

WHAT IS WANTED?

BEING THOUGHTS AND SUGGESTIONS
ON SOME OF THE
CHIEF WANTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
IN THE PRESENT DAY.

BY THE
REV. J. C. RYLE, B. A.,
CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD;
RECTOR OF HELMINGHAM, SUFFOLK;
AUTHOR OF
“Home Truths” “Plain Speaking” &c. &c.

Third Edition, Revised.

IPSWICH:
W. HUNT, STEAM PRESS, TAVERN STREET.
LONDON:
WERTHEIM & MACINTOSH, PATERNOSTER ROW;
NISBET & CO., BERNERS STREET.

MDCCCLVI.

WHAT IS WANTED?

THE condition of the Church of England seems likely to become one of the most important subjects of the present day. The minds of reading and thinking men are gradually concentrating on it. Something, we hear on every side, is wanted. But what is it that is wanted?

“Does the Church of England fulfil the duties of a richly endowed Protestant Establishment? Does it do as much good to the eighteen millions of England and Wales as may fairly be expected from its fourteen thousand places of worship, and its seventeen thousand clergymen? Are the moral and spiritual effects which it produces at all proportionate to the immense machinery at its disposal? Does it meet the reasonable wants of the bulk of our population? Does it possess the affections of the middle and lower classes? Is it in a healthy or diseased state? If diseases exist, is there any remedy for them?”—All these are questions which are continually asked in the present day. They are questions to which it is not very easy to give satisfactory answers. There are few, probably, who will not concede that *something* is *wanted*. But what is it that is wanted?

The temper of the times is evidently in favour of changes. The stream of public opinion runs strongly towards alterations in every direction. How much of this love of change is nothing better than the feverish restlessness of a sick man, I will not stop to enquire. I simply accept the fact that it exists. We have seen changes of late in almost every quarter. Our representative body,—our municipal institutions,—our commercial system,—our courts of law,—each and all have been subjected to great alterations. Our universities are being dealt with in the same way. The circle narrows round the Church of England. Men are saying that its turn must come next. It too must be changed. But, after all, what is it that is really wanted?

At a time like this I feel that I need hardly apologize for offering a few practical suggestions on some of the chief wants of the Church of England. I am aware that I have little right to be heard on such an important question. Neither years, reading, nor ecclesiastical position, give me any claim to attention. But the testimony of every witness, however humble, is useful in a disputed case. A looker-on sometimes sees most of a closely contested game of skill. And the tenant of a quiet country rectory may sometimes see one or two things, which are lost sight of in the daily hurry and hourly struggle of a life spent in large towns. These things let me endeavour to set down.

One thing only I wish to premise. I write all that I am writing as a sincere friend of the Church of England, and from a sincere desire to advance its interests. I am an ordained minister of that Church. I have declared my assent to its Articles and Formularies “ex animo,” and “ex animo” am prepared to defend them. I love the Prayer Book, and consider it a blessing to the nation. I hold firmly the principle of an Establishment, and should deeply grieve to see the connection between Church and State dissolved. I conscientiously believe that the Church of England, properly administered, is calculated to be an instrument of immense spiritual good, both to my own country, and to the world. Once for all let me say, that in hearty, reasonable affection to the Church of which I am a minister, I will give place to no man living. If any one thinks that I hold by it with a loose hand, let him know that he is utterly mistaken. In zeal for the promotion of its true interests, I will yield to none.

I. I begin by saying, that *it is the bounden duty of every true Christian to try to understand the requirements of his own times.*

Every true Christian will desire to do good in his day and generation. All can do something. There are two vast scales before us all, one for good and one for evil,—one for Christ and one against Him. Our influence must go in one scale or the other. There is no alternative. For this every one is responsible. The least and lowest has one grain in his hand. Let him see to it that he throws that grain into the right scale.

Every true Christian will desire to leave the world a better world than he found it, more godly, more moral, more enlightened, more civilized, more clean, and more happy. He will desire, if possible, to lessen the amount of physical, social, moral, and spiritual evil, and to do his part in cleansing some of it away. Let the selfish worldling reckon little how the world goes on, and care nothing if it only lasts his time. The true Christian is of another mind.

But how shall a man do good who does not see the evils around him? How shall he improve the world of his day, if he does not see its defects? How shall he help to cure, if he does not see the disease? Let all members of the Church of England apply these questions to themselves. Let them remember that it is of the utmost importance to know the wants and dangers of their own day.

I must plainly say that those are not to be commended who can think of nothing but their own spiritual conflict, and the welfare of their own little circle or congregation. I cannot praise those clergymen who think of nothing but their own parishioners, their own missionary meetings, and their own Sunday school. I believe it behoves a true Christian to take an interest in everything which affects the religion of his church and country, to cultivate extended views, and to be of a *public* spirit. Oh! that men would re-

member that the best of cabins is useless when the whole ship is wrecked. The mouse in the fable climbed to the top of the box in which he was born, and wondered to see the world so large. I fear there are only too many Christians very like him.

Too many seem to care for nothing so long as things go on smoothly within their own parochial bounds. So long as their own services are well attended, their own people regularly visited, their own schools well filled, their own little meetings successful, they really seem to take no heed of what goes on in the world. The parish on one side of their own my be full of Romanism. The parish on the other may be as dark as a heathen land. The diocese in which they live may be in a most unsatisfactory state. But what matter? They see nothing. They know nothing beyond the ditch round their own parish. They are admirable men at the use of the microscope:—they see everything close to their own door. They never look through the telescope:—they see nothing of things far away. Episcopalians in theory, they are independents in practice. Ministers and members of the Church of England in name, they appear to be utterly careless about the Church, except in the two or three thousand acres round their own homes.

Now these things ought not so to be. It is no light matter whether we take an interest in the circumstances of our own times. It is not a point on which Scripture is silent. It is not for nothing that the men of Issachar are commended, because they “had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.” It is not for nothing that our Lord Jesus Christ blamed the Jews because they did “not discern their times.” It is not without deep meaning that He says of Jerusalem, that “she knew not the time of her visitation.” For my own part, I believe there is no greater misfortune to a church than blindness as to the requirements of its own times. The want of public spirit is an evil sign. It bodes ill for a church when its members “will not consider.”

Three hundred years ago there were men in the Church of England *who understood their times*. They drew up Articles of faith, clear, plain, Evangelical, and unmistakeable. They gave the English Bible to the people, and exhorted them to read it. They encouraged plain, popular preaching. They called things by their right names. They dealt with Romish doctrine in an honest, out-spoken way, as an unscriptural delusion. They held out the right hand to the Protestant Churches of Germany and Switzerland as sister churches. They contended to the death for the pure Gospel. They laid down their lives, rather than give up Christ’s truth. They brought down a blessing on their Church. They cemented its foundation with their blood. They made it plain to the world that it was not a semi-Romish communion, but a Scriptural Protestant fold. The judgment day alone will show how much we owe to the courage, firmness, and decision of our martyred Reformers. It will be

an evil day for the Church of England when the names of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and Jewell are not held in honour.

Two hundred and thirty years ago there were men in the Church of England *who did not understand their times*. They forgot the principles of the English Reformation. Wittingly or unwittingly they made a retrograde movement toward Rome. They brought down God's wrath on the land. They alienated the affections of the middle classes from the Church of England. They sowed the seeds of rebellion, discord, and strife. They reaped a bitter harvest in the struggle of the Commonwealth times. In a word they brought about the destruction of the Church, the episcopate, the liturgy, and the throne. Alas! for their folly! Few men have ever done more harm to our Church than Archbishop Laud. If ever the day shall come, when his principles and practices shall once more be in the ascendancy, we may make up our minds to a storm.

