

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## What is Evangelical Churchmanship?

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

THE question asked above clearly implies that there is a Churchmanship other than Evangelical. And this is true, for there are three great sections of Churchmanship, popularly known as High, Broad, and Evangelical. It is a temptation to say Broad, High, and "Low," but it may be questioned whether the Low Churchman now exists, and, further, however convenient it may be to use these three epithets, the Evangelical Churchman refuses, as he always has refused, to be called a "Low" Churchman. It is well known that in the eighteenth century the Low Churchman was the inveterate and often fierce opponent of the Evangelical. The Low Churchman represented the sporting, unspiritual parson of latitudinarian view and low morality, and it is not surprising that he was the sworn foe of Churchmen who pleaded for the salvation of souls and emphasized spirituality of life and conduct.

There is no need to be afraid of parties or sections in the Church, for a party only means, as Mr. Balleine well puts it, "a section of a larger society united to carry out the objects of the whole body on principles and by methods peculiar to itself." There always has been, there always will be, those who, while agreed in substance, nevertheless view Divine truth from different though not insuperably differing standpoints, and who emphasize various aspects of that truth. The views can be different without being really divergent, as the Church history of over three centuries shows with such great and representative names as Cranmer, Ridley, Parker, Jewel, Hooker, Whitgift, Bancroft, Andrewes, Reynolds, Cosin, Tillotson, and Barrow, not to mention later names. There is, of course, a real danger of parties becoming partisan, and of so narrowing their views as to treat matters exclusively from their own particular and party standpoint. But there is no necessary connection between party

and narrowness. As a French essayist once said : " It is possible to have preferences without exclusions."

One question, however, necessarily arises out of these differences of thought and party, and that is, as to the limitations of differences within the Church of England. All varieties of view must of necessity be compatible with loyalty to the general position of the Church, and this was undoubtedly the case until the rise of the Tractarian Movement, which was very largely an effort to make out that the Church of England was after all not essentially different from the Church of Rome. Tract XC. by Newman marks the most familiar and ablest attempt in this direction. He endeavoured to explain the articles in such a way as to make them virtually identical with the teaching of Rome. But facts were too strong for him, and this non-natural, or rather unnatural, interpretation was soon seen to be impossible, and Newman with others went over to the Church of Rome. Unfortunately, however, there has remained in the Church of England to the present day a large party who hold essentially Roman Catholic doctrines and observe Roman Catholic practices. This party is in no sense the lineal successors of the High Churchman of the seventeenth century, and they are also to be carefully distinguished from those High Churchmen of the nineteenth century who were absolutely opposed to Roman Catholic doctrines and practices.

Thus the Church is faced with a real problem to-day in connection with men who call themselves " Catholic," and who are called by others Ritualists or extreme Anglicans. To show that I am not alone or unfair in regarding this party as in no proper sense belonging to the Church of England, I will appeal to the Bishop of Durham :

" I cannot but maintain that their theory of the Body of Christ, and of the way of salvation, was not so much development as a really new thing in the main stream of our post-Reformation theology."<sup>1</sup>

It is the presence of this problem that calls for renewed emphasis on Evangelical Churchmanship.

<sup>1</sup> " The Evangelical School in the Church of England," p. 29.

## I.

The first word that calls for attention is "Churchmanship," and Evangelicals claim to be absolutely loyal to the Church of England, with no wish or intention to be anything or anywhere else. They find themselves in a body which they believe to be at once Scriptural in character, historical in continuity, and valuable in practical effect, and they are more than content to be loyal, devoted Churchmen, rejoicing in their position, and perfectly satisfied to abide in it. But of course their Churchmanship is in harmony with the great work done in the sixteenth century, known as the Reformation, because the Prayer-Book as we now have it is the product of that age and movement. With the greatest possible readiness Evangelicals admit that the word "Protestant" is not found in Church of England formulas, but with equally great readiness they insist that the *thing* "Protestant" is there. And the question turns not on words but on realities. Evangelical Churchmen take their stand on the four words so frequently associated with the late Archbishop Benson: "Catholic," "Apostolic," "Reformed," "Protestant," and they agree with him that not one of these words can be spared, the last not least of all.

