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What is Our Position?[[1]](#footnote-1)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

I trust that I may confidently bespeak your indulgence, and claim an interest in your prayers. I address you at the close of a meeting of unparalleled interest, which has now lasted for two days. Your minds are naturally wearied, after a continuous strain upon your powers of attention. The field of topics suitable to an occasion like the present has been already traversed by the three beloved brethren who have preceded me. Like strong reapers, they have swept that field clean, and have only left a few stray ears for me to glean behind them. Above all, I am anxious that the closing address at this meeting should in no wise mar the effect of all that has gone before. The last portion of the banquet ought to leave no ill savour on the palate. The last note of the music ought not to be out of harmony, and jar upon the ear. Once more, then, I say, help me by your prayers.

In searching for a subject which may form a suitable conclusion to our meeting, I have naturally turned to what the Puritans would have called its “uses and application.” I wish to put the question to your minds,—Where are we, as evangelical members of the Church of England? What is our present position? What do the times in which we live especially demand of the evangelical clergy? What are we going to do when we leave this meeting and return to our respective homes? What new thing are we going to take up? To what practical point can we bring the whole of these proceedings?— The profound remark of Bishop Butler will naturally occur to your minds. He tells us, that passive impressions, often repeated, gradually lose all their power. Actions, on the contrary, often repeated, finally produce habits in the character. I trust the result of this clerical meeting will be *actions*, and not merely impressions. What, then, are we going to do?

I am not ashamed to speak of the *evangelical body*as a distinct and clearly defined body in the Church of England. It is an historical fact, that there always has been such a body. It flourished in the days of our Reformers, and under Jewel and his brethren in Elizabeth’s time. It maintained its existence in the early days of the Stuarts. It was weakened under Archbishop Laud. It almost expired in the times of the later Stuarts, William the third, Ann, and the two first Georges. It revived in the times of William Romaine, Henry Venn, Berridge, Grimshaw, Wesley, Whitfield, and others who laboured with them in the middle of the last century. From that time it has gone on growing, and I hope it will continue to grow a hundred and a thousand fold.

What then is the position in which the evangelical body stands at the present day? I will begin by pointing out reasons which exist for thankfulness to God for our position. I desire to look first at the blue sky.

We ought, for one thing, to be thankful for what God has done for us in the last hundred years as regards *our numbers!* Romaine used to say, that at one time he did not think he knew more than twenty ministers in the Church of England who preached the whole Gospel. Now they are numbered, not by twenties, but by hundreds, and I hope I may add, by thousands. We cannot, at the same time, shut our eyes to the fact, that the influence of the evangelical body has increased together with its numbers. Some person has said, that Exeter Hall is one of the five great estates of the realm. There are Queens, Lords, Commons, and the *Times* newspaper, and the fifth estate is Exeter Hall. We may receive the saying for what it is worth. It has truth in it. It is a striking fact, that a powerful paper like the *Times* is frequently obliged to confess that the evangelical body in the church has a voice, and a weight, and some effect on the movements of such a country as ours. An evangelical clergyman is no longer proscribed as a contemptible, fanatical person, as he used to be seventy years ago. Great statesmen have thought it worth their while to hold out their hand to evangelical men, and to raise them to the episcopal bench. Whatever their motives were, I believe, in so doing, they did wisely and well. It is matter for thankfulness to God, that at the present moment there are more evangelical bishops on the bench than there ever were at one time since the days of the Reformation. Acceptance with men, and increase in numbers, are specially the gifts of God. We should be thankless, indeed, if we did not see in the facts I have just mentioned a cause for gratitude.

We ought, in the next place, to be thankful for the *work* which God has enabled the evangelical body to accomplish on behalf of His Gospel, by the agency of voluntary religious Societies. I refer especially to the work done at home and abroad by the Church Missionary Society, the Pastoral-Aid Society, the Jews Society, the Irish Church Missions, the Colonial Church Society, and other societies of a similar character. How much has God done by them within the last fifty years! How wonderfully they have grown and gone forward in usefulness, and increased their incomes from hundreds to thousands, and tens of thousands, and, in one or two instances, to hundreds of thousands of pounds! For all this we should thank God. He alone has power over the hearts of men. He alone can incline men to give their money in order to spread Christ’s truth. He has proved, that He can raise up friends for His work notwithstanding the weakness, the infirmity, and the shortcomings of His people.

