

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1879.

ART. I.—THE EVANGELICAL SCHOOL.

1. *The Evangelical Movement: its Parentage, Progress, and Issue.* By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. (*The British Quarterly Review* for July, 1879.)
2. *History of the Eighteenth Century.* By W. E. H. LECKY.
3. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* By the Rev. C. J. ABBEY and Rev. J. H. OVERTON.
4. *Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges.* By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D.
5. *Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography.* By Right Hon. Sir JAMES STEPHEN, K.C.B.

IF the concurrence of independent testimony can establish any matter of opinion, the prevalent influence of the Evangelical School on the thought and feeling of the Church of England must be accepted as an established fact. All the writers above named concur in asserting it—the statesman, the philosopher, the clergyman, the Nonconformist, and the lawyer form the same general estimate. They differ widely, indeed, from each other as to the period at which the predominance of the School was reached, and as to the causes to which it is to be ascribed, but as to the fact they are unanimous. Mr. Gladstone affirms that by infusion it profoundly altered “the general tone and tendency of the preaching of the clergy.” Mr. Lecky asserts that before the close of the eighteenth century “the Evangelical movement had become dominant in England, and it continued the almost undisputed centre of religious life till the rise of the Tractarian movement in 1830.” Mr. Abbey, in the introduction to the valuable work with which his name is associated, states

that the Evangelical movement did good even in quarters where it had been looked upon with disfavour, and attributes to its influence "better care for the religious education of the masses, an increased attention to Church missions, the foundation of new religious societies, greater practical activity and improvement in the style of sermons." Mr. Overton declares that the Evangelical leaders were "the salt of the earth" in their day, and concludes his history of the Evangelical revival with the declaration that "every English Churchman has reason to be deeply grateful to them for what they did." Dr. Stoughton, in his introduction, speaking of the "outburst of religious zeal which took place under George II., both within the Church of England and without it," describes it as "a wonderful movement," "which develops into large and still larger dimensions as time rolls on." Towards the close of his second volume he states that the revival of Evangelical religion, with the religious machinery to which it gave rise, "penetrated efficaciously into the depths of society, so as to render the continuance of certain existing evils almost impossible. . . . And beyond all this, multitudes were converted to the faith and practice of the Gospel, so as to live in virtue and benevolence, and die in the hope of eternal life." Sir J. Stephen, in his Essay on the Evangelical succession, declares that its members "accomplished a momentous revolution in the national character."¹ If it may be permitted to combine all these statements into one, they cover the whole life of Evangelicalism from its revival in the eighteenth century down to the present day. They constitute a splendid eulogy; and those who can trace their religious genealogy back to Simeon, Scott, Newton, and Venn, have cause to be proud of their spiritual inheritance.

The fact must, therefore, be held to be established that the Evangelical School, more than any other, has moulded the religious character of the English nation. It is not simply that a

¹ Note in Lord Macaulay's Life, vol. i. pp. 67, 68.—Macaulay writing to one of his sisters in 1844, says, "I think Stephen's Article on the Clapham Sect the *best thing he ever did*. I do not think with you that the Claphamites were men too obscure for such delineations. The truth is, that from that little knot of men emanated all the Bible Societies, and almost all the Missionary Societies in the world. The whole organisation of the Evangelical party was their work. The share which they had in providing means for the education of the people was great. They were really the destroyers of the slave-trade and of slavery. Many of those whom Stephen described were public men of the greatest weight. Lord Teignmouth governed India at Calcutta. Grant governed India in Leadenhall Street. Stephen's father was Percival's righthand man in the House of Commons. It is needless to speak of Wilberforce. *As to Simeon*, if you knew what his authority and influence were, and how they extended from Cambridge to the most remote corners of England, you would allow that his real sway in the Church was far greater than that of any Primate."

revival of spiritual life, like the revival of letters in the thirteenth century, took place, and that this section of the Church of England, in common with other sections, partook of its quickening influence; but it is that the Evangelical School, taking its rise in the middle of the eighteenth century in the persons of a few men—not powerful from their wealth and social position, not remarkable for special intellectual genius or for vast erudition, not giving expression to the secret thought of their times or of their Church, but standing in opposition to it, and struggling against obloquy and reproach—has yet permeated and interpenetrated with its own spiritual force the heart and mind and conscience of the Church of Christ in this country for a period of more than a hundred years. In the face of such a fact despondency and timidity in the maintenance of our principles should be for ever discarded.

The mind naturally inquires about the source of this power, and the elements that have composed it. Two answers have been given, and it would seem that two answers only are possible. The one attributes the result to the character of the men themselves, principally of its first founders, and subsequently of those who have received their mantle, and inherited their spirit; the other attributes it to the doctrines embodied in the School—that is, to the vital power of the truth which formed the substance and communicated the quickening energy to their teaching.

