfield in Cheshire, and also refers to others held at Bradwell and Chinley.

⁸For Scholefield, Crowder and Harrison, see *Cheshire Classis*, pp.203, 166, 176.

⁹Clegg, *Assistance*, p.65.

¹⁰Clegg, *Assistance*, pp.88-9.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p.87.

¹²At her marriage in July 1717 to Stancliffe Jackson (d.1729) of Gainsborough, Hannah Ledgard was of Chesterfield; Madam Hopkinson of Gainsborough died 25 October 1737, "very rich, pious and useful": *Nonconformist Register*, ed. J. Horsfall Turner, Brighouse 1881, pp.211-12, 303, 323. Francis Hopkinson left £200 to the Gainsborough congregation, and his widow £500 to Dissenting trustees: *Familine Minorum Gentium*, i (Harleian Soc., 37). 357.

naming those present but recording attendances varying from “about 12” to “17 in all”. In April 1731 he complains “little business done. The conversation at those meetings is not of the sort I could wish”; but in August, at an ordination at Chesterfield, when Ashe “gave the charge” and Clegg “preachd” — their discourses were printed together later in the year —, “The whole work was carried on with Seriousness and Decency and to the Satisfaction I hope of all present”.

Between September 1728 and May 1736 Clegg also records his attendance on five occasions at meetings of Cheshire ministers, held usually at Knutsford. In this case the tally of those present is known from the Minutes, which are in print; Clegg’s *Diary*, so far as it mentions names, confirms the Minutes. As in Derbyshire, Clegg shared in ordinations: on 2 September 1729, when he “gave the exhortation”; and again on 5 September 1732. He was evidently held in high regard. In May 1724 he acted as Moderator. In September 1724, and again in August 1736, this time *in absentia*, he was appointed “to preach y^e next time” — on this occasion he chose the text “I Cor:9:27 But I keep under my Body & bring it &c And had y^e thanks of the Ministers for his good Sermon”. In May 1728 he and five others were appointed “to Examine Mr. George Hardy at Manchester”, and a copy of the certificate of proficiency they gave him duly appears in the Minutes.¹³ “Examined Mr. Hardy junr and approved him”, Clegg writes, “may God prosper him and make him a blessing”.¹⁴

What authority had these Cheshire ministers to depute a Derbyshire minister to examine a candidate in Manchester? To a Presbyterian such action would seem untidy or even illicit; but “the Presbyterian pleas for territorial bounds had little influence”. The “Cheshire Classis” was attended not only by Clegg and others from Derbyshire but by ministers from Lancashire, Shropshire, and Staffordshire, and “all were apparently received on equal basis”.¹⁵ In Cheshire the ministers met regularly twice a year, and arrangements were made at one meeting for the next or for an ordination or examination. In Derbyshire meetings were less regular, and those present might spend “the rest of the evning with concerting the method of the next days work”, as with the ordination at Chesterfield in August 1731. No matter: wherever he came, Clegg was welcome. In April 1729 he went to “Moncton” (Monton, Lancashire), where “some hours were spent in prayer by some ministers of that Class and mr John Heywood Preachd”; and in July 1736 he was at Rochdale for “Mr Holdens ordination” and later “dined with the Brethren”.¹⁶

It would not have occurred to Clegg that the Cheshire Classis had any authority to restrain its members from acting with other ministers beyond its bounds. At the ordination of Fletcher and Kelsall at Chinley in July 1736, after which “the ministers dind with us 17 in number and several other Friends”, he names those who took part. Except for himself and the minister who “prayd over Mr. Fletcher”, John Whitaker, from Platt Chapel, Manchester,¹⁷ they were all Cheshire ministers, and Whitaker, like Clegg, attended the Cheshire Classis, as also did Kelsall as a licenciate. But the Classis was not responsible for the ordination: not a word of it is in the Minutes. It was arranged by the ministers present on the previous evening, who, as Clegg puts it, “settled matters as far as we could relating to” the ordination.

¹³ *Cheshire Classis*, pp.67-83.

¹⁴ p.40.

¹⁵ *Cheshire Classis*, p.143.

¹⁶ Pp.55, 258. For Heywood, of Blackley Chapel, Lancashire, see *Cheshire Classis*, p.179; for Laurence Holden, of Whitworth Chapel, Lancashire, *Lancashire Nonconformity*, ed. B. Nightingale, [1890-3], iii.272.