This convinced Evangelical Churchmanship is perfectly compatible with sympathy and co-operation with other Evangelical Christians of non-Episcopal communions. Evangelicals claim to be the lineal descendants of Cranmer and Ridley in their attitude to non-Episcopal reformers. I was once asked whether as a condition of Reunion I was prepared to give up Episcopacy. I replied, "Certainly not," and I added that I saw no reason why Evangelicals to-day should not do what an Archbishop of Canterbury and a Bishop of London did in the sixteenth century in regard to friendship, fellowship, and even intercommunion with non-Episcopal Reformers. It is, of course, sadly true that the exigencies of political and religious controversy caused severances between 1563 and 1662, but even so no true representative of the English Church ever

ventured to deny the validity of non-Episcopal Churches and ministry. The same attitude was shown during the eighteenth century, and it was not until the rise of the Tractarian Movement that any real Anglican exclusiveness was seen. There were great and serious differences before that time with Non-conformists, but these were concerned with separation, never with invalidity. Evangelical Churchmen, while holding firmly to their own position, have always been able to associate with Christians of other Evangelical communions. Various movements in the nineteenth century show this, such as the Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Keswick Movement, and Moody's Missions. These have been, and are, strongly supported by Evangelical Churchmen, and I have yet to learn that their Churchmanship has been essentially impaired thereby. Certainly, if figures mean anything, the fact that 450 clergy went to Rome during the nineteenth century, and eight or ten to Nonconformity, ought to be sufficient to show the essential reality of the Churchmanship of Evangelicals.

## II.

But it is time to ask precisely what "Evangelical" means.

1. It means an emphasis on the *theme* of the New Testament "Evangel." Evangelicals have always proclaimed and concentrated attention on the Atonement, the sacrificial work of Christ for sinful man. They believe with Dr. Denney that "in the New Testament the centre of gravity is not Bethlehem, but Calvary," and they have ever made the Cross, or rather Christ crucified, the centre of their preaching and life. The great Evangelical hymns like "Rock of Ages" and "When I survey the wondrous Cross" are a fine testimony to this fact. It is, of course, quite easy to caricature the belief of Evangelicals about the Cross, and this is often done ; but, caricature or not, the fact remains that the preaching of the Cross does its work. The truth that "Jesus died for me" is the simple yet sufficient message of Evangelicalism, and it carries us into the heart of the New Testament Gospel. The Cross is at once the mani-

estation of Divine righteousness and the evidence of Divine love. What God's justice demanded His love provided. And in Jesus Christ "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." This is Evangelicalism, and the glory of it is that it can be preached and lived and exulted in. Dr. Denney points out that any doctrine of Atonement which cannot be preached is not true, because it is not that word of the Cross which St. Paul describes as God's power unto salvation. He gives an illustration which, though familiar to some, is worth while repeating to others :

"I have a friend in Scotland—a convert, I dare say you will be glad to hear, of Mr. Moody during his first visit to us in 1874—who has himself been wonderfully blessed by God as an evangelist and carer for souls. He is a fishing-tackle maker and an enthusiastic fisherman, and told me once of losing his bait in a mysterious way without catching anything. The explanation was that by some accident or other the barb had been broken from the hook. It was my friend himself who made the application of this, when he said that this was exactly what happened when people preached the love of God to men, but left out of their Gospel the essential truth that it is Christ on the Cross, the substitute for sinners, in Whom that love is revealed. In other words, the condemnation of our sins in Christ upon His Cross is the barb on the hook. If you leave that out of your Gospel, I do not deny that your bait will be taken—men are pleased rather than not to think that God regards them with goodwill—your bait will be taken, but you will not catch men. You will not create in sinful human hearts that attitude to Christ which created the New Testament. You will not annihilate pride, and make Christ the Alpha and the Omega in man's redemption."<sup>1</sup>

A similar testimony is borne by another modern writer, who tells of a conversation with the late Professor Pfeleiderer, to whom he gave an account of a dying quarryman, absolutely illiterate, resting with satisfied conscience on the simple story of Jesus Christ as his substitute. Says the writer, after telling the story : "I can never forget Pfeleiderer's emotion as he replied in effect, 'If a doctrine really meets a deep human need, it must be true.'"<sup>1</sup> This is the Evangelical view of the Cross, and I make bold to say that it is the essential view of the New Testament ; and if a man caricatures this he is not merely caricaturing Evangelicals, but St. Paul and the other inspired Apostles.

<sup>1</sup> "Studies in Theology," p. 127 (lectures given in America).