One hundred and ninety years ago there were men in the Church of England *who did not understand their times*. They returned to their parishes and dignities at the restoration of Charles the Second, without having forgotten old prejudices, and without having learned new wisdom. They had a golden opportunity for strengthening the Church of England, and they blindly refused to use it. Not one jot would they concede to the Puritans! Not one inch would they stir to meet conscientious scruples! They framed the Act of Uniformity. They cast out of the Church of England two thousand of its best ministers in one day. In short they laid the foundation of English dissent deep and wide with their own hands. Alas! for their folly! If the bitterest enemy of our Church had been told to contrive a plan for damaging it, he could hardly have inflicted a more deadly injury than it received from Archbishop Sheldon and his party.

One hundred years ago there were men in the Church of England *who did not understand their times*. They were sunk in a deep sleep, and saw and heard nothing. They had no eyes for the dark ignorance and gross immorality which overflowed the land. They would not lift a finger to help clergymen who saw the danger, and felt that extraordinary evils needed extraordinary remedies. On the contrary, they denounced them as irregular and disorderly, and cried aloud about canons and rubrics, when the ark of God was in peril, and the very existence of English Christianity at stake. They thrust out of the Church of England such men as Whitefield and the Wesleys, when they would gladly have remained within it. They blindly compelled men to form the Methodist denomination, and then anathematized them for forming it. Alas! for their folly! To drive men out of our camp who were ready and willing to fight on our own side, was surely the most insane line of policy that could have been adopted.

And now in the year 1855, do we understand our times? This is a momentous question. Here, in the year 1855, do we see our dangers, and are we prepared to meet them? This is a mighty problem. Unhappily, it is no new thing for the Church of England to commit blunders. Are we going to add one more to the blunders of old time, or have we learned wisdom? ARE WE BLIND, OR DO WE SEE?

II. I proceed, in the next place, to point out *some dangers which appear to me to beset the Church of England in the present day.*

In handling this part of our subject I am anxious to avoid everything like exaggeration. I am deeply thankful for the improvement that has taken place in the Church of England within the last fifty years. I do not forget the parishes which have been evangelized, the churches and schools which have been built, the money which has been spent in missionary efforts at home and abroad, by English Churchmen since the end of the last century. I remember it all, and am thankful. I only want to call the reader's attention to a few plain facts.

1. Is it not then a fact *that more than a fourth part of the population of England and Wales attend no religious service on Sundays?* One person in every four of our countrymen never attends public means of grace, either in church or chapel,—gives no outward sign of having any religion, and is in effect an habitual Sabbath-breaker! Let those who doubt this refer to the government Census of religious worship for 1851. Let them read these words: "It appears that as many as 5,288,294 persons able to attend, are every Sunday absent from religious services." (Routledge's edition, p. 102.) I see in this fact a most dangerous state of things.

2. Is it not a fact *that there are hundreds and thousands of parishes in England and Wales, in which little or nothing is done by the Church of England?* When I say this, I mean that little or nothing is done for the moral and spiritual good of the parishioners, much less of the rest of the world. The services of the Church are correctly performed. The rubrics are all duly observed. But when you have said this, you have said all that you can say. You may look in vain for the name of the parish in the subscription lists of any of the religious societies connected with the church. Turn to the Reports of the Church Missionary Society, or of the Propagation Society,—of the Additional Curates, or Pastoral Aid Societies,—of the Irish Church Mission, or the Jews' Society,—of the National Society, or the Colonial Church Society,—and you will get one and the same answer. It is all a blank. There is nothing done. You may look in vain for a congregation on Sunday. The church is more than half empty. You may look in vain for love and respect to the Church of England among the parishioners. They have long ceased to exist. I appeal to any one who knows much of the ecclesiastical state of our country. Let him deny, if he can, that parishes in the state I

have described are painfully numerous. I see in this fact a most dangerous state of things.

3. Is it not a fact *that there is an immense amount of ignorance as to the leading doctrines of Christianity among the professing members of the Church of England?* How few Churchmen at this moment could give any account of the doctrinal statements contained in the Thirty-nine Articles! How many know no more than this, that they have always been brought up “to go to church,” and to church they always go. Ask them why they are not Roman Catholics, and they can give you no good answer. Ask them in what respect they differ from Dissenters, and their ideas are vague in the extreme. I am not speaking now of parishes where there is no education. I speak of all parts of England, and of all classes, high and low, rich and poor. I appeal to any intelligent and hard-working clergyman who visits from house to house, and attends many sick people, whether I have stated one word more than the truth. It is to be feared that the English Roman Catholic knows far more of the doctrines of his church than the English Churchman does of his. I see in this fact a most dangerous state of things.

4. Is it not a notorious fact *that we have in the bosom of the Church of England, a school of teaching of a downright Romish tendency?* I need hardly say that I advert to the Tractarian School. We have at this moment in a professedly Protestant Church, hundreds of beneficed clergymen, and hundreds of laymen, whose views are notoriously opposed to Protestant Christianity. These men teach and maintain opinions about the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, which most of their thinking fellow-countrymen find it impossible to reconcile either with the Bible or the formularies of the Church of England. The middle classes are amazed and disgusted. The poor, in many cases, forsake the Church for the Dissenting Chapel. Public opinion complains loudly. But nothing is done to check this Romish teaching! The Church is gradually weakened. The affections of its best friends are gradually alienated. Its enemies look on and rejoice. But nothing is done! Year after year we hear of clergymen and young members of our aristocracy going over to the Church of Rome. Nobody likes the existing state of things. Everybody regrets it. Everybody thinks “something ought to be done.” But nothing is done! I see in this fact a most dangerous state of things.

5. Is it not a notorious fact that *a deliberate attempt has been lately made to thrust out of the Church of England a large number of its most laborious and deeply attached ministers?* I allude, of course, to the famous Gorham case, and the trial about Baptism and Regeneration. It would be ridiculous affectation to ignore the fact that Mr. Gorham’s general views were held by thousands of clergymen. It would have been impossible to condemn him without also, by implication, condemning them. If he had

been cast out of the Church for his opinions, there was nothing to prevent at least three thousand more being cast out also. There was nothing contrary to the formularies of the Church of England in Mr. Gorham's opinions. On the contrary, it may easily be shown that they are the only views on which the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies can be consistently and harmoniously interpreted, so as not to contradict one another. There was nothing new about Mr. Gorham's opinions on Regeneration. They had been held substantially by numbers of Clergymen ever since the time of the Reformation. There never was wanting a succession of faithful men in the Church of England, who said to the mass of their congregation, "Ye must be born again." Yet notwithstanding all this, an attempt was made to shut a door which for three hundred years had been open. An attempt has been made to narrow the terms of union with the Church of England. An attempt has been made to remove the ancient landmarks which our Reformers set up. An attempt has been made to exclude from the Church of Latimer and Jewell every Clergyman who does not hold High Church views about Baptism and Regeneration. I see in this fact a most dangerous state of things.*

6. Is it not a fact *that there is no place in all England and Wales where the Church of England is in so unsatisfactory a condition as London?* There is no town where so large a proportion of the population attends no place of religious worship. London is the most Sabbath-breaking city in the land. There is no town where the clergy as a body seem to have so little hold on the laity. It is fearful to observe the absence of the middle and lower orders in the great majority of Metropolitan congregations, and the immense preponderance of women over men in almost every church. One may well ask on Sundays, "Where are the men? Where are the poor?"† No doubt there are bright exceptions to these statements, but they are unhappily few and far between. London is the place, be it remembered, where the wealth, and intellect, and mind, and money of the land are mainly concentrated. The greatest statesmen, and lawyers, and merchants, and bankers,

* It is "reported commonly" that there are dioceses in England at this moment, where a systematic attempt is constantly made to keep out clergymen who do not hold the High Church view of baptism and regeneration. Difficulties are said to be thrown in the way of young men seeking ordination, and of curates seeking licenses, if they are likely to say to baptized people, "Ye must be born again." It is high time that public attention should be directed to this state of things. Lay patrons in particular should consider how seriously their range of selection is likely to be interfered with by these exclusive proceedings. Are we really to understand that men like Latimer and Hooper are not fit for institution, and not sound enough to be ordained? A few questions on this subject in the House of Lords might do much good.