¹⁷ For Whitaker, see *Cheshire Classis*, p.213.

If meetings of ministers punctuated Clegg's existence and an ordination brought the refreshment of a new paragraph, the small print, which must not be overlooked, consisted of unceasing attention to preaching — "at home all day preparing sermons" is a frequent entry — and of visits in all weathers in the hilly country round his home to attend to people's bodies as well as their souls. He was a physician with an M.D. from Aberdeen, and had a wide reputation locally. His entry for 15 March 1729 reads: "wind turning to the east returned home before noon and afternoon walked to John Moults in Chinley to visit a sick child and to Christopher Bennets who was in an intermitting fever returned very weary". But "my ordination vows are still upon me", he writes in August 1734, and on the Lord's day also, after sometimes as much as three or three and a half hours in the pulpit, he was often "very weary", "much fatigued", "very hoarse", "much indisposed", "much spent"; yet "if any good be done, all is well". He almost always preached twice each Sunday from the same text. In much of 1731, the first half of 1732 and most of 1733 he preached steadily through Romans 12, I Thessalonians 4, and Colossians 3 and 4. Apart from these three series a rough analysis over the nine years 1728-36 indicates a balance of 125 texts from most books in the Old Testament, 25 being from Psalms, 21 from Genesis, 16 from Job and 14 from Proverbs, against 155 from all the New Testament books save Titus, Philemon and III John, 46 being from the Gospels, 11 from Acts, 3 from Revelation and the rest from the Epistles. The attention given to the Synoptic Gospels (16 texts from Matthew, 15 from Luke, 4 from Mark) is worthy of note. In June 1734 "the young men that learn to sing begin to perform their parts"; and in the following January "I had about 30 of our young People to supper, many of them were young men learning Psalmody".

Clegg administered the Lord's Supper between five and eight times a year, not always in the same month or on the same Sunday in the month; more often than not be held a preparation service on the previous Friday, though "it grieves me to see these days so much slighted and so ill attended", he writes in October 1734. In November that year he has to record a suspension from the Lord's Table; but he also, occasionally, writes of admitting new members, as in March 1729, when "5 young ones were added one of which was my Daughter, blessed be God for this mercy, may he ever bless her". Only once does he record administering the Lord's Supper privately, to a sick woman "and some other communicants of our congregation called to be then present".¹⁸ Private baptism, however, was normal practice. Of the 25 boys and 37 girls whom he reports baptizing and naming, the boys' names include Hezekiah, Immanuel, Samuel and Zechariah, but the clear favourite is John, followed by his own name James; for the girls the names Keziah and Rachel are among those chosen, but the most popular names are the late Queen's name Ann(e) and secondly Mary. Clegg was a convinced Protestant and, though in 1729 he "forgot to give notice" and in the following year "it happens to be the Fair day . . . and I should have had but few hearers", he observed November 5th — rather than December 25th. What he did at Christmas time and over the New Year was to make a round of people's homes, "repeating" a sermon, e.g. from Isaiah 9:6, in every house, "and some time was spent in praise and prayer".

Clegg's comment on reading Socinus and Episcopius when a student in Manchester, "I could never after be entirely reconciled to the common doctrines of

¹⁸P.195.

of the Trinity . . . could never well relish the doctrines of rigid Calvinism",¹⁹ has often been quoted. The cautious phrasing is characteristic and should be weighed. Adequate consideration of the books he read, as reflecting or shaping his theology, must wait till his *Diary* is complete, but so far his reading is conventionally impartial: e.g. Chillingworth against Rome, Baxter's *Saints Rest*, the *Life* of Matthew Henry, William Law, Le Clerc, Leland against Tindal. He had a liking for history: Millar's *History of the Jews*;²⁰ Burnet, Oldmixon,²¹ Rapin; *An Account of Persia and the Countries about it*;²² Neal's *History of the Puritans* and Dr. Calamy's²³ *account of the ejected ministers* — "how far the ministers of this age fall short of those in Zeal diligence and labour" is his comment after reading the last. In November 1730 he read *The Political State of Great Britain*²⁴ for the previous month. But reading of this sort was his recreation, along with the turning, bowling, fishing, shooting, racing and hare coursing in which he indulged. In any case, the books in a man's diary will often be those of the moment. For what he treasured we have to look at his will, and here, with other personal bequests, we find not only Baxter but Doddridge and Flavell's *Fountain of life* and *Method of Grace*.²⁵