<sup>2</sup> Falconer, "The Unfinished Symphony," p. 243.

2. It means an emphasis on the *source* of the New Testament Evangel, the Bible. Evangelicalism has always made prominent a belief in the Bible as the rule of faith, as something Divinely given, historically trustworthy, supremely authoritative, and personally redemptive. Evangelicals take their stand on the great Reformation position of the supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures according to Article VI. And in spite of all that modern thought has to say on the Bible—indeed, it may almost be said, all the stronger (though by contrast) because of this—Evangelicals are more convinced than ever in their allegiance to the Bible as the supremely authoritative Word of God.

3. It means an emphasis on the *character* of the New Testament Evangel. This is regarded as at once simple and spiritual.

(a) Its view of Religion is simple and spiritual. It brings the sinner face to face with Jesus Christ, and allows nothing and no one to come between. Justification by faith is taught because it introduces the soul to God and leaves it in God's presence.

(b) Its view of Worship is simple and spiritual. Ornateness of building and ritual is known to possess the danger of spiritual distraction; and while there is no necessary connection between Evangelicalism and bareness, still less between Evangelicalism and tawdriness, less still between Evangelicalism and slovenliness, and least of all between Evangelicalism and dirt, there can be no doubt of the need of perfect simplicity of adornment in ritual and service. I remember my beloved old rector, Canon Christopher, justifying his expense in the building of St. Matthew's, Grandpont, by saying he wished members of the University to see that an Evangelical building could be of the very best quality and construction; and I recall the words of a former Simeon Trustee, the late Prebendary Tate, who said that while in his village church of Kippington the music of necessity had to be simple, yet he arranged for it to be of such a quality as that the most sensitive musical ear should not be disturbed by it. Thus is Evangelicalism in worship, at once simple, spiritual, and Scriptural.

(c) Its view of the Church is simple and spiritual. The Evangelical, following the New Testament, teaches that the true view is "through Christ to the Church," not "through the Church to Christ," and herein lies the fundamental difference between Evangelicalism and Rome. A good many years ago the late Bishop Ellicott pointed out with convincing force that the question of the relation of the individual to the Church was at the basis of everything between us and Rome. And within the last few years a leading Roman Catholic theologian has said the same thing, pointing out that in the Roman Catholic system the proper order is Christ, the Church, the individual; while in Protestantism it is Christ, the individual, the Church. He added that as long as there was this fundamental disagreement there could not possibly be any reconciliation. This opinion we heartily endorse, and are particularly glad to find ourselves in exact agreement in regard to the fundamental and insuperable difference between New Testament Evangelicalism and the Church of Rome.

(d) Its view of the Ministry is simple and spiritual. The minister is not a ruler, for the laity have their rights and privileges. The clergyman is a pastor, not a priest; a medium, not a mediator; a mouthpiece, not a substitute. With Lightfoot, Evangelicals say that the Kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system, and they maintain that those are the real "Low" Churchmen who hold the sacerdotal view; for instead of the truly "High" Church view of the Epistle to the Ephesians, they are not in the New Testament sense "High" Churchmen, but, if one may put it so, high-ministry men.

(e) Its view of the Sacraments is simple and spiritual. In opposition to anything like the medieval view of spiritual magic, the Evangelical emphasizes the Word, and the response of faith thereto in connection with the Sacraments. Ministers are described in Prayer-Book terms as Ministers "of the Word and Sacraments," never of the Sacraments and Word. Sacraments are at once simple, symbolical, significant, and sufficient as pledges of God's love and means whereby we receive the same,



but they derive their benefit from being the pledges and guarantees of Divine grace mediated through faith in Him and His Word.

4. It means an emphasis on the outcome of the New Testament Evangel. Evangelicalism means evangelization at home and abroad, and no Churchmen have been so prominent in connection with Missions of all kinds as Evangelicals. The existence of the Church Pastoral-Aid Society and kindred organizations proves this in regard to home missionary work; indeed, it is only the Evangelical who can really tell the man in the street that he must be born again. Anyone who wishes to know what Evangelicalism stands for in regard to home evangelization should read that striking and convincing little booklet by my honoured friend, Canon Hay Aitken, "The Importance of Divine Evangelical Teaching."<sup>1</sup> So also with foreign missions; the C.M.S. is itself one of the great proofs of Evangelicalism, and it is well known that in all parts of the foreign field Evangelicalism is very prominent as compared with work which is not Evangelical. In our own M.S.C.C. in Canada, it is simply true to say that if Evangelical Churches severed their connection with it, the work of the society would be very appreciably less, and would tend towards non-existence. Further, the interest shown towards Canada in England in recent years has been due more to the efforts of one man than to any other cause, and I make bold to say that the Archbishops' Western Canada Fund owes more to Principal Lloyd than to any other single individual.