† I cannot help saying that I think the system of having an immense number of free sittings in our new churches a great mistake. Our lower orders do not like being treated as paupers. They pay willingly for a sitting when they go to a dissenting chapel.

and physicians, and tradesmen in the world are to be found here. Here is the largest body of intelligent artisans and clever shopkeepers that can be seen gathered together on earth. Yet this very London is by far the weakest point in the whole Church of England. I see in this fact a most dangerous state of things.

I place the facts I have just mentioned before the reader, and ask his serious attention to them. I am far from saying that I have named all the dangers of the present day. There are others, and those neither few nor small. An unexpected revival of Romanism in its most rampant form,—an appalling growth of infidelity of the most subtle description,—a loss of former purity among our nonconformist brethren from meddling too much in politics,—an extravagant liberality of opinion in high places, so that men seem hardly to distinguish between truth and error,—a deplorably defective state of education,—a most unsatisfactory condition of things in some of our Colonial Dioceses,*—these might also be mentioned as signs of our times. But I purposely abstain from touching on them. I would rather confine my attention to the facts I have already mentioned, as the points which most practically demand the notice of the Church of England.

I do not feel that I am in the habit of indulging extravagant expectations as to the effects of the Gospel of Christ. I do not expect the knowledge of the Lord to cover the earth under the present order of things. I am prepared to find an immense quantity of impenitence and unbelief under the most faithful ministrations. The men of Chorazin, and Bethsaida, and Capernaum will never want successors. But still, after making every allowance, I cannot help thinking that there are evils in the Church of England which are far greater than they need be, and that the facts I have detailed call loudly for consideration.

I see in these facts the elements of immense danger to the Church of which I am a minister, and danger which is every year increasing. I am deeply anxious that the extent of the danger may be fully known. Our rowers have brought us into great waters. There are breakers a-head. We are in imminent peril of making shipwreck.

Five millions of our fellow-countrymen make no profession of religion at all! In thousands of parishes the Church of England does nothing, has no influence, and is practically asleep! Myriads of church-going people are grossly ignorant of the leading doctrines of Christianity! A deadly heresy is flourishing in the midst of us unheeded and unchecked! A deliberate at-

* It is well that people in England should know that there are Colonial dioceses at this moment, where every possible difficulty is thrown in the way of any clergyman who does not hold baptismal regeneration. The friends of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which is the main-stay of the Colonial Church, ought to explain this, before they ask us to give them our money.

tempt has been lately made to cast out of the Church of England a large number of its most faithful ministers! London, the heart of the whole country, is the weakest part of our ecclesiastical body! Can any one deny the existence of these facts? Surely not. Can any one deny that they constitute an enormous danger? Impossible!

But what shall be the end of these things? Whereunto will all these evils grow? We cannot go on long in our present condition. A church which has not the affections of the middle and lower orders can never stand long in a free country like England. An educated people will not always tolerate an Established Church which cannot prevent five millions of the population living without God. Men will begin to ask whether there is not something radically wrong when such a state of things exists. In spite of Bishops, Deans, Chapters, and Cathedrals, we shall have a revolutionary outbreak some day, in which many good things will be swept away as well as bad. Can nothing be done to avert such a calamity? Can nothing be done to improve our position? Is it really impossible to strengthen the things which remain? Are the difficulties in the way of amendment insuperable? SHALL WE LIVE OR SHALL WE DIE?

I call on all true friends of evangelical truth in the Church of England to consider well the dangerous position in which we stand. I make no appeal to the Tractarians. For the present many things are working in their favour. Presuming on popular ignorance, they are quietly Romanizing as many as they can reach. They little know, perhaps, the under current of popular disgust which is gradually swelling and rising against their principles.—I make no appeal to mere worldly people. The heart buried in politics and business, in stocks and crops, in amusements or money-making,—such a heart feels nothing, knows nothing, comprehends nothing of the danger I have described.—It is to professedly Evangelical people that I make my appeal. Oh! that we may all be delivered from that ruinous spirit of self-complacency which makes so many shut their eyes, and cry, “I see no danger!” Oh! that we may not go on staving off the day of amendment, and waiting for a convenient season, till we are suddenly awakened by some grand crash, and find that the whole fabric of the Church of England has given way and collapsed! Oh! that we may have wisdom to set our house in order, and so be allowed to live and not die!

III. I proceed, in the last place, to offer *a few suggestions on the true remedies for the present state of things in the Church of England*. This, after all, is the grand point to be considered. What is wanted?

I am aware that many profess loudly that they have remedies which would cure every evil in our Church, if only used. I regard most of these remedies as being little better than quack medicines. I desire to disclaim all

sympathy with the views and prescriptions of those who propound them. I warn every true friend of the Church of England to refuse their counsel.

I feel no sympathy whatever with those who want to tamper with *the Bible*. I want no alteration there, neither addition, nor subtraction, nor abridgment. It is all given by inspiration, all equally, all thoroughly, all perfectly. A new Bible is not the want of our times.

I feel no sympathy whatever with those who say we want *a new Gospel*. The old Evangelical system is not effete and worn out, as some say. There is not the slightest necessity for the new lights,—the broad views,—the kinder tone of theology,—the gentler interpretation of texts, which some are pressing on our attention. There is no need for the system which Mr. Maurice has put forth in His Theological Essays. We want nothing but the old truths boldly, fully, affectionately preached. A new Gospel is not the want of the times.

I feel no sympathy with those who think *altering the Prayer Book* would heal our wounds. I do not say the Prayer Book is perfect. Its compilers were men, and not God. They could not foresee our present want of discipline. They undoubtedly used some expressions liable to be misinterpreted, which have been fruitful causes of division and evil. The alterations proposed by the Royal Commission in 1689, which have been lately printed by order of the House of Commons, deserve most serious attention, and will repay a careful perusal. But we want something more than liturgical amendment. *Far too much is expected from it*. I doubt, moreover, whether we have men among us who are competent to alter the liturgy. I doubt still more whether any alteration would bring over many to the Church. The objections of those Dissenters who object to the liturgy, are not so much to the Prayer Book as it is, as to having any form of Prayer at all. A reform of the Prayer Book is not the principal want of the times.*

* It is impossible not to feel interest in the movement which has been originated by the Liturgical Revision Society. But though I see nothing hardly that I do not approve in their proposed amendments, I am unable to see that the movement is a *practical* one.

I am at a loss to understand by what means the proposed revision is to be effected. Convocation would never be allowed to take the work in hand. A Royal Commission in such a delicate matter is not quite so simple and easy a way of cutting the knot as it was in the days of Elizabeth, or the Stewarts. By whom are the members of the Commission to be nominated? Is it the least likely that such men would be selected as the Liturgical Revision Society would approve?

But let us grant, for sake of argument, that a Royal Commission to reform the Liturgy is appointed, which can work together harmoniously. Let us suppose that this Commission adopts the alterations proposed by the Liturgical Revision Society. Let us also suppose that Parliament sanctions the alterations recommended by the Commission. What is to be done next? Is it not certain that besides Tractarians, at least three or four thousand respectable and moderate-minded clergymen would dislike the alterations altogether, and refuse to

I feel no sympathy with those who think that *synodical action* would cure all our diseases. I do not deny that the present position of our Church, in the matter of synods, is anomalous, and may possibly be attended with some inconveniences. But I see far greater prospects of evil than good from a revival of Convocation in any shape or form. Above all I cannot forget that synods have never yet kept Churches from decay. Synodical action is not the great want of our times.

I feel no sympathy with those who say that an *increase in the number of our Bishops* would set everything right that is now wrong. I freely grant that our dioceses are far too large for one man to superintend. But unless we have some guarantee that Prime Ministers will select clergymen for Bishops upon purely spiritual grounds, I believe that an increase of Bishops would only be a change for the worse. There is nothing more dangerous in churches or states, than a superabundance of irresponsible power. Moreover the history of the Eastern and African Churches shows us that it needs something more than a multitude of Bishops to keep a church alive. An increased number of Bishops is not the main want of our times.