Clegg's *Diary* is in another world from the prayer-journal of an ejected minister such as Samuel Birch, or even from the intense piety of the diary of the later seventeenth-century convert to Nonconformity, Henry Maurice. Not a breath of the enthusiasm that imbues the journal of Doddridge stirs in its pages. Clegg is sober and sensible throughout. Only once does he mention the name of Jesus, when unhappy after a difference with his wife.²⁶ The sermons he preached were "plain and practical and I hope of use".²⁷ His piety is plain and straightforward, too. On New Year's Day 1735 he prays "that 1. I may do more for God. 2. that I might sit more loose to the world. 3. that I may be more heavenly minded". His model, undoubtedly, was his friend Ashe; and Ashe, as Clegg told the bereft congregation at Ashford in his funeral sermon, "made it his Care and Business to possess you with the Principles and Spirit of *true Catholic Christianity*".²⁸

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL

¹⁹Autobiography, in *Extracts*, p.67.

²⁰Robert Millar, *History of the Church under the Old Testament*, 1730.

²¹Not "old Mixon", which has produced a "ghost" in the Index.

²²*Historical Account of Revolutions in Persia*, 1727.

²³Transcribed in error, identified, and indexed, as Balguy.

²⁴"No periodical with precisely this title appears to have been in print in 1730" (p.275); but it is listed and located in the *British Union Catalogue of Periodicals*.

²⁵Clegg's will is reproduced from papers at Chinley Chapel in Appendix XVI of Mansfield, "Development".

²⁶p.233.

²⁷p.201.

²⁸Clegg, *Assistance*, p.44 (italics Clegg's).

REVIEWS

The Dissenters. Volume 1. From the Reformation to the French Revolution. By Michael R. Watts, Pp. xiv. 543, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978. £15.00.

It is an extraordinary fact that Michael Watts is able to claim that his history of Dissent is the first to appear for more than 60 years. There have been brief surveys in the interim, but the last two general histories were those of H. W. Clark and before that of Skeats and Miall, both of which certainly left much to be desired even when new.

This is the first half of a two-volume history. It carries the story of Dissent (which here includes Methodists) from its origins to the French Revolution; or rather to the Methodist revolution constituted by the death of John Wesley. To say that it will take its place immediately as the definitive history sounds lukewarm in view of the lack of competition; so let it be added that it well deserves its place.

Why should there have been no major history for so long? could it be that Dissent is not a real phenomenon? Does the title cover movements too diverse to be classed together? Certainly Watts makes no attempt to impose a false homogeneity on the diversity. Not only do the historic denominational titles relate to widely differing conceptions of churchmanship, but each conceals diversities under a single label. Watts is especially careful to distinguish the range of opinion among Independents, and uses the term "Jacobite" to refer to the moderate group to which Henry Jacob belonged.

The proportions of the volume are unexpected. Dissenters have usually given a good deal of space to the Elizabethan age and to the seventeenth century (and have sometimes argued which of these periods deserved more attention); and Methodists naturally dwell on the Evangelical Revival. But Watts gets to 1640, even with some attention to the prehistory of Dissent, in 69 pages. He is of course scholarly, but sometimes relatively cursory here. He deals more fully with the heroic age of 1640-1689. But he really kindles most warmly when he reaches the point at which interest usually flags, after the Toleration Act, and he gives 163 pages to the period 1690-1730. Thus the period associated with the phrase "the decay of the Dissenting interest" gets more attention than the whole history of Dissent before the Long Parliament and more than the Revival.

In a sense this is disproportionate. But it is a forgivable disproportion in view of the neglect of this period, except by Unitarians, in the past. The specialist study of the statistics of churches and members extends this section and will not be of interest to everyone, but in its own field is authoritative.

Watts's stress on diversity and on the fluidity of denominational lines is appropriate to an ecumenical age. Students of Nonconformist history, and one imagines many other people too, will be grateful for this excellent volume and look forward eagerly to its successor.

STEPHEN MAYOR

Milton and the English Revolution. By Christopher Hill. Pp.541. London, Faber & Faber, 1977. Paperback Edition, 1979, £4.95.