As to philanthropy and social reform, it is sometimes said that Evangelicalism does nothing to alleviate conditions and to bring about social regeneration. But, first of all, it should not be forgotten that the personal interest in social and moral questions is due more than anything else to the Evangelical individualism which starts from "Ye must be born again." It is familiar almost to triteness that "the soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul," and as long as Evangelicalism

<sup>1</sup> J. F. Shaw and Co.

keeps to this, it will be doing much for social uplift. But further, we must not forget that the slave trade was abolished through Evangelicals, like Wilberforce and Buxton. Many social reforms were brought about through one who gloried in being an Evangelical of Evangelicals—Lord Shaftesbury. And in spite of Mr. Winston Churchill's "The Inside of the Cup," there is no incompatibility between a loyal adherent to the orthodox creed and a thorough sympathy with social reform. There is nothing more ludicrous in that now well-known book than its readiness to show that the hero only took up social work when he had shed all his orthodoxy, such as it was. This shows that neither the hero nor the author has any conception of the connection between Evangelicalism as the cause and the uplift of life as the effect. A recent work from one who is at once an Evangelical and a social reformer will show the proof of this. I refer to Dr. Clow's book, "Christ in the Social Order." Evangelicalism insists on the fact that whatever may be done for the masses, it will not be identical with the ushering in of the Kingdom of God. Pulling down the rookery and building the model dwelling is often absolutely essential, but it will not destroy the fascination for crime. There will still remain the need of that new birth which is the foundation of Evangelicalism, and which always makes Evangelicalism so hard for the ordinary man.

This is essential Evangelicalism, and if it be said that others as well as Evangelicals hold and proclaim these truths, the fact is readily admitted; though at the same time it is contended that there is such a thing as proportion and prominence, and we believe that nowhere, as in Evangelicalism, is the proper proportion of the New Testament emphasized and urged. To quote again from the Bishop of Durham :

"To his own thought and heart the 'school' here dealt with has long approved itself, on the whole, as faithful in essentials to the all-important test of *the scale* of Christian verity as presented in the Holy Scriptures. It places, as it seems to him, 'the first things first,' as the things of salvation are set before us in the Divine Book of Appeal."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Evangelical School in the Church of England," p. 6.

This question of Evangelical Churchmanship has a special point in connection with a sermon preached some months ago at St. Alban's, Holborn (of all places), by Canon Simpson, with the title, "What is an Evangelical?" The preacher is now well known for his view of the Atoning Sacrifice which it is the joy of Evangelical Churchmen to welcome. I for one am never tired of speaking of Canon Simpson as one of three (Denney and Forsyth being the others) who are doing much to bring us back from the undue emphasis on the Incarnation to the New Testament view of Christology. Ever since I read Dr. Simpson's paper on the Old Testament at the Weymouth Church Congress, I have learnt to look for his utterances with interest, and his little book on the Holy Communion, "The Thing Signified," is essentially Evangelical, with its acute criticism of the Bishop of Oxford, even though the writer seems to be somewhat surprised, and perhaps concerned, in the second edition, at Evangelical appreciation and approval of his book. But his valued emphasis on the Cross must not blind us to the impossibility of accepting his bold paradox in describing the people of St. Alban's, Holborn, as a congregation "so notably evangelical." He thereupon spoke in warm terms of the Evangelical Alliance, and stated the conditions of membership. I wonder what his hearers at St. Alban's thought of this. Evangelicalism is rightly described by Canon Simpson as consisting of the preaching of Christ's Death, Resurrection, and Second Coming, and then he goes on to say that the most "Protestant" feature in St. Paul's Cathedral is the reredos with its crucifix and Latin version of "God so loved the world." Well, when the reredos was erected we never heard of this "Protestant" idea connected with it, and Canon Simpson well knows that for at least five centuries there was no crucifix used in the Christian Church, and that the Greek Church to this very day has a remarkable form of the crucifix in a picture of Christ as alive and reigning while nailed to the Cross. All this is a testimony to the real insight of the early Christians, that Christ is not on the Cross but on the throne, and Protestantism

likewise stands to-day for this essential Gospel of Christ as the One Who, though once dead, now lives for evermore (Rev. i. 18).