I have thought it right to advert to these points, because some of them are often brought forward as remedies for the evils which beset the Church of England in the present day. My own deliberate conviction is that *they are not such remedies as our case requires*. I believe we might reform the Prayer Book, have an Annual Convocation, treble our Bishops, build a church for every two thousand of our people, equalize the incomes of the working Clergy, and yet be really in no more healthy condition than we are now. We should probably have only changed one evil for another. We should have left the root of all our weakness untouched. Like the sick man who turns in vain from one side to another, we should merely have changed our position. We should have done nothing really useful towards shaking

accept them? And are these men to be turned out of their benefices for their refusal? Few, I think, would approve of such an ejection as this.

These practical difficulties appear to me very formidable. The Liturgical Revision Society would do well to look them in the face.

At best I believe the proposed revision would occasion a tremendous struggle within the Church of England. It would be such a serious operation in Ecclesiastical surgery, that I doubt exceedingly whether the patient would survive it. At any rate the risk, to my eyes, seem so great, that I dare not share the responsibility of incurring it. I had rather “bear the ills I know, than flee to others that I know not of.” I had rather keep the Liturgy as it is, than peril the existence of the Church of England by trying to improve it.

If the members of the Liturgical Revision Society really want to strengthen and improve the Church of England, I would humbly suggest to them a far more practical and simple course. Let them obtain the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee, to consider the operation of the Act of Uniformity, and the Conventicle Acts, with a view to a modification (to say the least) of their enactments.

off our disease. Our five millions of Sabbath-breakers would still be unreclaimed. Our empty churches would still be unfilled.

What then is really wanted? What does the condition of the Church of England require? Let us look the question in the face and give an answer.

1. We want *a great increase of plain, thorough, unmistakeable Evangelical teaching*. This is, in my judgment, beyond all comparison the first thing that is needed. Without this everything else is useless. With this we can get over many deficiencies. But this must be our main object, and our chief aim, “More Evangelical teaching.”

If any man asks what I mean by Evangelical teaching, I will tell him without hesitation. I mean such teaching of Christian truth as is to be found in the Thirty-nine Articles of my own Church, in the same *clearness*, the same *order*, and the same *proportion*. I mean such teaching about Scripture as agrees with the Sixth Article and the Homily on Holy Scripture;—such teaching about human nature as agrees with the ninth and tenth Articles;—such teaching about justification as agrees with the Eleventh Article and the Homily of salvation;—such teaching about baptism and regeneration as does not ignore the Seventeenth Article, and does not make the Homily for Whit-Sunday contradict the baptismal service;—and such teaching about the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments as does not go beyond the Nineteenth, Twenty-third, and Twenty-fifth Articles. I mean such doctrine as may be found in the sermons of Bishop Latimer and Bishop Jewell, at the time of the Reformation,—and in the sermons of Archbishops Usher and Leighton, one hundred years afterwards,—and in the works of Romaine, Scott, Cecil, and Venn in the last century. Plain, outspoken instruction,—of which the main subjects are man’s sin, Christ’s full salvation, justification by faith, regeneration by the Spirit, the necessity of sanctification, the sufficiency of Scripture, Christ the only Mediator and High Priest, faith the mean which joins the soul to Him,—this is the kind of instruction I call Evangelical teaching.*

This is the kind of doctrine which formed the basis on which the Church of England was originally founded, at the time of the Reformation.

* I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I do not for a moment say that none but Evangelical ministers hold sound views about the great doctrines referred to in this passage. On the contrary, I believe that thousands of clergymen, who are not reckoned Evangelical, would never think of formally denying any one of them. I feel comfort in the belief that there are hundreds of my brethren in the ministry who hold the Head, Jesus Christ, as truly as I do myself, though in Church matters we are entirely disagreed. But I am obliged to say that such men appear to me to spoil all their ministry by mingling up with much that is good, vague and unsound statements about *the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments*. They unwittingly alter the proportions of the Gospel prescription by such statements, and so spoil the whole medicine. And hence their teaching becomes not evangelical teaching.

Whether men like it or not, it is an acknowledged fact, that the first five Archbishops of Canterbury—Cranmer, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, and Abbott—were decidedly Calvinistic in sentiment, and discouraged all kind of teaching which was opposed to the Calvinistic school. As to such men as Jewell, Hooper, Latimer, Becon, Rogers, and Bradford, who were all leaders of the Church of the Reformation, let any honest man read their works, and he will soon discover the tenor of their opinions. Could any one of them be raised at this moment, and tell us whether the Church of England is most faithfully represented at St. George's, Bloomsbury, or at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Pimlico, I have not the smallest doubt what his opinion would be.

This is the kind of doctrine which I firmly believe the Church of England intended its ministers to preach. It meant to exclude no man so long as he preached justification by faith, salvation by grace, and the absolute necessity of the work of the Spirit. Davenant and Beveridge, Hopkins and Andrews, Fletcher and Toplady, all were admissible within its limits. But to say that men were intended to be its ministers who taught justification by the sacraments, and a long train of Romish doctrines, is to say far more than I am able to believe.

This is the kind of doctrine which revived our Church at the end of the last century. Speaking after the manner of men, we owe the very existence of our Church to the preaching and writings of such men as Romaine, Venn, Cecil, Newton, Scott, Berridge, Grimshaw, Hervey, Toplady, Walker, and their companions. They were the men who alone kept our Church from falling. They were the salt which preserved it from utter corruption. Without them, I am firmly persuaded, in spite of antiquity, learning, endowments, and dignities, the Church of England would have perished and passed away.

It is the want of this Evangelical teaching which keeps out of the Church of England a vast number of the people who go to dissenting chapels. My own observation leads me to the conclusion that multitudes have left the Church for the Chapel for one simple reason,—the *want of spiritual food*. It is not to episcopacy, nor liturgy, nor surplice, nor forms, that they object. They object to the absence of Evangelical teaching.

It is the presence of this Evangelical teaching which gives strength to the Church of England, wherever it is really strong. The bishops or clergy who are most thoroughly Evangelical, are precisely those who have the most real power and influence at the present day. The dioceses in which there is most Evangelical teaching, are precisely the dioceses where the Church is most truly beloved and most vigorously supported. The cities and towns in which there are most Evangelical clergymen, are precisely those in which the Church of England stands most firm.

This is the kind of teaching which alone has power over the middle and lower classes in England, and will draw them together like a magnet, when neglect has driven them out of our pale. There is an honest common-sense about them, which tells them that neither Semi-Romanism, nor mere morality will meet the wants of their consciences, nor feed their souls. You may gather a congregation of the fashionable classes, by a well-conducted round of forms, and a mere sacramental and sensuous kind of Christianity. But, as a general rule, nothing seems to lay hold on the hearts of our middle and lower orders but downright Evangelical teaching.

This, then, I believe, is the head and front of all our wants,—“More Evangelical teaching.” Give me only this, and I see nothing in the position of the Church of England that would make me afraid. Without this I have little hope for the future. You may build churches and multiply ministers, and see no good done. Without this the five millions of Sabbath-breakers will never be reclaimed by the Church of England. Without this our parish churches will never be filled. Without this the Spirit of God will grant no blessing, and God’s work will stand still.

2. We want, in the next place, *a greater reverence for the Word of God*. It may seem a strange thing that I should mention this, but I am sure there is a cause. I want to see among us a greater willingness to use the Bible as the judge of every controversy, and the arbiter of every question in religion. There is far too much readiness among some to turn to formularies and ask, “What says the Prayer Book;” when the first question ought always to be, “What says the Bible?” There is far too much readiness in others to construct systems of their own about God’s mercy and God’s purposes, instead of settling every hard question by plain texts.