It was inevitable that Dr. Hill would eventually produce a book on Milton and this book bears all the marks which are associated with Dr. Hill's work — the wide reading, the broad sweep of the argument, the clarity of style, and the brilliant ability to produce the quotation which seems to reinforce and clinch the case he is seeking to present. The case in this book, as so often with Dr. Hill, is controversial.

Milton was a highly-gifted man whose interests ranged over the Bible, the Classics, History, Ethics, Politics, Literature, Drama and Music, and he has been accorded the rank of greatness by scholars, politicians, churchmen and literary and dramatic critics. He has, for example, been hailed as a major figure in the English Independent tradition and his portrait appears in the windows of Emmanuel Church in Cambridge. Moreover, despite his scathing attack on Ulster Presbyterians and indeed upon Presbyterians in general, the Presbyterian builders of Westminster College, Cambridge, included his portrait in the chapel windows. His renown as scholar, poet, statesman, and theologian had for long obscured the highly idiosyncratic aspects of his character and his teaching. These aspects have recently been brought to the fore.

Dr. Hill has concentrated on these neglected aspects and has given a full exposition of his teaching on divorce, his deviations from traditional Christian orthodoxy, and his elitism. He sees the roots of much of Milton's teaching in the world of sectarianism, anabaptism, millenarianism, familism, and even arianism. Dr. Hill seeks to show that Milton had a wide acquaintance with his turbulent world and its literature. The bibliography in this book points the reader into many curious bypaths of theological and political thought. Milton emerges from this book as a man much influenced by this contemporary ferment.

Yet it is still arguable if this will prove to be the definitive portrait of Milton. Milton was acquainted with many worlds of thought but his powerful mind digested and sifted what he read and he was never the mere echo of the thought of others. His vast classical learning was absorbed into his own system of thought and used in *Paradise Lost* for purposes far removed from the intentions of the classical writers. So also was his harvest from sectarian literature absorbed into his own system and he would have been looked upon as an alien by sectarian groups just as much as he was by the more sober and traditional churches.

Few will read this book without being moved to admiration, to protest, and to a reassessment and fresh study of Milton and his works.

R.B.K.

A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain: Volume 2. Pp.340, London, Epworth Press, 1978. £10.00.

In the 13 years that have elapsed since the publication of the first volume of this projected 4-volume work, the Rev. A. Raymond George has joined the original editorial team, Professor Gordon Rupp and the Reverend Rupert Davies.

Mr. George contributes to the present volume one chapter, on ordination, which, along with essays by the Rev. J. M. Turner on Methodist religion, 1791-1849, and by the Rev. Norman F. Goldhawk, The Methodist people in the early Victorian age: spirituality and worship, makes up about one-fifth of the text, and serves to remind us that the subject of the work is a religious body, whatever else other historians may have made of it. It had begun as a connexion of societies held together by the leadership of one man, John Wesley. This volume covers the period from the death of Wesley in 1791 to the middle of the nineteenth century, and these three chapters describe the internal life and religious activity of the Methodist people as they struggled to sustain and develop a style very different from what Wesley had originally intended, but one equally consistent with his object of directing the energies generated by his part of the Evangelical revival. Mr. George's essay begins

with an extensive list of references for the literature on Methodist developments in the practice of ordination and the pastoral office, and his careful discussion of the problems of relating an extra-ordinary ministry to established historical norms is an important contribution to the ecumenical debate. Mr. Turner and Mr. Goldhawk provide detail of the regular worship and fellowship of the Methodist people, handling sensitively and critically this aspect of historical study where it is most difficult and necessary to recover the life of the past as it was continuous with our own and yet having its own authenticity.

Two chapters, by Professor W. R. Ward, Church and society in the first half of the nineteenth century, and by Professor T. E. Jessop, The mid-nineteenth century background, describe the ecclesiastical, political and economic, and intellectual movements of the society in which the Methodist people were seeking their identity. There is a certain amount of overlap between these two essays, and it is difficult sometimes to recognise the same events as they appear in Professor Ward's allusive and ironic analysis and in the less sophisticated narrative by Professor Jessop of the age of economic and social turbulence and political and ecclesiastical reform. It is unfortunate that this duplication has not been avoided and that more space has not been made available for an account of developments in literature and education. The matter of education was crucial for a mature religious body engaging with its environment, and critical in the movement of Wesleyan Methodism into the spectrum of Dissent. When Jabez Bunting in 1836 envisaged for Methodism a periodical publication, profiting from Brougham's example, with "articles on chemistry free from materialism; religious and yet free from Calvinism", he was perhaps identifying the need for a more disciplined and instructed community than one characterised by the individualism and febrile and promiscuous religiosity to which Methodism was too often prone.