Then Canon Simpson goes on to speak of the belief of the Evangelical Alliance in "one body." This is true, but here again the view is not that of St. Alban's, Holborn. To that congregation, the "one body" is limited to the three branches—Greek, Roman, and Anglican; while the Evangelical Alliance includes all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. To many of Canon Simpson's readers the reference to a C.M.S. missionary being able to fill out his Old Gospel from writings like those of Bishop Gore will suggest that there must be something curious in a mind which can seriously regard the Bishop's writings as a complement to Evangelicalism. I suppose this must refer to the corporate as complementary to the individual aspect of truth. And yet I will undertake to prove most of the essential principles of Evangelicalism on the Church and Ministry from the admissions that Dr. Gore is compelled to make in his book, "Orders and Unity." Let me adduce a very different example from that of the C.M.S. missionary referred to by Dr. Simpson. A friend of mine, who was once in the trammels of a narrow, extreme Churchmanship, told me that his first step towards Evangelicalism was the reading of Bishop Gore's commentary on Romans i.-viii.—that he first saw the possibility of the Evangelical view in the Bishop's treatment of St. Paul's great chapters. Just so; but this man is now in a position which is not complementary to, but contradictory of, the essential position for which Bishop Gore stands.

It is, of course, quite easy for Canon Simpson, with his love of paradox, to speak of the Evangelical as being a Churchman; but the question is, What is meant by such Churchmanship? Does he mean the Ephesian view of the Church as interpreted by Moule, Hort, and others? Or does he mean the view of Moberly, Bishop Gore, and men of that school? Canon Simpson ought to know that the highest views of the Church are found in Ephesians, but that which is associated with St. Alban's, so far from being "notably Evangelical," is utterly

narrow, and exclusive of millions of the noblest Christians now in the world, to say nothing of some of the finest spirits of the last three centuries. And so, in spite of Canon Simpson's fine spirit and his real large-heartedness, there are fundamental differences between St. Alban's, Holborn, and the Evangelical Alliance, which not even he, with all his ability, can bridge over. The Evangelical "early Communion" is not one and the same thing with "Low Mass" at St. Alban's, and if Canon Simpson thinks it is, someone ought to undeceive him quickly, and remind him of that which has been true from the time of the Galatians downwards—that between legalism and spirituality, between so-called "Catholic" exclusiveness and New Testament Christianity, there is a great gulf fixed.

It is easy to say that Evangelicals are pure individualists, despise learning, ignore worship, contemn ritual, neglect sacraments, and sit lightly by Episcopacy. But they do nothing of the kind. They believe in learning, they hold to the necessity of worship and ritual, they adhere to the New Testament view of the Sacraments, and they hold firmly to that conception of Episcopacy which was the predominant and almost the entire view of the Church of England from Cranmer and Hooker to the Tractarian Movement. There is no finer testimony available than that given to Evangelicals by Professor Gwatkin :

"In their chief message there is an impressive monotony. It is the old word ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth, 'Ye must be born again'; and surely they were right in teaching that what does not touch the heart is worthless as a religion. If there is a God, and if there be such a thing as right feeling towards Him, then plainly neither learning, nor right belief, nor works of law will do instead of it. These men have been the prophets of the modern world. Many a time their preaching has been like streams of water in a barren land of orthodoxy and formalism. . . Many a time they have gone down among the outcasts of England and made them into self-respecting men, fearing God and eschewing evil. They have been foremost in the war against public wickedness and wrong—say, the abominations of the old prisons, the iniquities of the slave trade, the oppressions of the truck system, the sordid cruelties of the old factories. They have been foremost also in every good work of social help, from the modest beginnings of the Pietists at Halle to the mighty rescue agencies working round us now. It is the fashion to sneer at them, but no man who cares for truth can fall in with it. Darwin for one did not despise their mission work. Perhaps these men had

more of earnest purpose and less of maudlin sentiment than we ourselves—I mean in England—have shown in the general debasement of the last twenty years.”<sup>1</sup>