Are we the Church of the Sixth Article, or are we not? Do we really believe that “Holy Scripture containeth all things needful to salvation, and that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed?” If this be so, why do we not boldly maintain that a decided line must be drawn between things ordained by man, and things revealed by God? If this be so, why do we not resist to the uttermost the attempts so often made to raise to the level of divine authority, opinions and practices for which not a text of Scripture can be shown? Oh! for a more rigid adherence to the good old test, “To the law and to the testimony.”

I must plainly say I want to see the Bible lifted higher than it is now in the Church of England. I want to see it more read, more studied, more thoroughly known both by the clergy and laity. Too many, I am firmly persuaded, are most imperfectly acquainted with it. There are few religious controversies in the last fifty years which might not have been disposed of in a day by twelve honest men prohibited from looking into any book but the

Bible. But unhappily the principle of the Sixth Article is not carried out as it ought to be. Hence the Spirit of God is grieved,—five millions of people remain irreligious, and God's work stands still.

3. We want, in the next place, *a higher standard of sanctification among all who profess to love Evangelical truth in the Church of England*. I do not for a moment concede that, as a body, they are destitute of practical godliness. I believe that in real, simple, unaffected piety, they will bear comparison with any party or denomination in the world. But, after all, this is not enough. There is room for much improvement. I doubt whether, as a body, they have not fallen below the mark at which believers should aim. Profession of decided religion is far more common than it was fifty years ago. But it may well be questioned whether the stream has not lost in depth far more than it has gained in width. We should do well to consider whether a great amount of worldliness has not insensibly crept in among us. Are Evangelical ministers sufficiently careful to be the ministers of Christ in every place, society, and company, as well as in Church? I fear not. Are the members of Evangelical congregations as zealous of good works as becomes their principles? I fear not. In dress, in amusements, in entertainments, in the education of children, in the style of our living, in the books we read, in the rate of our giving money to Christ's cause, in our employment of leisure time,—in all these things I fear that much inconsistency may be detected in many quarters. But these are the very things which the ungodly and the Sabbath breaker observe and have in remembrance. These are the things which destroy our influence, and check the progress of Christ's truth. The Spirit of God is grieved, and God's work stands still.

4. There is wanted, in the next place, *a greater confidence in evangelical truth among those who profess to hold it*. We ought to make it plain to all men that we are thoroughly convinced that the Evangelical system of Christian doctrine is God's pure truth, and that no other system is. There ought to be nothing wavering, faltering, and hesitating in our adhesion to this system, as the only system calculated to save souls. We ought to be bold, unflinching, and uncompromising in our confession of it. But unhappily, there is such a timid, morbid fear of party-spirit in many men's minds, that they hardly dare to say of any opinion, "It is false!" Their witness is borne in so feeble and hesitating a manner, that a man might almost doubt whether they believe what they say. The men who turned the world upside down 1800 years ago were of another order. They said, "We know that we are of God, and that the whole world lieth in wickedness."

I grieve to feel obliged to write these things, but I am sure there is a cause. No man can observe the conduct of the Evangelical body, and not be struck with the timidity and hesitation of its members at any critical period. Yet why should we be ashamed of our principles? Why should we shrink

from avowing them? Where, in all the world, has any lasting spiritual good been done by any religion except that of the Evangelical system? What Tinnevely, what Sierra Leone, what New Zealand, can the advocates of Tractarianism or Germanism point to as the result of their teaching? What can they show which will bear comparison with the work of the London City Mission? What alleys in Whitechapel, or St. Giles', or Spitalfields have ever been purified and Christianized excepting by Evangelical teaching? Verily we have no excuse for our timidity.

Let us be more bold and decided. We forget that the boldest and most confident witness is generally the one whose evidence carries most weight. Multitudes, I suspect, do not believe that Evangelical men are really in earnest. Hence the Spirit of God is grieved, and God's work stands still.

5. In the next place, *we want amongst all of us a clearer understanding of the great object of the Gospel,—that is, to save souls.* Too many of us are apt to content ourselves with the mere external effects of the ordinances of the church. We are too ready to believe that all must be going on well if the church is filled, the Lord's table well attended, and the schools full of children. Our system flourishes. Our party increases. Our adherents are numerous. What lack we yet? We forget that all this is only outside work. It is matter for thankfulness so far as it goes, but is not everything. It is all nothing, we ought to remember, if souls are not born again, and names not written in the Lamb's book of life. Oh! that all Evangelical ministers may increasingly remember that popularity is worth nothing if souls are not saved, and that crowded churches are but whitened sepulchres if hearts are not touched and sinners brought to Christ! Oh! that we may all realize more and more that no Church is in a flourishing condition which does not promote the conversion and salvation of souls! Alas! it is far too much forgotten. Success is often measured by the size of a congregation, and not by the spiritual work going on in it. Respect is had to the quantity of worshippers, while the quality is unheeded, and the actual presence of the Holy Ghost lightly esteemed. Hence the Spirit is grieved, and God's work stands still.*

6. In the next place, *we want, amongst Evangelical ministers, greater diligence about preaching,* I am sorry to say that it is my deliberate opinion, that very few of us give sufficient attention to the preparation of our sermons. I fear that too many are apt to spend their whole time in their schools, or in visiting their people, or in attending their sick, or in working their parochial machinery, and so leave themselves no time for getting ready their pulpit work. I deeply regret this. It is a great mistake. No pasto-

* I doubt much whether private personal communication with persons who are really anxious about their souls, is as much sought after by Evangelical Ministers as it ought to be.

ral labour will ever compensate for inadequate pulpit preparation. A ministers sermons should be incomparably the first thing in his thoughts. He is not ordained to be a schoolmaster, a relieving officer, or a doctor, but to preach the Word; and if he neglects his sermons under the excuse of other work, he has no right to expect God's blessing. What costs nothing is generally worth nothing.

I offer a few enquiries on this matter to my brethren in the ministry, which I humbly submit to their attention. I do it with a deep recollection of my own deficiencies. I desire to take my stand by their side. But I am sure that they are enquiries which are much needed.

Is our preaching what it ought to be in point of *subject*? Too often I fear not. We insensibly get into a narrow circle of subjects, and work round and round upon them like a horse in a mill. We leave an immense proportion of the field of Scripture utterly untilled.—The person of Christ, for example, is seldom dwelt upon as it ought to be.

Is our preaching what it ought to be in point of *matter*? Too often I fear not. We do not remember our Lord's advice, to bring forth "things new as well as old." We are always repeating our old thoughts, and our congregations find it out to their cost.—The plain truth is that most of us do not read enough, and hence our stock soon comes to the bottom.

Is our preaching what it ought to be in point of *style*? Too often I fear not. We are neither plain enough, nor direct enough, nor bold enough, nor discriminating enough. Our sermons are too like essays, flat, pointless, tame, and wearying,—unawakening to sinners, and unedifying to saints,—blunt swords, and headless arrows. Do we address either the unconverted or the converted as faithfully as we ought? I doubt it.

I write these things in sorrow. I only fear there is too much occasion for them. One thing at any rate is certain, and that is, that preaching does not produce the effect it did in days gone by. I am not surprised myself that it should be so. I believe that one great reason is, that Evangelical sermons are, in matter and style, too often very inferior to what they might be. They are neither studied before, nor prayed about at any time, as much as they ought to be.

I know that the common answer to all I have been saying is generally this, that the spread of knowledge has made preaching comparatively of less importance than it was. From this opinion I entirely dissent. I believe, on the contrary, that education has made men far better judges, and far less likely to be satisfied with a weak, ill-digested sermon, than they were fifty years ago. The shrewd men of the world in this day complain that the pulpit of the Church of England is, in point of intellect, behind the times. I am sadly afraid that they have only too much reason for saying so. I fear that,

as a body, Evangelical ministers are apt to neglect the preparation of their sermons. Hence the Spirit is grieved, and God's work stands still.*

7. In the next place, *we want amongst us a great increase of systematic knowledge of Christianity*. It is matter for deep regret, that few young people in the Church of England, whether rich or poor, are ever made acquainted with the Articles of their own Church. A partial acquaintance with the Catechism and Prayer Book, in nineteen cases out of twenty, makes up the whole substance of their system of divinity. This is a subject of great importance. To the neglect of this systematic training may be traced a vast proportion of the loose and indefinite notions about religion which so widely prevail among our people. For my own part I should like to see the thirty-nine Articles, with Scripture proofs, forming a regular part of the instruction in every school connected with the Church of England. False doctrine would make little way with a population trained in this manner. We have thousands of soldiers enrolled in our ranks, but we do not train them in the use of their weapons. We give them the sword of the Spirit, but do not show them how to handle it. Hence the Spirit is grieved, and God's work stands still.