Professor John Kent's essay, *The Wesleyan Methodists to 1849*, shows how the tensions within and outside Methodism interacted to produce the bewildering, sometimes comic, sometimes tragic, responses of Methodist leadership at the centre and in the Circuits. This is an area where the historiography has been distorted by the question-begging generalisations of Lecky and Halévy, and Professor Kent makes some attempt to survey the copious literature that has appeared in the last two decades. If he is justifiably severe on Robert Currie's *Methodism divided*, it is nevertheless to be regretted that neither the statistical nor the geographical dimensions of Methodist development in the period covered by this volume are dealt with as a separate topic. Much, though not all, of the apparent fissiparous character of Methodism in this period arose from the difficulties of extending the movement into territory untouched by Wesley and his preachers, and some explicit recognition of this would have given greater perspective to the least satisfactory chapter, that by the Rev. J. T. Wilkinson on the rise of other Methodist traditions. Mr. Wilkinson's essay suffers from the cut-off date of 1850, since the non-Wesleyan developments, particularly the Primitive Methodists and the Bible Christians, need to be seen in a longer perspective; when once their period of rapid expansion ceased they tended to recapitulate in slightly different terms the tensions which had produced in the "Old Body" of Wesleyanism the Methodist New Connexion and the Free Methodist bodies. It also suffers from the absence of any substantial recent work on the Methodist New Connexion and Primitive Methodism, apart from Mr. Wilkinson's own studies of Hugh Bourne and William Clowes. The mis-print on page 296, "Mary-Wee" for "Mary-Week", i.e. Week St. Mary, where O'Bryan began the

Bible Christian work, should not, however, be taken as evidence of a constitutional indifference in Methodist leadership to what goes on outside London, although many nineteenth century Methodists would have thought so.

We are promised a third volume completing the history, and a further volume of documents. It would strengthen the whole work if some substantial bibliographical survey could be promised, to cover important publications, the publication of which inevitably outpaces the rate at which a co-operative work like this can be produced.

A. N. CASS

The Book of Common Order (1979), prepared by the committee on Public Worship and Aids to Devotion of the Church of Scotland. St Andrew Press, Edinburgh, pp. xvi, 182, £3.50.

The Book of Common Order issued by the Church of Scotland in 1940 and in many reprintings has been of inestimable help to countless ministers of the Church of Scotland and of many other Churches. It set a high standard of dignity and order in the public worship of God and even if its rubrics and forms were exotic in comparison with current Presbyterian practice it nevertheless encouraged a pattern of worship which was indebted to the tested experience of the ages and of many denominations and it also helped many ministers to avoid unworthy and trivial eccentricities in the various services and ceremonies of the Church. It was in accord with Scottish and Presbyterian practice in that it began with several orders of service for the ministry of the Word; this ministry was then and still is the regular diet of worship at the great majority of Sunday services. Thereafter followed the orders for the Sacraments.

There were many liturgical scholars who held that the norm for Sunday morning worship ought to be the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper and that even where this was not the practice it should be made clear that the service with the ministry of the Word was in fact the first part of a full Communion Service. The new *Book of Common Order* is constructed on this principle. The first and main order is that of Holy Communion and, as readers will see, it is undoubtedly a dignified and deep and devotional act of worship. It has a clear family resemblance to the service in the 1940 Book but it also shows the influence of recent liturgical studies and of many ecumenical consultations. The most noticeable sign of this external influence is in the prayer of consecration. In the 1940 Book the main order of the Communion prescribed the reading of the words of institution as the warrant for all that followed and the call to obey the Lord's "blessed example in word and action" was one of the finest points in the service. Many other liturgical traditions incorporate the words of institution in the prayer of consecration and this seems to be the method preferred in the new book; at least, the words of institution at the beginning are in brackets and the rubric is that they may be omitted at this point if they are in the prayer. Some fashionable phrases such as "Holy things for holy people" are also introduced and while they are theologically defensible they have an alien sound in our tradition.