Of course, there are dangers surrounding Evangelicalism, and no one wishes to ignore or even minimize them. There is an intellectual danger—Evangelicals may be tempted to follow the latest phase of intellectual, scientific, or doctrinal opinion. They may be urged to accept as among “assured results” that which is not assured. They may be charged, as they have been, with ignoring modern thought, when all the while they may be only anxious to see where modern agrees with ancient—that is, Biblical—thought, and to accept it when it does. Thus it is sometimes said that Evangelicals ought to have accepted at once the Darwinian theory of evolution; but, as it has been well pointed out, that theory was associated in the minds of most of its exponents with a materialistic and naturalistic view of religion, which made it impossible for any Christians, Evangelical or others, to endorse it. And time has shown the wisdom of this attitude, for to-day the leading evolutionists have departed far from the Darwinian position, and are teaching a view that approximates much more nearly to the conception of a Divine Source and Cause. In the same way, Evangelicals may be tempted to shift their doctrinal basis by incorporating certain aspects of modern thought which contain elements not found in the Evangelical Gospel. But to such temptations Evangelicalism will turn a deaf ear, even though it is charged with obscurantism. A native Japanese evangelist has been so successful in winning souls that he is known as the Moody of Japan. Some of the advanced teachers tell him that he is one hundred years behind in his theology, and he replies that he is nineteen hundred years behind and expects to stay there. It is sometimes said that we must not teach anything to our children that they will afterwards have to unlearn, and with all my heart I agree with this. Thus, on the

<sup>1</sup> “The Knowledge of God,” p. 242.

Atonement Evangelicalism holds by the simple word which we teach our children :

“ He died that we might be forgiven,  
 He died to make us good,  
 That we might go at last to heaven,  
 Saved by His precious blood.

“ There was none other good enough  
 To pay the price of sin ;  
 He only could unlock the gate  
 Of heaven, and let us in.”

God forbid that we should ever have to unlearn this view of the “ old, old story ” !

Ecclesiastical dangers may also loom in front, and Evangelicalism may become enamoured of a view of the ministry which has done little or nothing but harm—a doctrine of the Church which, while it seems to stand for the New Testament truth of corporate Christianity, is in reality essentially narrow and an utter contradiction of New Testament catholicity, and a doctrine of Episcopacy which is not only against Scripture, but finds no warrant in history or present experiences. If Evangelicalism ever weakens on these points, it will suffer, and deserve to suffer. But this will not be for long, since Truth is mighty, and these things have a wonderful way of righting themselves.

Another danger is worldliness—the growth of the secular spirit which makes Evangelicalism fashionable. But when Evangelicalism becomes the fashion it inevitably tends to spiritual powerlessness. “ In the world, but not of the world,” must ever be the characteristic of New Testament religion.

Not least of all, there is the moral danger of nervousness—of being afraid of Evangelicalism, and of yielding to the clamour for everything modern, scientific, and “ up-to-date.” But if ever Evangelicalism loses moral fibre and spiritual courage, it will warrant all the opprobriums of spiritual powerlessness that it will obtain. There could not be a finer testimony to this aspect than that given in the book already quoted from by the Bishop of Durham :

“Recently I was told by a friend that a Bishop, not of our school, had lamented to him the fewness at present of candidates for orders trained in Evangelical homes. Such candidates had as a rule, in the speaker’s opinion, ‘so much Christian backbone.’”<sup>1</sup>

In spite of all these dangers, it is impossible for an Evangelical to be other than hopeful, because he knows that the New Testament is on his side, and his constant endeavour is to be more and more on the side of the New Testament.

Professor Gwatkin writes as follows of Evangelicals :

“If ever the full power of religion is to be brought to bear on the mass of the people, these are the men who will have to do it. Evangelicals and Nonconformists are still the backbone of serious religion in England, and its future chiefly depends on their willingness to receive new truth from the world around them; and of such willingness there are many hopeful signs. If they will only thank God and take courage, they have it in them to represent religion more worthily than any who have gone before them.”<sup>2</sup>

What are wanted to-day are men of conviction, men of courage, men of consistency, and then the old Evangelical Gospel will continue to demonstrate its worth as “the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.”

<sup>1</sup> “The Evangelical School in the Church of England,” p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> “The Knowledge of God,” p. 246.