We ought, in the next place, to thank God for the readiness which He has put into the hearts of men to devise *new machinery*, to meet the wants of the times. We should be thankful for the rise and progress of open air preaching. We should be thankful for the general confidence reposed in lay agency. I, for one, am glad to see the laity taking their proper place, and working side by side with the clergy, as coadjutors, not as rivals, in the cause of God. I regard any agency without the slightest feeling of jealousy. I would not check the zeal of any Christian fellow-workman, because he is not ordained. I would rather say with Moses, forbid him not, “Would God that all the Lord’s people” would come forward and work. There is work for all. Laymen, no doubt, in working for Christ, sometimes make mistakes, or overstep their province. Like their ministers, they are no more infallible than the Pope. But do their ministers never make mistakes, or overstep their proper province? I verily believe the working clergy make more mistakes than the working laity. For the agency of the laity— for the new boldness with which the laity have come forward to be the helpers and aiders of the clergy, we ought, indeed, to be thankful to God.

We ought, in the next place, to thank God for the passing of the *Religious Worship Act.* This was a measure, which, having passed the house of Commons without opposition, met with fierce opposition in the Upper House, in a quarter where it was to be expected. Yet, having raised up the Protestant feeling of the country, it passed with acclamation. In spite of every prediction, it has hitherto done no harm to the Church of England. So far from doing harm it has strengthened the Church immensely. It has broken fetters which never ought to have been imposed on ministers of the Gospel. It has given us a liberty which an extreme caution had too long withheld, the glorious liberty of doing good in our parishes, no man making us afraid. I regard the Religious Worship Act as the greatest boon which our Church has received since the days of the Reformation.

One more feature in our position I cannot pass over. We ought to be deeply thankful for the rise and progress of *special services* on behalf of the working classes. And here I may be allowed to bear testimony to the value of such meetings as those which we have now the privilege to attend. Many of my rev. brethren may not be aware of the origin of the special services of the last two years. They arose entirely and exclusively out of the last clerical meeting, held in this very room, in Weston-Super-Mare. If these clerical meetings had done no more good than that, they have at least done one thing which will stand as a monument of their usefulness, in souls saved and God glorified, as long as the world endures. On the last day of that meeting, there met in one corner of the drawing-room of the Ven. Archdeacon, who presided, Dr. M’Neile, Dr. Miller, and myself, to talk over what should be the practical result of the meeting. I proposed the question, In what way are we to adjust the conflicting claims of duty? I remarked that we could not preach or speak everywhere. I asked what was the best method of economizing our strength, and spending ourselves to the best purpose? Dr. M’Neile said, “Let every man find out his proper work, and that work let him do—preaching, speaking, or lecturing.”—Dr. Miller said, “Why not attempt this? Let us open some large church in one of our great towns, and have special sermons five or six nights running, throwing open the pews, and inviting the working-classes to come without distinction, simply to hear the Gospel of Christ! “Dr. M’Neile at once agreed to it with all his heart. Dr. Miller said he would offer St. Martin’s Church, Birmingham, for the occasion, and invited Dr. M’Neile and myself to assist in the work. The thing was attempted, within three months, in November, 1856, and I need hardly remind you that the success was complete. In spite of many a prediction of failure, it was clearly proved that when you go out of your routine path to meet the working-classes, they will come and meet you. For six successive nights, to the astonishment of many, the huge Church of St. Martin’s, Birmingham, was filled with attentive, hearing congregations. That week, one of the most important movements of the last few years was set on foot. It went on from town to town, from Birmingham to Ipswich, and from Ipswich to Islington, and from Islington to Exeter Hall. Nothing, to my mind, is a more convincing evidence that special services are a step in the right direction, than the fact that the prince of this world has sought in every way to mar the good effect of the movement, and to turn it into an instrument for doing harm.