“The points,” Mr. Gladstone says, “in which the Evangelical School permanently differed from the older and traditional Anglicanism were those of the Church, the Sacraments, and the forensic idea of Justification. They are not, in my view, the strong points, and I do not wish to dwell upon them.” Accordingly, in contrast with them, he proceeds to place what he assumes to be the primary points of difference. “Its main characteristic was of a higher order. It was a strong, systematic, outspoken, and determined reaction against the pervading standards both of life and preaching. It aimed at bringing back on a large scale, and by an aggressive movement, the Cross, and all that the Cross essentially implies, both in the teaching of the clergy, and into the lives as well of the clergy as of the laity.” In this effort it is admitted that they succeeded; “the pith and life of the Evangelical teaching, as it consists in the re-introduction of Christ our Lord to be the woof and warp of teaching, was the great gift of the movement to the teaching church, and has now penetrated and possessed it on a scale so general, that it may be considered as pervading the whole mass.” Let the statement be accepted; but how did the Evangelical Fathers succeed in reintroducing Christ the Lord as the woof and warp of teaching, but by inculcating those very doctrines which Mr. Gladstone professes to put on one side as questions of

inferior importance. What is the "preaching of the Gospel" which the Evangelical fathers are stated to have restored, but the doctrines relative to the person and work of Christ. There are few of these doctrines more crucial than the very three which are deemed not to be strong points of the Evangelical School. They are the doctrines of all doctrines. Let it be said that the soul derives spiritual life by membership with the Church; that the body and blood of Christ are *in, with, or under* the consecrated bread and wine; that justifying righteousness is inherent and not imputed—and in every case our Lord is pushed into the background, and other objects interposed between Him and the sinner. Yet it is implied (p. 14) that these doctrines are negative, not positive. The Evangelical teaching is but the echo of the eleventh, the nineteenth, and the twenty-fifth Articles, and in all these Articles the language is not negative, but affirmative and didactic to the utmost degree.

The statement, therefore, that the great obligation conferred by the Evangelical School upon the Church of England consists in "having roused her from her slumbers and set her vigorously to work" (p. 10) is scarcely consistent with the admission that the revival of Gospel preaching was due to it, or with the statement in another place (p. 24) that the function of the School is to keep alive "the vigour and activity in the Anglican body of those 'doctrines of grace,' without which the salt of Christianity soon loses all its savour" (p. 24). It may, however, possibly be thought that the spiritual force of the School is due not to the doctrines they preached, but to the depth of conviction and fervency of zeal with which they were preached. It would be not only foolish, but ungrateful, to overlook the service rendered to the Church by the personal qualities of the Evangelical Fathers. Their profound convictions, their intense earnestness, their self-sacrificed devotedness, their self-abnegation, their heroic courage, their lofty faith and spirit of devotion, were worthy of all admiration. It is scarcely possible to exalt them too highly. Nevertheless, no force of personal qualities can adequately account for the work that has been accomplished. For personal qualities only act upon the circle of those who are brought into personal contact, and this circle is, after all, a narrow one. It was so especially with men who, like Newton, Scott, Romaine, Cecil, and Simeon, were pastors of congregations, or incumbents of parishes, which taxed all their energies, and from which the most vexatious and trying opposition was sometimes encountered, as with Newton and Scott at Olney, and Simeon at Cambridge. No doubt the itinerancy maintained during the earliest stages of the revival extended the sphere of personal influence. The immense labours of Wesley and Whitefield, within the sphere of Methodism, and of Grimshaw of Howarth, and Berridge of Everton, outside

of it, must have acted over a very considerable area. It has been computed that Whitefield preached from forty to sixty hours every week, and ten or even twenty thousand hearers at a time would hang breathlessly on his words. Grimshaw itinerated throughout the Northern counties, Berridge in the Eastern, Toplady and Walker in Devon and Cornwall, and all of them with a burning zeal that knew no weariness. By these labours, the seeds of truth must have been sown broadcast throughout the land, and men's minds have been brought into a receptive condition. But the impression produced by the personal earnestness of the preachers, valuable as it must have been in establishing what Aristotle calls the *ἦθος* of the speakers, must have been in itself too superficial to have lived, still less to have worked, without some solid basis of doctrinal truth to support it. By the very necessities of the human constitution, strong and permanent affections can only be excited and maintained by equally strong and permanent convictions. Every human emotion has its root in some truth apprehended by the understanding. It is certainly conceivable that a general sentiment of reverence and desire may have been aroused by such preaching and such preachers in persons who understood but little of the truths presented and impersonated; but such a sentiment can have had no vitality. It must have been too nerveless to act upon others; too deficient in backbone to be able to stand by itself. The holy enthusiasm of the Evangelical Fathers was a powerful instrument for exciting attention; but the spiritual force of the movement must be sought in something much more inward, more constraining, and more abiding.

Moreover, if it be admitted that the Evangelical School has been distinguished for peculiar earnestness—and to use a Scriptural as well as a popular word, “unction”—in preaching the doctrines of grace, the question occurs, whence this earnestness has been derived. It cannot have been a personal attribute if it has descended in the succession of a School. Unity of spirit maintained for a hundred years would be an abiding miracle if there were no underlying cause to which it is to be attributed. That the common characteristics of a School should hold no relation to the peculiar system of belief which constitutes it into a School is absolutely incredible. Men die, but truth lives.

This leads to another aspect in which the whole question may be considered. It has already been observed that the admissions of the various writers, who have discussed the rise and progress of the Evangelical School, involve the existence of a spiritual force peculiar to the School, and not possessed by other Schools of religious opinion. This force must exist in that which distinguishes it from other Schools, that by which

it is differentiated. What are the specific marks by which it is to be identified? There are three possible answers—by the personal holiness of its members; by its outward system of worship; by its inward principles of truth.