After the orders for the Communion service there is a two-page framework of "the main Sunday Service when the Lord's Supper is not celebrated" and such a service is still by far the most common type of service in our tradition. The Introduction to the new Book informs us that sixteen sets of prayers are provided in a companion volume. This companion volume will naturally not be *The Book of Common Order*. This shift in the balance of provision for the most common form of service in our tradition does mark a move in liturgical thinking.

In the orders for occasional offices there is evidence of wide and practical study. The marriage service has a commendable clarity and balance. In the funeral services there is a welcome attempt to prescribe words which can be used on every occasion. There is much to be said for the replacement of the words "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life" by "having our whole trust and confidence in the mercy of our heavenly Father". I invariably used the words "in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life" and I had no hesitation in using them for all, but the suggested new wording has much to commend it. However, it is surprising to find the inclusion of the words

"Rest eternal grant upon him, O Lord,
And let light perpetual shine upon him".

Admittedly, these words have increasingly slipped into many services in our tradition but they assume a doctrine of prayer for the departed which has not been adopted by the Church of Scotland or by kindred Churches.

In the preface, the Convenor of the Committee stresses that in the main the orders are only models and not definitive forms but the models are constructed on distinctive theological lines. It is not difficult to see why the National Church Association of the Church of Scotland has published a *Reformed book of Common Order*; its contents reflect a strong Scottish tradition and will awake an answering note in many minds but it is a pity that its preface and some of its rubrics are marred by tendentious acrimony and that it attributes motives to the compilers of the new *Book of Common Order* which are scarcely worthy of the Association.

In the new *Book of Common Order* alternative forms are provided in language which addresses God as Thou and as You; the traditional form is printed first and is defended as "an art-form of rare quality and part of our culture". The book is of convenient size and is clearly printed and handsomely bound.

R.B.K.

Second Fiddle. By Norman Goodall. Pp.165, London, S.P.C.K., 1979, £4.25.

This splendid book of recollections and reflections is about "playing a part with fellow performers in an unfinished symphony. Sometimes. . . I have been entrusted with responsibilities of a leading kind. Often I have found greatest satisfaction in playing a secondary role". To have been allowed "to play with the orchestra for a long time" has filled the author with a gratitude which has happily impelled the writing of this account of his stewardship. It goes without saying that it is written with the graceful felicity which so many of us have long envied in all Goodall's spoken or written utterances; and it is a remarkable story on any reckoning. It starts in Birmingham and sparse educational opportunity. It proceeds through patches of clerical work in a City Treasurer's office, intervals of national service in the 1914-1918 war, to a spell in the Civil Service in which Goodall might have reached a very high level. Yet it was to the ministry that he was called; and after Mansfield College, to which his devotion has never ceased, came pastorates at Walthamstow and New Barnet (it must have been exciting then to have Norman Goodall and Herbert Farmer in neighbouring churches). Overseas service had long claimed his loyalty. Circumstances prevented the fulfilment of that ambition in the normal way; but service with the London Missionary Society as one of its Foreign Secretaries, work with the International Missionary Council, and eventually as Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches were surely sufficient fulfilment of it. It was largely due to Goodall's determined diplomacy that the fusion of the

International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches became possible: one wonders whether that accomplishment ever received due recognition. Why has no Scottish University given him a D.D. on that ground alone?

The bare outline of the narrative does but scant justice to the richness and flavour of the content. One would like to know more, for instance, of those war-time journeys in the service of the world church, of the reconciling ministry in the Middle East, of the plain speaking in South Africa, and, perhaps most of all, of the ecumenical break-through in a lectureship at Heythrop College and later a visiting professorship in the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, where Roman Catholic students were instructed in the ecumenical movement which started long before Vatican II: no doubt, they learned much more. All this is shot through with vignettes of those whom the author has encountered in his "journeyings oft". The book concludes with a moving and penetrating confession of faith in which loyalty to the local and to the universal are held in balance by the Gospel on which both alike depend and without which each is insignificant.

Those who wonder about the ecumenical movement as well as those who are convinced supporters of it will find here much illumination from the pen of one who carries into his eighties the mental and spiritual enthusiasm which derive ultimately from him whose "matchless power is ever new and ever young".