That these movements, which all began with the evangelical body, are not without their effect on the public mind, the conduct of our adversaries is a plain proof. The cry has often been raised in times gone by, that the “Church was in danger.” Lay agency, and open-air preaching, and special services, were to prove her ruin! Such a cry has repeatedly been raised; but the Church still survives. The dangers of the Church do not arise from the evangelical body, but from those who eat her bread and yet maintain doctrines contradictory to her Articles. But now we see the very things once condemned taken up by those who opposed them. Lay agency is used even by our adversaries. Even in cathedrals and abbeys are to be heard sermons addressed to the working classes. Our movements are effective, even our enemies being judges. When all these things are remembered, there is indeed great cause of thankfulness. We cannot look to these facts, and not feel that God has yet an elect people in the Church of England. Who can tell but there may be in store even greater mercies than these? God seems to be saying, “Destroy her not, for a blessing is in her.” Surely if we are not thankful for all these mercies, the very stones will cry out.

I must next pass to the other side of the question. There are black clouds as well as blue sky in the position of the evangelical body in the Church of England. There are many dangers around us, as well as things for which to thank God and take courage.

One of the chief dangers of the day is the firm hold which *Tractarianism* has on a large portion of the clergy, and not a small portion of the laity. We must not suppose that Tractarianism is extinct. Newman, and Manning, and Oakley, and Ward, have gone to Rome, but they have left behind a leaven which still works, and will work, in the hearts of many of the clergy and the laity. I believe that people do not sufficiently estimate the power which Tractarianism has over a large body in the Church of England. It does not come forward so prominently as it once did, but it is not the less dangerous. Its influence just now, is seen in the unscriptural doctrines put forth respecting the Lord’s Supper,—in the secret efforts that are made in some quarters to introduce the Romish confessional, and in the wide-spread taste for histrionic ceremonies, and Popish habiliments in the performance of public worship. Its progress appears in the immense difficulty there is in getting satisfactory curates when they are wanted. How rare and hard to find they are! How often, after writing to friends, and advertising in the *Record,* evangelical clergymen are obliged to put up with curates not established in the faith, and not up to the mark, simply because no others are to be met with. The theological training of young men, preparing for orders in the present day, is often most unsatisfactory and dangerous. It does not build them up in the principles of the Reformation, but places them on an inclined plane, of which the logical conclusion is neither more nor less than Romanism.

One of the next dangers of the day arises from the rise and progress of *Neologian principles* in the church. There are some who are called Church-of-England men, who publicly and privately put forward strange and unscriptural views about the atonement, about the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and about His substitution for us on the cross. There are clergymen in England, who hold strange views about inspiration, and the eternity of punishment which Scripture speaks of as being the desert of unbelief. These men go on unrebuked. No effort is made to put them out of the Church. The sentimental, the semi-liberal, the would-be-called charitable, say that there is something so loving, tender, and kind about the doctrine, that none can be lost, but that all will be saved, that they cannot but admire it. The rise and spread of this school is indeed a great evil in the present day, and demands the most anxious attention of the evangelical clergy.

One of the next great dangers of the day arises from the spirit of *false liberalism*—a morbid love of unity, falsely so called. No doubt we all love unity; but we must distinctly maintain, that true unity can only be built on God’s truth. No doubt we must not withhold the right hand of fellowship from any faithful brother, because he does not think exactly like us; but we must understand who the men are to whom we extend the right hand. Many are saying now-a-days, that “after all, there is no great difference between one clergyman and another. Some speak of a thing by one name, and some by another; but, after all, they mean the same.” It is not uncommon now to hear of high churchmen saying to evangelical clergymen—as was said in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, by Sanballat and Tobiah—“Let us build with you.” But let us not be taken in by such sophistry. Better build by ourselves—better let the work go on slowly—than allow Sanballat and Tobiah to come and build by our side. I believe that all communion of that sort, all interchange of pulpits with unsound men, is to be deprecated, as doing nothing but harm to the cause of God. I believe that, by so doing, we endorse the sentiments of persons who have no real love of Christ’s truth. We enable the high church party to manufacture ecclesiastical capital out of the evangelical clergy, and to make people believe that we are all one in heart, when, in reality, we differ on first principles. From such unity and co-operation may we pray to be delivered.