Of the personal qualities of its members little more need be added. It would ill become an Evangelical writer to assert any monopoly of holiness, or of earnestness and zeal, for the members of his own School; and was he conceited enough to advance the claim, certainly none of the writers mentioned at the head of this Article would admit of it for a moment. The claim has, indeed, been advanced on the other side. Few things have been more prominently pleaded in Episcopal Charges and the columns of the press than the peculiar holiness and self-devotedness of English sacerdotalists. Those who would not for a moment advance such a claim on their own behalf may be pardoned for demurring to its justice when advanced on behalf of others. Such a comparison should be not only unspoken, but unthought. The operations of the Holy Spirit upon the human heart are no special prerogative of any School. In the absolute freedom of His sovereignty He divides to every man severally as He will.

Is the secret of Evangelical influence to be found in the system to which it has given rise, and the modes of worship in which it has embodied itself? This needs to be carefully considered, the more carefully, because of the confessed, and perhaps the growing similarity of practice which exists between Evangelical Clergymen on one side, and High Churchmen and even Ritualists on the other. Some view this approximation with the greatest alarm; some with exultation and loud-expressed triumph. Both of these parties widely mistake the facts of the case, and exaggerate the results. One broad distinction which lies at the threshold of the inquiry, and which must be jealously kept in mind throughout, may perhaps tend to allay the alarm of one section, and to moderate the triumph of another. A line, broad and deep as it can possibly be drawn, separates ritual practices which are symbolical of doctrine, and ritual practices which are matters of æsthetic taste, and which vary with the varying constitutions of men. That ritual may have a symbolical meaning was openly asserted at an early period of the ritualistic history by the Rev. F. Lee, in his "*Directorium Anglicanum*," and has been constantly repeated since, as, for instance, by the Rev. W. J. Bennett in his "*Plea for Toleration*," and very recently by the Lord Bishop of Colombo in his correspondence with the agents of the Church Missionary Society. One quotation may suffice for all. "*Ritual and Ceremonial*," says the Preface to the "*Directorium*," "are the expressions of doctrine, and witness to the sacramental truth of the

Catholic religion." With practices of this character, ritual or otherwise, no man of Evangelical belief can have anything whatever to do. To adopt them would be to deny the fundamental principles of his own creed. He must not only shrink with jealous vigilance from the slightest complicity with them on his own part, but must protest against their introduction into the Church of his forefathers. He must regard them with an abhorrence not measured by the trivial nature of the acts, but by the importance of the doctrines they are employed to symbolize. His attitude towards them must ever be an attitude of indignant protest and uncompromising opposition.

There is one matter not strictly belonging to the class of practices just mentioned, which may be noticed in this place more properly than in any other. I refer to the habitual disrespect exhibited by Ritualists towards their Bishops, when they happen to disagree with them. It furnishes a curious illustration of the genealogical descent of modern sacerdotalists, for it would be unfair to the great body of English High Churchmen to involve them in the charge, from the Ultra Churchmen of the eighteenth century. The latter are described by Mr. Lecky in a passage which might be adopted as an accurate portraiture of the modern Ritualist. The passage is worth quotation, in spite of its length, so precisely and exactly true are the particulars of the portrait:—

The writers of this school taught that Episcopalian clergymen were as literally priests as were the Jewish priests, though they belonged not to the order of Aaron, but to the higher order of Melchizedek; that the Communion was literally, and not metaphorically, a sacrifice; that properly-constituted clergymen had the power of uttering words over the sacred elements which produced the most wonderful, though, unfortunately, the most imperceptible of miracles; that the right of the clergy to tithes was of direct Divine origin, antecedent to, and independent of, all secular legislation; that the sentence of excommunication involved an exclusion from heaven; that the Romish practice of prayers for the dead was highly commendable; that all non-episcopal communities who dissented from the Anglican Church were schismatics, guilty of the sin, and reserved for the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Aiming especially at sacerdotal power, these theologians had naturally a strong leaning towards the communities in which that power had been most successfully claimed, and negotiations were accordingly at one time opened for union with the Gallican, at another with the Eastern Church. Some of them contended that all baptisms except those of Episcopalian clergymen were not only irregular, but invalid, and that, therefore, Dissenters had no kind of title to be regarded as Christians. Brett, some time before he joined the sect, preached and published a sermon maintaining that repentance itself was useless unless it were followed by priestly absolution, which could only be administered by an Episcopalian clergyman; and both Dodwell and Lesley were of opinion that such absolution was essential to salvation. . . .

It might have been imagined from the solemnity of the ordination vow, and from the peculiar sanctity supposed to attach to the clerical profession, that clergymen would be distinguished from lawyers, soldiers, and members of other secular professions, by their deference and obedience to their superiors. It might have been imagined that this would be especially true of men who were continually preaching the duty of passive obedience in the sphere of politics, and the transcendent and almost divine prerogatives of Episcopacy in the sphere of religion. As a matter of fact, however, this has not been the case. If the most constant, contemptuous, and ostentatious defiance, both of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, be a result of the Protestant principle of private judgment, it may be truly said that the extreme High Church party in more than one period of its history has shown itself, in this respect at least, the most Protestant of sects. While idolizing Episcopacy in the abstract, its members have made it a main object of their policy to bring most existing Bishops into contempt, and their polemical writings have been conspicuous, even in theological literature, for their feminine spitefulness and for their recklessness of assertion. The last days of Tillotson were altogether embittered by the stream of calumny, invective, and lampoons, of which he was the object. One favourite falsehood, repeated in spite of the clearest disproof, was that he had never been baptised.—*Lecky's History of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. pp. 86-88.