JOHN HUXTABLE

SHORT REVIEWS

Concerning Scandals. By John Calvin, translated by J. W. Fraser. St Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1979. £3.50

This is a valuable addition to the works of Calvin now available in English. Calvin wrestles with the stumbling blocks which beset the Church in the world; they arise from the malice of men and also from the discipline and chastisement imposed by God to test the faith of the Church and to prevent the Church from becoming at ease in Zion. Calvin, as usual, always stimulates, sometimes inspires, and occasionally provokes the reader.

R.B.K.

I will build my Church: the story of the Congregational Union of Ireland, 1829-1979. By Malcolm Coles. Pp.40, Belfast, no price given.

Congregationalism has never had a major role in the ecclesiastical scene in Ireland. This work finds evidence of its existence from the time of Cromwell and since then Congregational Churches have been found in various parts of Ireland. The first attempt to organise these Churches into a Union took place in 1829 and this booklet traces the varying fortunes of the Union. The Churches shared in the results of the 1859 Revival but then there followed a time of recession which the author attributes to the influence of Liberalism, Modernism and even Ecumenism. Political factors also played their part. The influx of English ministers, particularly those trained in the Fairbairn tradition at Mansfield College, Oxford, is seen as part of the means by which these alien influences percolated into the Union. The Union at present has twenty-six member Churches and some of these are expanding. This survey takes the view that the Churches have survived and repelled the alien influences of former years. There could be another reading of the story. This account is more a confession of faith than a final assessment of the history of the

Union. The influence of Fairbairn and his progeny had its weaknesses, as readers of Nathaniel Micklem's *The Box and the Puppets*. will know, but it had lessons which it was necessary for the Church to ponder seriously.

R.B.K.

Elisabeth Murray's *Caught in the Web of Words: James A. H. Murray and the Oxford English Dictionary* (Yale University Press, 1977 Pp.386, £6.95) was received with critical acclaim. It is not too late to remind readers of this *Journal* that Miss Murray's life of her grandfather is an absorbing account of academic publishing and University travail, achievement and misunderstanding; a lucid description of the compilation of a monumental work of scholarship; and an engaging biography of yet another good Scotsman moved south and made better — in this instance a Victorian Congregationalist who taught at Mill Hill School, became a life deacon of George St. Oxford, and greeted his knighthood with resignation, as the sort of thing best suited for "a brewer or a local mayor."

Ian Sellers disarmingly sees his *Nineteenth Century Liverpool and the Novelists* (limited edition, obtainable from the the author, Padgate College, Warrington, Cheshire, 1979, Pp.64, £1.30 inc. postage) as a diversion from his pursuit of church history. So it is; historians will profit from a fellow historian's scholarly engagement with the disciplines of literary criticism; Free Churchmen will be alerted, admiringly, to the Unitarian J. L. Haigh and, less admiringly, to the Free Methodist Silas K. Hocking; readers of this *Journal* will reflect especially upon William Wilson, Margaret Oliphant's ne'er-do-well Presbyterian (Westminster trained) minister brother. Dr. Sellers discerns literary merit of a sort in all these, yet, although Puritanism stalks every page of his study, as it must where the novel is concerned, and although these three were also ministers, their talents remain too slight to permit startling speculation; their value is less for the literary critic than for the historian. Dr Sellers justifies their reappraisal.

J.C.G.B.

ACCESSIONS TO THE LIBRARY

Our Research Secretary, Mr. Keay, has supplied us with a classified and annotated list of recent additions to the Library.

He begins with four books under the general heading of nonconformity: *So Down to Prayers* by Dr. Binfield; *Chapels and Churches: Who cares?* by Marcus Binney and Peter Burman; *Robert Mackintosh, Theologian of Integrity* by Dr. Sell; and *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent* edited by Dr. Knox. Mr. Keay thinks that Dr. Binfield's assessment of the nonconformist conscience as a "mirage" is too severe and that in fact Dr. Binfield's book "gives a most readable and comprehensive account of the actions that resulted from the working of that nonconformist conscience he seems to discount".

Mr. Keay then lists as further evidence of nonconformist life a number of histories of local churches and he points out that the Society tries to keep as complete a collection of such histories as possible.

Some of these are brochures issued to mark special events such as jubilees and centenaries. Among these are histories of Broadstone (Dorset); St. Andrew's Cheam; St. John's, Orpington; Heaton, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Trinity, Streatham;

St. Andrew's, Blackhill (Durham); Baldock; Skinner St., Poole; Grosvenor-St. Aidans, Didsbury; Salisbury; Loughborough; Hest Bank, Lancaster; St. Columba's, Worthing; Lyndhurst Rd., Hampstead; and East Cliff, Bournemouth. There are also a number of histories of continuing Congregational churches.