8. In the next place, we want *an increased willingness among the laymembers of the Church of England to take an active interest in their Church's affairs*. This is a point of great importance. I desire to call the reader's special attention to it.

I regard the common opinion that the clergy alone are "the church," as one of the most mischievous vulgar errors that has ever afflicted this country. Multitudes of people seem to suppose that ministers alone have the right to judge decidedly in religious matters, and that laymen ought to submit to their judgment. They seem to fancy that the voice of "the clergy" is the voice of "the church." They appear to give the clergy a monopoly of thinking in all spiritual things, and to regard the laity as a mass of cyphers.

It is high time that this mischievous error should be exploded. It is utterly opposed to the first principles of a Protestant and Bible-reading church. It is an opinion for which we shall find no authority in the Scrip-

* I must in fairness concede that there are probably no Protestant ministers on earth so badly trained for the work of preaching, as the clergy of the Church of England. The great majority of us were never trained at all! We are sent forth to do the most difficult work in the world, to address large bodies of men in a popular style, about the most important of all subjects, the salvation of their souls. But we are never taught how to do it. We receive no instruction about the composition of a sermon. We get no hints about style, manner, elocution, and the like points, on which a university degree is no help at all. Our sermons must necessarily be nothing better at first than experiments. The suppression of the meetings called "Prophesyings" by Queen Elizabeth, was one of the greatest mistakes that an English Sovereign ever committed. Archbishop Grindal's letter to the Queen upon the occasion deserves an attentive perusal.

tures. Not least it is an opinion calculated to place both clergy and laity in a wrong position. It exalts the clergy too high. It places the laity too low. It is likely to engender official pride in the clergyman, and indolence in the layman.

I call on the lay-members of the Church of England to awake to a sense of their duty and responsibility. I entreat them to remember that they are “the church” as much as the clergy. I exhort them to recollect that they are intended to “prove all things,”—“to try the spirits,”—and “to contend earnestly for the faith,” quite as much as the ordained ministers. I urge on them to insist that their voice shall be heard in every movement affecting the doctrine, discipline, or formularies of our Church, and to let nothing be done without their counsel. I urge them to keep watch over the doctrine preached by the clergy, and never to tolerate any teaching which is contrary to the Bible. I charge them to remember that Protestant truth is their inheritance, and belongs to them as much as to the clergy; and to see to it that they hand it down to the next generation unimpaired.

I am sorry to say that many lay-members of the Church of England are far more apathetic about the condition of their church than they ought to be. They complain and find fault with many things that are now going on—and no wonder. They have good reason. But do they do their part in trying to remove the evils of which they complain? Have they used all means? Have they employed every weapon within their reach? Do they appeal to the Bishops, the Courts of Law, and the Houses of Parliament as much as they might? Do they always speak out, like a Bible-reading people, when truth is in jeopardy, and say, “This shall not be?” I fear these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered. The evangelical clergyman is too often left to fight for truth alone. The layman too often forgets that he is as much a part of the church as the clergyman, and as deeply interested in the maintenance of the pure Gospel. Hence the Spirit of God is grieved, and God’s work stands still.

9. In the next place, *we want amongst us a greater jealousy about false doctrine, and a more determined effort to get rid of it.* This may sound fierce and controversial to some ears, but I am satisfied that Scripture and the Church of England alike demand this of us. There is far too little sense of the dishonour which false doctrine does to the Gospel. The mind of him who said, “If any preach any other doctrine than that we have preached, let him be accursed,” is rarely found amongst us. The example of him “who withstood Peter to the face,” is seldom followed. There is too often a sickly, sentimental fear of hurting people’s feelings. There is too often an unhealthy dread of personality. There is too much false charity, and love of peace. Oh! that men would try to realize that peace purchased at the ex-

pense of truth is worth nothing, and the quiet of a church kept quiet by tolerating heresy, is the quiet of death.

Peace is an excellent thing, no doubt, and every effort should be made to preserve it. But even gold may be bought too dear, and “peace at any price” is sometimes dearly purchased both by churches and nations. Oh! that men would remember that there may be times when peace is nothing less than treachery, and when truth must be fought for, or lost for ever! Oh! that they would recollect that it was the Prince of Peace Himself who said, “Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.” (Matt. x. 34.) “Truth first, and peace afterwards,” should be our maxim.

Surely this is no time to cry, “Peace! peace!” when some of the most dangerous doctrines of the Church of Rome are taught and defended by men who call themselves clergymen of the Church of England! Alas! it is painful to observe the zeal and anxiety displayed in some quarters when the Church’s *pecuniary interests* are assailed, and then to observe the coldness and apathy shown when the Church’s *doctrines* are flatly contradicted. Would that we could see as much trouble taken to defend the altar, as there is to defend the gold which is about the altar! We are often calling on rich laymen to give money to build new churches. I declare I know not with what face we can do it, unless we can give them some better guarantee that these churches will not be held by ministers teaching transubstantiation, or auricular confession, or some other Romish doctrine, than we can at this time.

Controversy, no doubt, is a painful thing, but circumstances may make it a positive duty. Prosecutions for false doctrine are sadly undesirable, but there are times when they are imperatively needed. So long as we allow spiritual Achans to continue in our camp, it is vain to expect God’s blessing on our Church. The Spirit of God is grieved, and God’s work must stand still.

10. We want, in the next place, *a greater spirit of union among all who love Evangelical truth in the Church of England*. It is a shame and disgrace that there should be so little united action amongst men who in the main are so thoroughly agreed. Our opponents work together as one body. They never throw away a chance in carrying out their objects. They never lose an opportunity of advancing men who will promote their cause. We, on the contrary, are like a rope of sand. We seldom meet together in large numbers to take counsel, and strengthen one another’s hands. When we do meet, the excessive timidity of some, and the excessive crotchettiness of others, prevent anything being done. One class of excellent men will not allow a finger to be raised, lest by any chance the heads of the church should be offended. Another class of men, no less excellent, will never consent to have

anything done, unless every jot and tittle, and pin, and cord of the plan proposed is arranged in their own way. All this is very sad. It ought not so to be.

I am sure there never was a period when union among Evangelical members of the Church of England was so much needed. If any man thinks that our cause is in no great danger, I can only marvel at his blindness. I am thoroughly persuaded that there is a settled determination, in some quarters, to cast out of the church Evangelical opinions, and to risk the destruction of the Establishment rather than fail of success. The Gorham case was only the beginning of the campaign. The effort to obtain synodical action, and to bring about a union with the Scotch Episcopal Church, are all moves in the same direction. It is amazing to me that many Evangelical people cannot see the storm which is quietly gathering. Only let a few leading Bishops be removed by death, and their places be filled by Anti-Evangelical men,—only put the reins of civil government in Tractarian hands,—and then we may see things that will take many by surprise. Unless Evangelical men can agree to work together more than they do now, they will awake some morning and find the Church of England turned upside down, and themselves turned out.