For the Sacerdotalists of the eighteenth century take the Sacerdotalists of the nineteenth; for Archbishop Tillotson substitute Archbishop Tait, and *de te fabula narratur*. Caustic, however, as Mr. Lecky is, he has failed to trace this common likeness to its common source in the two centuries. The cause is probably to be found in the conception formed of the Church by the Sacerdotal School of the two periods. To their imaginations she has stood ever in the front, an august and majestic figure bearing on her crowned brow the words, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Such a conception has been a pure work of imagination. It has had no existence in fact. It is but a great name given to an abstraction of the mind; a vague, shapeless shadow beneath the majesty of which each man may idolize his own private judgment and stamp it with an ideal Catholicism. But with such a conception in view it is not surprising that the actual claims of practical authority should be disregarded, and treated with contempt in face of a supreme authority, which, were not the conception as utterly baseless in fact as it is imposing in theory, would naturally overshadow particular persons, however high their office, into insignificance. If the curious accuracy of Mr. Lecky's portraiture be doubted, or its application to some moderns be called into question, we have only to refer the doubter to the *Church Herald* of July 15, 1874.

But while there can be no truce between the Evangelical

School and practices, which are the unwritten language of doctrines offensive to all our deepest convictions, there is another class of devotional practices which are common to more parties than one, and which, consequently, furnish no line of distinction between the Evangelical School and other Schools with which we stand in conflict. I refer to practices relative to the solemnity of public worship, to the honourable beauty of the outward structure, to the office of the Christian ministry, as being of Divine appointment, and not of Ecclesiastical convenience, and to the authority of the Church as an organised society, with "power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith" (Art. xx.).

No candid mind will claim perfection for the Evangelical School, or be ashamed of admitting that in modern times it has learned something from its opponents. It is probably true that higher conceptions of the functions of the Church, and of the value of the sacraments now prevail than were common among Evangelicals fifty years ago; but this change, if it be a fact, has only brought the School back to the standpoint of its most eminent founders. In those practices which are distinctive of Sacerdotal doctrine there has been no approximation between the Schools; no, not a single hair's breadth. There is, however, a tendency in the human mind in avoiding one extreme to approach rashly towards another. There is danger lest, in getting as far as possible from a given error, the simple standard of revelation should be overstepped, and some corrective truths overlooked in the very vehemence of the rebound. It is not given to any human mind to embrace with equal clearness and force every section of the Divine circle of truth. We cannot yet see things as God sees them. The Great Master governs His Church in a great degree by the action of contraries. Each man sees with peculiar vividness some truth or class of truths, and for that truth he must contend with all his might. He sees a part, where God sees the whole; grasps a part, while God holds in His mighty hands all the converging lines in one perfect and harmonious unity. That in their strong revulsion from Romish or Romanizing teaching some ardent minds should trench too far towards the other side is no more than natural. Richard Cecil saw and lamented the tendency in his own day.

Man is a creature of extremes—the middle path is generally the wise path, but there are few wise enough to find it. Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them: the Papists treat man as all sense; some Protestants would treat him as all spirit. Because one party has exalted the Virgin into a divinity, the other can scarcely think of that "most highly-favoured among women" with respect. The Papist puts the Apocrypha into his

canon; the Protestant will scarcely regard it as an ancient record. The Popish heresy of human merit in justification drove Luther on the other side into most unwarrantable and unscriptural statements of that doctrine. The Papist considers grace as inseparable from the participation of the Sacraments; the Protestants too often lose sight of them as instituted means of conveying grace.—*Remains*, p. 168.

The attitude of the Evangelical Fathers, adjusted to the parties of our own day, may be aptly described by the phrase "Protestant Evangelical Churchmen." Mr. Overton, in his sketch of the Evangelical Revival, states that the early Evangelicals were as firmly attached to the Church and to parochial order as the highest of High Churchmen. Dr. Stoughton states that while "Newton and Scott were friendly with Methodists, and were not shocked at the Ecclesiastical irregularities of their fellow-labourers, Cecil and others were Churchmen to the backbone, and intensely disliked the doings of the itinerants."

Cecil says of himself, "I never choose to forget that I am a priest, because I would not deprive myself of the right to dictate in my ministerial capacity." Newton in his "Theologia" expresses himself thus—"Though the Bishop who ordained me laid me under no restrictions, I would not have applied to him for ordination if I had not previously determined to submit to his authority and to the rules of the Church."—*Works*, vol. v. pp. 44, 45.

It is true that Venn, of Huddersfield, did himself itinerate. But his son writes, "Induced by the hope of doing good, my father, in certain instances, preached in unconsecrated places. But having acknowledged this, it becomes my pleasing duty to state that he was no advocate for irregularity in others; that when he afterwards considered it in its different bearings and connections, he lamented that he had given way to it; and restrained several other persons from such acts by the most urgent arguments."—*The English Church*, vol. ii. p. 184.