Another great danger in the present day arises from the proceedings of our *rulers and legislators*. Can there be any doubt in the mind of any intelligent observer of the times, that little by little we are casting off, as a nation, the religion of the Bible, the public national acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ? There are those who cannot see it; but I cannot read public events with their eyes. I have always strongly opposed the endowment of Maynooth. I deeply deplore the admission of the Jews in Parliament, and regard it as an insult to our Saviour. I see no force in the arguments brought forward in its favour. No public opinion can make that right, which is wrong in the sight of God. A thing may be politically right, and expedient, and popular, but if scripturally wrong, we ought not to touch it with the tip of our fingers. Once admit the Jew, and where are we to stop? Admit the Jew, and I know not why some eminent Parsee, should not someday take his seat in the House of Commons side by side with Mr. Disraeli. Admit the Jew, and I do not see why some Hindoo Brahmin or Mahometan, who has done service to the state, should not take his seat for some borough, as its representative in the British Parliament. I view with deep regret the assault made on the church in the matter of church-rates. The amount of money is not the question at stake. It is the principle which is involved. The principle is, that a nation ought to provide for the maintenance of God’s worship, and that there should be a charge on property for this purpose. This principle many of our great men are disposed to give up. I am firmly convinced it is the thin edge of a wedge, which is to split in sunder the union of church and state in the land.

I wish that I could conclude the catalogue of our national short-comings at this point. But unhappily I cannot. I observe with painful feelings the language used in both Houses of Parliament by eminent statesmen about India, and the position we ought to occupy there. I see a disposition to regard all creeds as alike, and to speak of shasters and vedas as having the same authority as the Word of God. I see it questioned whether the Bible should be taught in schools maintained by national money in India. When I see all this, I think that coming events are casting their shadows before. There are unmistakeable premonitory symptoms of a great political crisis. There is a plain tendency to effect a separation between the church of Christ and the Government of England. The time is drawing near when the question will have to be decided, whether the country, as a country, and the government, as a government, shall recognize Christianity at all. There is in all this imminent danger. I say these things, not because I fear for the true Church of Christ, or for the Church of England, so long as she is faithful to her principles, and so long as her clergy stand by the Word of God. But I say these things as an Englishman who loves his country, and who sees in the separation of Church and State evil to England,—no great harm to the true interests of Christ’s cause, but great harm to the land, as a land, and to the nation, as a nation. I believe that God will be displeased; and that when God is displeased with a nation, He has but to put forth His finger, and that nation shall pass away. To use the words of Dr. Owen, “If the rulers of a nation say, they have nothing to do with religion, God will quickly manifest that He has nothing to do with them.” It is a solemn saying in God’s word, “Amalek was the first among the nations, but his latter end shall be, that he perish for ever.”

Having now dwelt upon the position of the evangelical body, both as regards its reasons for thankfulness, and its reasons for alarm, I am desirous to impress upon mybrethren the question, What use are we going to make of all that we have heard at the meeting of this week? What practical lessons are we going to carry away for our future conduct as ministers of Christ? I will first mention a few things which we ought to attend to individually, and then a few which we ought to attend to collectively.

With respect to individual duty, I will first remark, that it is of great importance from time to time to recall to our minds the *real nature of our work*. We should remember constantly the great ideal of what a Christian minister ought to be, sketched out in the sixth chapter of the Acts: “We will give ourselves to the Word of God and to prayer.” The preaching and expounding of the Word of God, with nothing added, and with nothing taken away, is beyond all doubt our principal business. But after that, we must never forget private prayer. It was said by an old writer that Luther’s habits of private prayer, and John Bradford’s habits of private prayer, were things more talked of than practised and imitated. Private prayer is one grand secret of the strength of the ministry. It is here that the roots of the ministry, practically speaking, are to be found. The ministry of the man who has gifts, however great, but who does not give the closet the principal place, must sooner or later become jejune and ineffective. At the same time we must take heed that we give due honour to the Word of God in our public ministrations. A thousand things continually call us away from this—committees, schools, lectures, visiting, and the like. But we must remember, that we are ministers of the Word of God— that our province is the Word of God—and that we must be very careful how we leave the Word of God to serve tables.

I will remark, in the next place, that it is of immense importance that we should take heed to *our own lives*. I have been lately studying the lives and private habits of those men whom God raised up to be the revivers of the Church of England in the last century. I have been much struck with their self-denial, and entire devotedness to the work of the ministry. They were men who lived very plainly and simply, and did not seem to care much for anything but their work. They were not diners out. They were not men who sought the entertainments of the great and the rich. We should do well to consider whether we are living as near to God as they did.