One thing is very clear, and that is, that division is a great cause of our weakness. A house divided against itself cannot stand. An army which is disunited must always be liable to be conquered in detail. And—worst of all—our disunion specially grieves the Spirit of God. Hence it is that evil abounds, and God's work stands still.*

11. In the next place, *there is wanted among Evangelical members of the Church of England a greater readiness to cooperate with all who hold Scriptural truth, of every denomination.* Dissent is, on many accounts, a thing to be deeply deplored. But we should do well to remember that the greater part of it is the result of our own Church's neglect, and the blame of it in great measure lies at our own door. We should do well to remember also, that in many cases where the church did nothing, Dissenters have done great good, and been the means of saving many souls. What ever we may think, it is certain we shall never make dissent decrease by coldness and opposition. The wisest and most scriptural course is to work with Dissenters whenever we can. Between ourselves and Rome there is an im-

* I cannot help suggesting to my brethren in the ministry, never to forget the importance of clerical meetings. I urge them to form them where not already formed, and to attend them regularly when formed. Only let them remember that to be really profitable, *they must be composed of men of one mind.* When this is not the case, there can be nothing but constant constraint, or constant controversy, or constant triviality. If all the Evangelical clergy in each county would arrange also to meet together once every year, it would be found most beneficial.

mense gulf. Between ourselves and Protestant Dissent there is but a thin partition wall. Away with the idea that we occupy a middle position between the two! Let us never forget that there is a wide field of common ground between ourselves and Dissenters, on which we ought never to shrink from meeting them. A common Bible, a common Protestantism, an entire agreement as to all the leading articles of the Christian faith, ought to draw us and them together. In the days of James II. a sense of common danger brought together Nonconformists and Episcopalians. Oh! that the same spirit might rise again! Oh! that we may be more ready to say with the apostle, "Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

12. In the next place, *we want a greater readiness in the leaders of the Church of England to meet the circumstances of the times.* We are surrounded on every side by multitudes who never attend our services, and are growing up in utter ignorance of Christianity.—What is to be done to reclaim them? It is useless, I believe, to expect that these neglected masses can be brought at once to appreciate the services of a Church which they have never been taught to value. No! we must go to work in another way. We must adopt measures of a far more aggressive kind than any hitherto tried.

Does any one ask what I mean by more aggressive measures? I will tell him at once.

For one thing, I should like to see a far more systematic attempt to carry out *open air preaching* in densely populated neighbourhoods. I do not for a moment regard this as a substitute for regular services. But at a time like this, every effort must be made to reclaim those who are now like sheep without a shepherd. If they will not come to us we must go after them. We must go out into the streets, highways, and hedges, and "compel them to come in."

For another thing, I long to see the day when in every large town-parish a clergyman shall have license to hold *short religious services*, for those who will not come to church, and go nowhere at all. It is perfectly absurd to expect people who are almost as ignorant as heathen, to rise at once to a sense of the value of our full service. It would be as absurd to expect a heathen to value a liturgy the day that a missionary first visited him. No! we ought to teach people as they are able to bear, and without power to hold short services, when circumstances demand it, we shall never do this.

For another thing, I long to see the day when *young men who want to work for Christ* in connection with the Church of England, shall be enabled to do so. There are hundreds of young men who have grace and zeal, but not education sufficient to qualify them for the ministry. Let such have plenty of evangelistic work cut out for them, and room for all their energies

to be put forth on our side. I want to see numbers of our lay brethren of the middle classes recognized and licensed as lay agents. They have unhappily too often been frowned at by the clergy of the Establishment, until they have been regularly driven into dissent. If clergymen had more lay-helpers, their last excuse for neglecting the preparation of their sermons would be cut from beneath their feet.

These are the kind of steps which ought to be taken if we would meet the times. IF ANY ACT OF PARLIAMENT STANDS IN THE WAY OF SUCH MEASURES AS THOSE I HAVE POINTED AT, THE SOONER IT IS REPEALED THE BETTER. Our forefathers really seem to have legislated sometimes as if they were afraid of too much good being done, and were acting in league with our enemies! Surely it is high time to use reason and common sense in ecclesiastical matters. The Pope, the infidel, the devil, and the world are coming in on us like a flood. This is no time to fetter and tie up the Church's limbs. This is no time for keeping up antiquated and needless restrictions. Give us full liberty, and the work to be done is hard enough. To pull down Satan's work and pluck brands from the burning is no easy matter. But what chance have we when our hands are tied, and every step is met by penalties and canons?

Think for a moment of the unreasonable and absurd position in which we stand. The Romanist, the Infidel, and the Mormonite may walk over the land, and go to work in any way they please. The clergyman of the Church of England, on the other hand, is fettered and hampered on every side. Dissenters of every description may build chapels all over London, if they can only get money and land. The rich layman who wants to build a self-supporting church, and place in it an Evangelical minister, cannot do it without innumerable difficulties, and often not at all. The zealous clergyman who sees thousands round him no better than heathens, is pulled back at every step by Acts of Parliament, if he desires to reclaim them. Surely in very fairness this ought to be altered. The Guards themselves would do but little if they had to fight an enemy with the weapons used at Agincourt and Cressy. Oh! that some bold man in high places would come forward and cry aloud, "Loose the bands from the Church's limbs, and let her have room to show her strength. It was a fine saying of Dr. Chalmers, when one told him that something he was going to do "was beneath his dignity," "Sir! if we don't mind, we may die of dignity." I sometimes fear that the Church of England may come to this end. Its clergy were let alone long enough, when they delighted in hunting, shooting, gambling, and dancing. Surely

the time is come, when they may be let alone and not interfered with, when they desire to evangelize their parishes, and save souls.*

13. In the next place, *we want a general increase of faithfulness in the matter of giving testimonials to young men seeking ordination.* This is a subject of immense importance. It does not receive the attention it deserves.

The evils which arise from an unconverted ministry, are really past calculation. How can that man do good to souls who never felt the value of his own soul? How can he lead to Christ who never felt his own sins, or his need of a Saviour? Yet it is vain to deny that scores of unconverted ministers are added every year to the ranks of the Church of England. Scores of young men take orders who are utterly unfit for the care of souls. They might make excellent soldiers, or sailors, or lawyers or merchants. But as to spiritual things, they know nothing about them. This is an immense evil.

Now where does the blame lie? It cannot be laid on the Bishops. It is impossible for them to read hearts. They must be guided, in great measure, by written testimony. *It lies mainly on those who give the testimonials.* This is the point I want to have remembered. Oh! that all would recollect that he who wilfully assists an unconverted man to become a minister, commits a great sin! It is no kindness to the Church. It gives the Church a workman who is not fit to do the Church's work. It is not kindness to the individual who seeks ordination. It is assisting to put him in an office for which he is utterly unsuited, and in which he cannot be happy. But alas! how often it is done! Oh! for more honesty and faithfulness in this matter! Truth is too often forgotten. Good nature makes men do things they never ought to do. Hence the Spirit is grieved, and God's work stands still.

14. In the last place, *there is wanted a new theological college.* It is not too much to say that there is not at the present time a single theological college in England to which a young man can be recommended to go, without some anxiety as to the teaching he will receive.

There is no Institution on which we can depend, that it will only send forth unmistakeable Evangelical men,—such men as will work with Evangelical ministers, and with none else,—such men as hold thoroughly Evangelical views about the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, and teach as well as hold them. There is no Institution of which we can say, “it is not merely a Church of England College, but it is also a downright Protestant and Evangelical College.” I consider this to be one of the gloomiest points in the position of the Church of England. The sources from which the ministry is supplied are not trustworthy. If we want a Protestant and Evan-

* I must frankly say, that I see little chance of the neglected population in our town parishes being reclaimed and Christianized by the Church of England, unless the Act of uniformity and the Conventicle Acts are either largely modified, or deliberately allowed to become a dead letter.

gelical institution for training a young man as a schoolmaster, we have Cheltenham and Highbury. But if we want to find a Protestant and Evangelical institution to train a young man for ordination, there is none to be found. I consider one of the greatest wants of the day is a new theological college in some central position, for preparing young men for the ministry at a moderate expense, on thoroughly Protestant and Evangelical principles. I earnestly hope the day may come when such a college may be called into existence. We profess to believe that none but the Holy Ghost can make a real minister of the Gospel. Bishops may confer orders, and make a clergyman. But nothing short of the Spirit's power can make a real man of God. We require every candidate for orders to profess that he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take on him the office of the ministry. And we are right in doing so. But have we remembered all this time that the Spirit loves to work by means? And do we really believe that our existing colleges, and means of theological training, are entirely such as the Holy Ghost delights to bless? I fear this is much overlooked. Hence the Spirit is grieved, and God's work stands still.*

Such are the remedies I suggest for some of the evils which beset our church. To many, I have no doubt, they will be utterly unsatisfactory. They aim at far higher and grander objects than any I have mentioned. Their ambitious minds are content with nothing short of an entire re-construction of our ecclesiastical fabric, and a root and branch alteration of everything that is now in existence. I have no sympathy with them. I am satisfied they are mistaken in their expectations.