Thomas Scott's loyal attachment to the Church was attested by the publication of his "Seven Letters on the Evils of Separation from the Church of England." Simeon, as already stated elsewhere, was charged by the writers of his day with being more of a Churchman than a Gospel-man. And in the discussions of the Eclectic Society it appears that the unanimous opinion of the brethren held schism to be a sin. Firm attachment to the Church of England, therefore, and a devout recognition of her claims on the obedience of her ministers, and of the Divine appointment of the ministerial office, furnish no line of demarcation by which the Evangelical School can be distinguished from the Anglican School, either of the eighteenth or of the nineteenth centuries.

Nor did there exist in the Evangelical Fathers any lack of re-

verence for the Sacraments, or any tendency to depreciate baptism, or to neglect the Lord's Supper. Any such accusation would be most untrue. Simeon protested against being misrepresented, as if he thought meanly of the Sacrament. "All penitent adults have in baptism the remission of their sins sealed to them, and the Spirit in a more abundant measure communicated. Infants dedicated to God in baptism may, and often do (though in a way not discoverable by us save by its fruits), receive a new nature from the Spirit of God in and with and by that ordinance;" and he prefaces the statement thus: "We are no more disposed to detract from the honour of that sacred ordinance than our adversaries themselves." At a later period he expressed himself somewhat more cautiously. We have not, indeed, very ample materials for ascertaining the views of the Evangelical Fathers on the Sacraments, because it was not this side of doctrine which had been forgotten in their day, or consequently which they had need to revive and to confirm. Their work lay in the vivid proclamation of those "doctrines of grace" which all writers admit had nearly disappeared from the pulpits of the Church of England in the first half of the eighteenth century. But we have intimations here and there in the story of their lives and labours, from which their views may be not obscurely gathered. We know, for instance, that Thomas Scott administered a weekly communion at Lothbury. And earlier in the movement we read of such immense numbers of communicants thronging to the ordinance as to prove that "mad Grimshaw" himself had no low estimate of that blessed Sacrament. Three thousand persons are recorded to have received the consecrated memorials of the Body and Blood of Christ at one time, and no less than thirty bottles of wine to have been used in a single administration. Neglect of the Sacraments was, therefore, no characteristic of their system.

Neither, again, is the specific characteristic of the Evangelical School to be found in the careless performance of Church ordinances, or the disrespectful neglect of the sacred buildings appropriated to public worship. This has been a common charge; but it unjustly shifts on to the shoulders of the Evangelicals what was the general fault of the Anglicans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and especially of that section popularly known as the "high and dry!" That the services of the Church were wretchedly conducted, the congregations irreverent in the extreme, and the churches themselves neglected and mean, can scarcely be denied. Archbishop Secker, in 1750, thus described the condition of the churches of his day: "Some, I fear, have scarcely been kept in necessary present repair, and others by no means duly cleared from annoyances, which must gradually bring them to decay; water undermining and rotting the foun-

dations, earth heaped up against the outside, weeds and shrubs growing upon them. . . . Too frequently the floors are meanly paved, or the walls dirty or patched, or the windows ill-glazed, and it may be, in fact, stopped up . . . or they are damp, offensive, and unwholesome." So much for the structures. Dr. Stoughton draws a picture of the same general character. "In country villages, where no exemplary minister was found, where the rector or curate lived a free and easy life, and liked to drink a dish of tea with the landlady, and afterwards a bowl of punch with the landlord of the inn, not much attention would be paid either to spiritual necessities, or to the decencies of religious service. Buildings were neglected; chancel and nave fell into decay; the communion-table presented a shabby appearance; surplices were dirty; the singing was miserable; the preaching no better; and, from beginning to end, everything presented a slovenly aspect" (I. p. 286). He tells a story, that the high-backed pews which have only of late years been ejected from our churches originated in the reign of Queen Anne, and were occasioned by complaints that the maids of honour and the gentlemen of the Court at Whitehall and elsewhere spent their time in looking at one another, instead of attending to their religious duties. All accounts concur in representing the irreverence of the age as absolutely shocking during the early part of the century. Addison thus describes the demeanour of a friend of Will Honeycomb: "He seldom comes in till the prayers are about half over, and when he has entered his seat (instead of joining with the congregation) he devoutly holds his hat before his face for three or four moments, then bows to all his acquaintances, sits down, takes a pinch of snuff, and spends the remaining time in surveying the congregation." When all allowances are made for exaggeration, the picture that remains is equally melancholy and offensive.

Now, on what section of the Church must rest the responsibility of this state of things? Surely, on that party which had a predominant influence, and yet allowed the evil to grow unchecked. This party was High Church, and its prevalence at that time is unquestionable. An attempt has been made to call this predominance into question, and so to relieve the School of the responsibility of the unhappy state of things that has been described. But the more closely the matter is examined the more firmly does the odium rest on the shoulders of High Churchmen. Mr. Lecky establishes the fact with his usual abundance of evidence in the first volume of his *History* (pp. 53-57 and pp. 73-80); and that the High Churchmen of the eighteenth century were the legitimate progenitors of the Sacerdotalists of the nineteenth has been illustrated in a passage already quoted in this Paper. That this irreverent slovenliness in the services and in

the churches is in no degree due to the Evangelicals, and is no characteristic of the School is certain, since the Evangelical revival had not originated when these things were at their worst. As soon as their influence began to be felt, the evil was abated. "During the latter half of the century," writes Mr. Abbey, "the careless and undevout could no longer have ventured without fear of censure on the irreverent familiarities in church which they could have freely indulged in for the first twenty years."