I will remark, in the next place, that we must take heed that we do not neglect our *pulpit preparation.* The matter and style of our sermons must be equal to the demands of the times. Ignorant and unlearned people may perhaps put up with anything in the way of preaching, but the more the people are trained by means of teachers and libraries, the more need there is to take heed to our preaching, in order that the pulpit of the Church of England may not fall behind the times. There is danger on this point. Some may be ready to say at the end of the week, “I have been working for God the whole of the week.—I have been attending the school, visiting from house to house, distributing tracts, making speeches, delivering lectures*;* and if my sermons on Sunday are not quite what they might be, at any rate I have not been idle.”—We should remember, that all work of this description, if it trenches on the preparation of our sermons, is work ill-spent. It is no excuse in the sight of God, if our sermons on Sundays are poor, because we have been working so hard all the week. What costs little is worth little. If a man comes to his Bible on the Saturday, takes the first text that occurs to him, puts a few thoughts together, and then, trusting to his extempore powers, goes with that preparation only into the pulpit the next morning, we must not be surprised if the people complain of sameness in their pastor’s ministrations. There never was a period when the pulpit demanded more preparation, more serious, hearty, studious preparation, at the hand of all God’s faithful ministers.

I will remark, in the next place, that we all need to be more careful in the employment of *our time*. There is a danger of trying to do too much. Some clergymen have so many irons in the fire that it is impossible to keep them all hot. A few things well done are far better than twenty ill done. The man whose work will stand the longest, is the man who, whatever people may say, however lazy they may call him, determines that he will not do more than he can do well, that he will not attempt more work than he can really do, and that he will not start more machinery than he can keep steadily going.

I will remark, in the next place, that it deserves serious consideration, whether we give sufficient attention to *reading and study*, in the present day. By all means let us put the Bible first, chief, and foremost, and make it our principal study. But I should be sorry if it came to be said that the ministers of the Church of England were ignorant men. I do not mean by the reading which I refer to, such reading as would lead us away from the Bible, but such as would help to the study and understanding of it. I do not mean that we ought to read things which do not throw light on the Word of God. But I do say that, in the multiplicity of our engagements, there is great danger of forgetting that reading makes a “full man,” and neglect of reading makes an empty one. Sorry should I be if the evangelical clergy of the Church of England were to get the character of being men who read little, and took little pains to add new things to old. I am sure that Mr. Venn will not say that his grandfather was not a reading man. No one will say that James Hervey was not a reading man. Of John Berridge, it was said, that there was no man in Cambridge who was better read on all subjects than he was. I must plainly give it as my opinion that clergymen who think there is no occasion for reading and study make a great mistake, and are likely to bring the ministry into great contempt. We ought to be familiar with books which throw light on our great work, and we ought to make time to read them.

I wish, finally, to say a few words on our duty, not only individually, but collectively. For one thing, we ought, if possible, to keep up *more union* among ourselves, from one end of the kingdom to the other. Here is the great value of these clerical meetings. I hope that, ere long, there will not be a county where there is not such a meeting as that which we have attended this week. I do not see why we should not, in every county, collect together our little companies of ten, fifteen, or twenty evangelical clergymen once every year, and take counsel together about the things of the common Gospel in which we are concerned. I hope that the idea will be taken up, and that we shall hear of the example set here, being carried out all over the land.

For another thing, we ought to try to improve, in some measure, the character and conduct of the *meetings* on behalf of religious societies. Persons are continually complaining, on all sides, that such meetings are not what they used to be—that they are falling off in interest, in attendance, and in their results. Many are rising up in the Church of England—persons of knowledge, faith, and grace—who say they never go to religious meetings, because they are so unprofitable. Many say that our meetings consist of jokes about the ladies and the fair collectors, of references to this brother, and his usual eloquence, and to that speaker, with his ready facetiousness, and of compliments to everybody in turn. The upshot is, that many people are disgusted, and will not attend. This is a matter on which we ought to consider whether something cannot be done. Could there not be more solemnity, and vigour, and pith, and power about our meetings? Could there not be more co-operation and arrangement among speakers, one taking up this point, and another that? Could not each bring something that costs something, and has taken time in the preparation? These things seem trifling to some. But they are not so. Public meetings supply the only opportunity when the evangelical clergy and many of the laity are brought together. The conduct of them is a matter that ought not to be overlooked.