I am far from denying that there are many things in the Church of England which are gross abuses, and call loudly for reform. But I am entirely decided in my opinion that every one of these abuses might be reformed, and the church be in as thoroughly dangerous a position as it is now. The reform of the cathedral bodies,—the equalization of incomes,—the building of churches,—the subdivision of parishes,—the multiplication of ministers,—all these things would not heal the wounds of the Church of England. You may dress the sick man. You may deck his room with flowers. You may supply him with careful nurses. You may provide for him the choicest food. But all this time, be it remembered, you have not cast out his disease. You have not given him health and strength.

I have no desire to check those who are labouring to amend the outward fabric of the Church of England. Whatever reasonable reforms can be effected by the intervention of Parliament, by all means let them be carried

* I trust, the friends of Evangelical truth will not forget the opportunity afforded them by the permission to open new Halls at Oxford, under the new Oxford University Act. Why should we not have a "Latimer Hall?"

out. All I maintain is that within and not without is the seat of our principal disease, and within alone, and not without, can our principal remedy be applied. I am thankful for every help that can be given to the Church by its friends in the house of Commons. But I must hold to my opinion nevertheless, that *our worst evils are beyond their reach*.

It cannot be too often and too strongly asserted that the remedies we need are *not mechanical but spiritual*. It is not the *fabric* of the Church of England which needs medicine one half so much as the *heart*. More Evangelical teaching! More Evangelical teaching! More Evangelical teaching! This is the grand want of the Church. Give us this, and all other evils will sooner or later be cast out. Withhold this, and not all the reforms and changes in the world will keep the Church alive.

I now conclude by inviting all who agree with me in the views which I have endeavoured to set forth, both of our dangers and of our wants, to join me in carrying into effect the three following resolutions.

1. Let us resolve *to make special prayer morning and night every day that we live, for a more abundant outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the Church of England*.

We must never forget that the Holy Spirit alone is the Author of spiritual success, and the spring of spiritual life in a church. He alone can open the eyes of ministers who are now blind to their responsibilities. He alone can raise up new preachers of the Gospel to fill the place of those who are removed by death. He alone can bless sermons when preached, and make them life-giving to souls. Where He is there will be health and vigour. Without Him there can be nothing but dullness, formality, and death. Men really talk sometimes as if everything depended on churches, school-rooms, societies, systems, parochial districts, and the like. We should do well to remember that St. Paul had no helps of this kind, and yet he turned the world upside down. Oh! let us pray more for the Holy Ghost!

There is every encouragement to put up this prayer for the Church of England. The Lord has done great things for us in the last hundred years. He has multiplied our evangelical ministers a hundred fold. He has sent light into hundreds of parishes which were once dark as midnight. He has called into being many blessed institutions for spreading the Gospel at home and abroad. For all this we ought to be thankful. There is far more blue sky in our position than there was in the days of good old William Romaine. The prospects of our church were gloomy indeed when the Rector of St Ann's, Blackfriars, sent forth his "Earnest invitation to the friends of the Established Church, to join in setting apart one hour every week for prayer and supplication." This was in the year 1756. Surely we have seen

an answer to their prayers. Let us not be behind them in diligence. Let us walk in their steps. Let us unite in praying for the Holy Ghost.

I call on all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in the Church of England, into whose hands these pages may fall, to join in carrying into effect the suggestions I have made. I warn them that the main wants of our church are wants which the Spirit of God alone can supply. Queen, Lords, and Commons cannot heal us. Acts of Parliament cannot deliver us from our danger. The Spirit alone can raise up evangelical teaching. The Spirit alone can bless that teaching when we have it. But our God is a God that hears prayer, and loves to be entreated. A great responsibility is laid on the believing laity and clergy of the Church of England in this matter. May they all bear it in mind! May we all unite in praying for a more abundant outpouring of the Holy Ghost!

2. Let us resolve in the second place, to *aim at a spirit of patient continuance in well doing*, as *Evangelical members of the Church of England*.

There are hard things to be borne, I know, in taking up this position. We must be content to hear our views often misrepresented and our conduct misinterpreted. Some will openly persecute us, whenever they can. Others will privately warn people against us, as firebrands, enthusiasts, puritans, and dangerous men. Others will coldly stand aloof, and say that “we mean well, but are sadly extreme.” Let none of these things move us. Let us work on patiently. Let us endeavour to commend our views by meekness, by charity, by self-denial, by kindness, by long-suffering, by love unfeigned. But let nothing tempt us to draw back and forsake our posts.

Let us work on patiently, for we have no reason to be ashamed. Are others Churchmen? So are we. In the matter of true and real attachment to the Church of England, we need not give place by subjection to those who are called High Churchmen, for a moment. Have they signed the thirty-nine Articles *in good faith*? So have we. Have they declared their assent to the liturgy? So have we. Have they promised obedience to the Bishops in all lawful things? So have we. Do they honour the sacraments? So do we. Do they love the prayer-book? So do we. Do they labour for the best interests of the Church of England? So do we. Yes! indeed! We may well defy them to name any forty High Churchmen, who have done as much to promote the wellbeing and prosperity of the Church of England, as those four Evangelical clergymen, Simeon, Bickersteth, Stowell, and M’Neile.

Let us work on patiently. Let neither sneers, nor obloquy, nor persecution tempt us to forsake our posts. Let us not leave our high position, so long as we have truth on our side. Let us stand by our people, and our people will stand by us. Let continuance in well-doing be our motto and our rule.

3. Let us resolve, in the last place, *to devote the whole of our religious influence, whether it be great or small, to the advancement of nothing but pure Evangelical religion.*

It will cost us a struggle to carry out this resolution. It will entail on us the charge of being party-spirited, narrowminded, exclusive, and the like. Let us not heed such charges. If we really do believe that the only religion calculated to do good is that contained in the Evangelical system, let us throw ourselves unreservedly into the cause of that system, and labour unceasingly to promote its spread.

Let us subscribe to no religious societies which are not thoroughly Evangelical,—support no religious movement which is not distinctly Evangelical,—give away no tracts which are not Evangelical,—appoint no ministers, if we have a voice in any appointment, excepting those who are Evangelical,—countenance no ministry which is not unmistakeably Evangelical. Let the Gospel, the whole Gospel, and nothing but the Gospel, be our watchword,—in the pulpit, in the press, in the school, in the committee room, and on the platform.

Let us stir up all around us who profess to love the truth, to adopt the same line of action. Let us urge on every one the importance of decision. Let us try to awaken the sleeping,—to encourage the timid,—to bring over the wavering,—to disarm the prejudiced,—to inform the ignorant. Let us not be afraid to tell men that we believe our system is the true one, and that we will stand by it.

Thus acting, by God's help, we should in a few years see much good done. No doubt we should anger the enemies of truth. Beyond question we should be called very party-spirited. Very likely we should frighten many half-hearted people. But I firmly believe we should rally round us a large proportion of the lower orders and middle classes, and not a few of those in the upper ranks. I am quite sure we should take the surest course to strengthen the hands of our beloved old church. And, best of all, I am thoroughly persuaded God Himself would be with us.

W. HUNT, PRINTER, IPSWICH.