The real fact is that the Evangelicals were the first to set the example of restoring the Churches of England into a state worthy of their sacred purpose, and to them belongs the honour of cultivating that reverential regard to all the accessories of public worship which has become characteristic of our own day. The Camden Society was instituted in 1838. But twenty years earlier the Rev. R. P. Buddicom, St. George's, Everton, Liverpool, and Archdeacon Jones, of St. Andrew's, were remarkable for the order they maintained in their churches, when the general state of things on every side of them was very different. The Rev. W. Carus Wilson, about 1817, was the first to introduce order into the churches of the North, administering baptism in obedience to the rubric after the Second Lesson. The Rev. R. Carus Wilson during his incumbency built five churches in the parish of Preston, all of them distinguished among the churches of the day by their ecclesiastical character, and was himself suspected in some quarters of being too "churchy." The Rev. W. Richardson, of St. Michaelle-Belfry, who died in 1820, his brother, James Richardson, and John Graham, of St. Saviour's, were staunch Churchmen, and remarkable for their strict observance of church order. The same thing is true of many others of their contemporaries. Charles Simeon's church was restored in 1833, and was the first at Cambridge to undergo the process and be brought into a state of comely beauty. The fittings were of oak throughout, and the work handsome and costly, the total expense having been 3000*l.* In the words of a living dignitary, whose name is a title of honour, "The Evangelicals began the great work of church restoration and extension, were the introducers of order in their services, and gave the impulse to church building." Thus it was that the early Evangelical Fathers lived and worked, combining in one harmonious system the love of God's truth with loyal attachment to the Church to which they belonged. The grand "doctrines of grace" were, as it was right they should be, the first supreme objects of their care; yet they were not indifferent to secondary truths, but held them with firm conviction and consistent observance.

It is evident, therefore, that the specific characteristic of the

Evangelical School, and the source of its spiritual power, is not to be found in those points of belief or of practice which are common to itself with other Schools contained within the broad comprehension of the Church of England. If it has exercised a peculiar force, that force must lie somewhere in its peculiar attributes. The source of it is, in short, to be found in Evangelical doctrine. Mr. Gladstone practically admits this, when he states the special function of the School to be the maintenance of the doctrines of grace, and attributes to its influence "the re-introduction of Christ our Lord to be the woof and warp of preaching." Such a work goes far beyond the use of the Divine name, which is as "ointment poured forth;" it must include the Divine person and the Divine offices, all that circle of doctrine by virtue of which Christ is Christianity, and Christianity is Christ. But Evangelical doctrines constitute one complete and harmonious whole, cemented by a strictly logical connection of truth with truth. They cannot be broken up, as Mr. Gladstone breaks them up, nor can one part be accepted, while another part is put on one side as comparatively unimportant. They must consistently stand together or fall together. They are a galaxy of jewels strung on one thread, and that thread is the immediate personal contact of the individual soul with God. This truth is not only replete with the richest comfort and full of strength, but it is a singularly grand one, and throws its own dignity over the human soul, and all its relationship to the Divine Being. Mr. Lecky has had the sagacity to perceive this, and to appreciate the fact.

It is (he says) the glory of Protestantism, whenever it remains faithful to the spirit of its founders, that it has destroyed this engine (Sacerdotal pretension). The Evangelical teacher emphatically declares that the intervention of no human being, and of no human rite, is necessary in the hour of death. Yet he can exercise a soothing influence not less powerful than that of the Catholic priest. The doctrine of justification by faith, which diverts the wandering mind from all painful and perplexing retrospect, concentrates the imagination on one Sacred Figure, and persuades the sinner that the sins of a life have in a moment been effaced, has enabled thousands to encounter death with perfect calm, or even with vivid joy, and has consoled innumerable mourners at a time when all the commonplaces of philosophy would appear the idlest of sounds. This doctrine had fallen almost wholly into abeyance in England, and had scarcely any place among national convictions, when it was revived by the Evangelical party:—Vol. ii. p. 639.