In the last place, I will urge you to do something towards bearing a public testimony on the important question, whether or not *the state shall recognize Christianity*, or cast it aside altogether. The India bill has forced the subject on us. A hundred and fifty millions of persons have been adopted and brought in as part of the British empire. On what principle are they to be ruled? The East India Company being cast aside, and the Queen being now the governor of all that vast continent of Hindostan, are we to go among the people and say, practically, that we have left our Bible and our Christianity at home? It is a matter of great importance. I trust that none will fail to stir up their congregations and their parishes upon it, and to let the government know what a large body of the English people think respecting the future government of India. Surely we have a right to demand these three things: that the government shall not be ashamed to make the Bible an indispensable part of the instruction given in all schools maintained by them—that caste shall not be made a disqualification for having employment under the state—that there shall be a thorough repudiation of any union between the government and idolatry in any form, directly or indirectly, in short, that England shall have nothing to do with Indian idolatry. If government seems disposed to encourage neutrality, the ministers of the Church of England must not be guilty of the neutrality of being ashamed of Christianity. I hope that we shall be awake to the times in which we live, and shall endeavour to stir up the country, to make some public declaration about what we desire government to do, and what we protest against being done, in the new empire of Hindostan.

We are living in troublous times. There are dangers ahead, which ought to turn every Christian heart to thesanctuary, crying, “O Lord, spare us; O Lord, spare the people, and give us thy blessing.” These are not times in which men ought to get into their little parish and say they care not what goes on outside that ditch or that wall, or that lane, which is the boundary of their parish. We must have public feelings, and do our duty, and take our part against the common foes by which the Church of England is in danger of being assailed. We must bear the kind of testimony which Jeremiah was called to bear in his time. We must not suppose that anything will do except fighting,—not fighting with carnal weapons, but with the sword of the Spirit.—We must earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. All like peace and quietness. It is pleasant to sit under our own vine and fig-tree. But the times in which we live will not allow us to sit still. We must remember the Lord’s word, “Think not that I come to send peace, but a sword;” and the injunction which He once gave, “He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.” It is hard to be ever fighting. But our forefathers won the Reformation through dangers, and we must strive to keep it, and hand it down to our descendants, whatever dangers we have to pass through.

I will ask one favour in behalf of the brethren who have done the principal part of the labour in the meeting now nearly concluded.—We ask a special place in your intercessory prayers. You should consider the position in which we are placed. We are often put forward into positions which others perhaps would fill just as well, if they would but make the trial, and are deeply sensible of our own deficiencies. But still, being put forward in the forefront of the battle, we may surely ask for a special place in your prayers. We are only flesh and blood. We are men of like passions with yourselves. We have our private trials, and our special temptations. Often, while watering the vineyards of others, our own is comparatively neglected. Surely it is not too much to ask you to pray for us. Pray that we may be kept humble and sensible of our own weakness, and ever mindful that in the Lord alone can we be strong.—Pray that we may have wisdom to take the right step, to do the right thing in the right way, and to do nothing to cause the Gospel to be blamed. Pray, above all, that we may go straight on, even unto the end—that we may never lose our first love, and go back from first principles,—that it may never be said of us, that we are not the men we once were, but that we may go on consistently and faithfully, die in harness, and “finish our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God.”

In conclusion, I will remind you of the words which the Apostle addressed to the Ephesian elders: “I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace.” Weare about to part, perhaps to meet no more in this world. Let us solemnly commend one another to God, and to the word of His grace, as that which will never err, never fail us, never lead us astray. Guided by that word as our light and lamp, we shall at last receive an inheritance among them that are sanctified. Above all, let us never forget the advice which Whitefield gave in one of his letters, let us “make much of our Lord Jesus Christ.” There are many things of which we may easily make too much in our ministry, give them too much attention, think about them too much. But we can never make too much of Christ.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

W. HUNT. STEAM PRESS, IPSWICH.

1. The following address was delivered to a large clerical meeting, held at Weston-Super-Mare, under the presidency of Archdeacon Law, in the month of August, 1858. It was originally delivered from rough notes, and has been considerably abridged by the reporter. This must account for the elliptical and fragmentary style which it in many parts assumes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)