Then there is a group of substantial surveys including histories of Gatley in Cheshire, of Highworth in Wiltshire, of St. Paul's, Wigan, of Richmond, of Knaresborough, and of Trinity, Plymouth. These are extensive chronicles and take a view of world events. In the Highworth story there is mention of three well-attended services on 26 April 1854, the day of humiliation on account of the war with Russia. In the Wigan story there is mention of an approach from Hope Congregational Church proposing a union of the two churches; this had to wait for ninety years.

A further group sets the histories in an even wider national, social, political and moral setting. The story of Hope Church, Wigan, is "a splendid picture of life in a nonconformist society". The story of Silverhill and St. Luke's in St. Leonards is "splendidly written and illustrated with old photographs that evoke the atmosphere of the periods covered"; in the section on Sunday School Treats there is a description of how "the children walked in procession from the Church schoolroom to the Farm, each child carrying a mug and every girl wearing a hat with long skirts almost down to her ankles, black stockings and good stout boots well laced or buttoned up". The story of Aston Tirrold is entitled *Monument to Faith* and deals with one of the oldest of our churches and has "a good section on the contribution of the Church to the provision of schooling in the village".

Dr. Knox has produced three histories in this group. Little Baddow in Essex traces its story from the early part of the seventeenth century and Mr. Keay says this history is "the best referenced of those received". The histories of Westminster College, Cambridge, and of St. Columba's Church in Cambridge deal with two stories which had a deep influence on Presbyterianism in England and around the world. Presbyterian services were commenced on Cambridge in 1879 and since then the congregation has included a vast variety of members from many lands.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES

Reformed World (Vol. XXXV, Nos. 1-4)

A large proportion of these issues is taken up with reports on dialogues between the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and other confessional bodies, the Baptist World Alliance and the Roman Catholic Church.

There are also contributions from John Huxtable, Lesslie Newbigin and Martin Cressey of the United Reformed Church.

Journal of Presbyterian History (Vol. 56)

This is the Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society in the U.S.A. It is beautifully produced and the majority of its articles are built around biographical accounts of persons in public life who have had Presbyterian connections, for example, Erskine Caldwell the novelist and Catherine Marshall whose best-selling writings arose from the life and times of her husband, Peter Marshall, the influential minister in Washington, D.C.

The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society (Vol. XLI)

This issue ranges over events and personalities in Quaker history in England, Bermuda and Ireland from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century. Jean Mortimer's article, "Leeds Friends and the Beaconite controversy", shows that Friends had local divisions which were not dissimilar to divisions in other nonconforming denominations.

Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society (Vol. XVI, Nos. 3 & 4)

We envy this Society its ability to produce a journal twice as large as our own. These numbers contain an extensive history of St. Mark's Unitarian Church in Edinburgh; there is an interesting article by Ian Sellars on "The Risley Case" and one by M. P. A. Macourt on "Non-subscribing Presbyterians and the Irish Census in the nineteenth century".

Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society (Vol. XLI, Parts 4, 5, & 6)

These issues include an assortment of articles ranging over Methodist history and personalities and bibliography. There is a series of articles on recent changes in Methodist organisation and forms of worship.

The Baptist Quarterly (Vol. XXVII, Nos. 5-8)

In addition to articles of interest mainly to those in the Baptist tradition there are valuable articles of wider interest; "Medieval Spirituality" by Principal Raymond Brown of Spurgeon's College, "The Relevance and Vitality of the Sect-Idea" by Rev. J. G. C. Norman, "The Wilderness of this World — Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*" by Dr. R. Pooley of the University of Keele, and "Free Churchmen and the Twenty Years' Crisis" by Professor K. G. Robbins of the University of Wales.

R.B.K.

BOOKS

Send for our catalogue of Nonconformist books and for details of our other theological catalogues:

Laurie Gage Books,
100 The Broadway,
Leigh-on-Sea, Essex SS9 1AB

BOOKS

We buy all kinds of second-hand books and especially those about English Congregationalism.

Write or telephone:

John R. Hodgkins,
Clifton Books,
130 Alexandra Road, Southend-on-Sea, Essex.
Telephone 0702 40537 (Home)
0702 331004 (Shop)