But whence did the Evangelical School derive their special doctrines? They drew them out of the formularies of the Church of England, as those who prepared the formularies drew them from the pure fountain of the Word of God. It was the strength of their case, as Evangelicals, that they appealed to the

authority of the Sacred Scriptures, and, as Churchmen, to the authority of the recognised documents of their Church. No one can peruse their writings, as, for instance, the *Theological Essays* of Thomas Scott, without perceiving this. "In this great and cardinal business," writes Mr. Gladstone, "without doubt, the Evangelical preachers of the English Church were not innovators, but restorers. They were restorers, not by re-enactment of laws which had been repealed, but by revived attention to laws which had been neglected or forgotten." "The Evangelical leaders of theology," says Dr. Stoughton, "drew their inspiration from the Protestant works of the sixteenth, and Nonconformist works of the seventeenth century. The Homilies were their delight. They appealed to them in proof of their own distinctive theology; certain Articles they regarded with great satisfaction, especially the seventeenth." This witness is true. It is the honourable pride of the School that they represent not only the letter but the spirit and reality, what Mr. Gladstone pithily calls "the sap and juice," of the teaching of their Church. Their belief has been not only framed on its broad outlines, but nicely adjusted to its proportion of faith. Nor is there any point of doctrine on which this is the more remarkable, than that moderate Calvinism (not extreme Calvinism), which has ever been characteristic of the School, and which has been moulded on the exact lines traced with equal moderation, firmness, and wisdom, in the language of the seventeenth Article. The claim is equally true in regard to the three special doctrines which are declared by the statesman not to be the strong points of Evangelicalism, but which are specified by the Nonconformist historian in an exactly opposite estimate. The Evangelical doctrine of Justification is the accurate echo of the eleventh Article, supplemented and explained by the Homily of Justification—that is, as the Bishop of Winchester states in his learned work upon the Articles, the Homily on the salvation of mankind. The doctrine of the Sacraments is the exact echo of the twenty-fifth, twenty-seventh, and twenty-eighth Articles; and the Evangelical doctrine of the Church of the nineteenth and twentieth.

It has been said that the Evangelical scheme of doctrine, indistinguishable from that of the Church herself, is a harmonious whole, and that all its parts must in consistency stand or fall together. But, happily, men are not always consistent, nor are they guided by strict logical conclusions. Thus, in modern times there has been a distinct School of divines who, with the highest views of sacramental grace and of the corporate life of the Church, have held also the doctrine of immediate faith and of spiritual conversion. This is the distinctive feature of what has been known as "Aitkenism."

The Scriptural doctrine of grace has been a spring of Divine life wherever it has been held, and has fructified what otherwise had been barren. Even the broken fragments of Evangelical truth have borne fruit, just as a tree may flourish by virtue of some roots which have struck deep into the fertile soil, although other roots may touch the stony ground, whence neither moisture nor nourishment can be derived. It is in this respect that Theological Schools have approximated in our day. It is not that the Evangelical School has borrowed from its opponents those principles of a Scriptural Churchmanship which were distinctly maintained by its founders, but it is that other Schools have borrowed from it the vivifying doctrines of justification by faith, and of the sovereign operations of the Holy Spirit of God. We have Mr. Gladstone's authority for this statement. "To bring it (the preaching of the Gospel) back again was the aim and work of the Evangelical reformers." "The juice and sap of the Evangelical teaching has in a very remarkable manner coursed through 'the natural gates and alleys of the body' of the English Church." It would not be difficult to extract passages from the writings of High Ritualists which, taken alone, might be supposed to have issued from the warm heart and the burning tongue of the Evangelical School. The necessity of drawing this Paper to a conclusion prevents more than a quotation or two from a single writer: "Justification derives its special force from our being by nature sinners and culprits. It supposes a judicial process—a judgment-seat and a prisoner. Such is our condition. As sinners, with guilt in the past, there can be for us no justification but the Divine acquittal. Justification, as viewed in connection with the past, can mean nothing else. Not in our power is it to unlive the past; we cannot unsay the words we have spoken, or the deeds we have done. Would to God we could, but we cannot. And here God comes and freely pardons; and such a pardon really proclaimed, and leading the sinner on to the knowledge of the forgiveness of sins, is the justification that can alone satisfy the cravings of the sin-burdened heart, and change its agonizing cry into the deep thanksgivings of him "whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered." Again, "Many a soul, burdened and heavy laden with the sense of its sin, has gone to the Cross of Calvary, and there, kneeling at the feet of the Crucified, and looking unto Jesus, has seen in Him his sin nailed to the Cross, and in the recognition of Christ's redeeming grace, 'his soul set on fire with the joy of Divine forgiveness,' has sung to Him who loved him his triumphant thanksgiving." Could any Evangelical preacher express himself more clearly, or more eloquently? Yet they are the words of the Rev. G. Body, extracted from his book on the "Life of Justification."

What has been already said may constitute a sufficient answer to the suggestion that the Evangelical School is partly responsible for the rise of Tractarianism, just as the Tractarians are responsible for the constant stream of secessions that has flowed from their ranks to the Church of Rome. The proportionate dimensions of what the two Schools are respectively alleged to have contributed to Schools beyond themselves might show the parallel to be illusive. For if all that is asserted be accepted as true without qualification, there are some half-dozen cases in which distinguished men have passed from the Evangelical School to the Tractarian School; while the perversions from Tractarianism to Rome are numbered at three thousand. If all that is meant had been the existence of a historical sequence, and of that reaction to which the weakness of the human mind renders it specially susceptible, there would be no need of being careful to disprove the imputation. No doubt the Reformation preceded the rise of Socinianism. "Hampden moved in the direction of Cromwell; Lafayette in the direction of Robespierre." In all such cases, it is enough to reply *post, non propter*. But more than this is intended. It is vaguely suggested that some undefined, and to all appearance wholly undefinable, connection of cause and effect has existed between the Evangelical and the Tractarian Schools. Now that the matter is reduced to a question of doctrine, such a connection scarcely lies within the sphere of possibility. In regard to the three specified points—the Church, the Sacraments, and the mode of Justification—the difference between the two Schools is fundamental. There are some minds which, wrestling against a conviction they are unwilling to receive, find refuge in an extreme hypothesis in the other direction. But this is the fault, not of the doctrine, but of the mind of the thinker, and of his constitutional tendency to run into opposition. On the principle that none are such bitter enemies as apostates, it may be readily understood that those who reject an Evangelical doctrine once entertained by them, may run violently into the opposite extreme; just as the sons of Nonconformists are often found to become the bitterest of High Churchmen. But inclined plane between the two Schools there is none and can be none, where the line of separation is as deep and sharply cut as between Protestantism and Romanism. Between Tractarianism and Rome the case is wholly different; there is a distinctive principle common to both, and there is no difficulty in defining it. It is the acceptance of the authority of the Church as supreme. On Evangelical principles the Bible gives authority to the Church; on Tractarian principles the Church gives authority to the Bible. The Church is, therefore, supreme, and, consequently, whatever is stamped with the authority of the Church must be accepted, whatever it may be. The conclusion

s inevitable ; and a vigorous mind will readily receive it in proportion as its habits of reasoning are logical and its convictions deep and earnest. Does it follow from all this that there has been no connection between Evangelicalism and Tractarianism, and that the one contributed nothing to the other ? By no means. Those who passed from the one to the other took with them their Evangelical warmth and earnestness, and their supreme faith in the personal Christ. This Mr. Gladstone affirms, and so far we willingly accept his evidence.

It remains, then, that the distinctive characteristic of the Evangelical School is the Evangelical doctrine. It is only a truism to say so, and nothing but great subtlety of intellect could ever conceive of it otherwise. If there has been a spiritual force in the Evangelical School, such as no other religious School possesses, it must be in that Evangelical doctrine which no other School holds with the same completeness and consistency. This doctrine has been already shown to be identical with the teaching of the Church of England. But its genealogy may be traced yet higher. In the words of Sir J. Stephen, it is "that system of which (if Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Knox, and the writers of the English Homilies may be credited) Christ Himself was the author, and Paul the first and greatest interpreter."

Here, then, we find the secret of the spiritual force exercised by the Evangelical School. It is not intended to assert, for a solitary moment, that the men by whom the School has been represented at any given period have been perfect men ; that there has been neither defect nor redundancy in their opinions, or that they have reflected, without any admixture of human error, the revealed mind of God. It cannot be that the most absolute truth should not acquire some touch of imperfection, some taint of contamination from the earthly vessels in whom has been placed the priceless gift. Nor is it asserted that no precious fragments of the great diamond have found place in other Schools. But the Evangelical School has possessed the truth of God in a far higher and more complete degree than any other School, and by it has been linked backwards in an unbroken succession to the true Church of God that has worshipped Him in secret in all periods, to the Primitive Ages, to the glorious company of the Apostles, and to the Great Master Himself. The Spirit of God has accompanied the truth He has Himself revealed. In its ultimate source, the spiritual power of the School has therefore been nothing less than the operation of God the Holy Ghost on the intellect and heart and conscience of mankind. But here we prefer to speak by another, and by an impartial tongue. Sir J. Stephen, in his "Essay on Wilberforce," thus expresses himself :—

The human mind is subject to a sacred influence, which, like the wind, bloweth where it listeth, although it be given to none to discover whence it cometh, or whither it goeth. It is a fact which few, if any, self-observers will deny, that in the inward life of every man there are occurrences explicable on no hypothesis, but that of the direct intervention of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe for the spiritual improvement of His rational creatures. Such events may be considered, either as parts of some great pre-determined system, or as immediate interpositions of the Deity in particular cases. Each supposition alike refers to that Divine origin, those salutary changes in human character, which the least thoughtful so often notice, and which even the most depraved not seldom undergo.—Vol. ii. pp. 214, 215.

Then we reach a height where the varying fortunes of religious controversy and the hopes and fears of party strife lie far below. From the imperfect knowledge of man we pass into the sphere of Divine omniscience; from the mingled motives of human action into the cloudless atmosphere of Divine wisdom; from amid the shattered wrecks of human hope to the full sunshine of Divine accomplishment. As we look at the widespread and varied landscape, presented in the fortunes of the Church of Christ from the beginning, we see that the course of the spiritual kingdom has been that of progressive triumph. Like the course of the natural sun, its march has been ever onward. Now almost eclipsed by clouds, now dimmed with earth-born mists and fogs, now struggling up through drifting storms, it has yet risen higher and higher towards its zenith. The progress has been interrupted and irregular; but it has been sure. Not only faith, but even reason herself anticipates the full meridian, when, before the unclouded face of a manifested God, the last trace of human ignorance, the last doubt and fear, the last conflicts of faith will for ever pass away in the perfected manifestation of the Redeemer. That meridian will have no decline, that sun no setting, that "sacred high eternal noon" no evening. Then the saints of Christ will doubtless be permitted to see truth in its ultimate relations, and all the doctrines of our earthly faith will be found to have their origin, and to find their explanation, in the immutable realities of God Himself.

EDWARD GARBETT.

