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III.

HOW FAR MAY CHURCHMEN DIFFER?

THE subject which lies before us has always been one of vast importance in the Church of England. Every well-informed student of history knows that it is a “burning question,” which for three centuries has been the fruitful parent of strifes and divisions. But though we are poor judges of our own time, I venture to think there never was a time since the Reformation when the subject required more serious attention than it does now. Whether we Churchmen like to confess it or not, the Anglican Church is in a somewhat critical state. Upon a right solution of the subject before us hinges the mighty question, “Can the Established Church of this country hold together? Shall we live or shall we die?”

I think the simplest way of handling the subject will be to examine, first of all, two views of it which are commonly held in this day—both, in my judgment, totally incorrect and mischievous—and both, I am sorry to say, extremely popular in some quarters. Against both I shall enter my protest, and give my reasons for protesting; and I shall then attempt to point out the right answer which, in my opinion, ought to be given to the question.

I. The first view of the subject which I shall protest against is that of extreme liberalism. This is the view of those who maintain that every kind of diversity in opinion, practice, and ritual ought to be tolerated in our pale, and that no clergyman ought to be interfered with, no matter what he thinks, teaches, or does. As it was in the days of the Judges, these men say, every one is to be allowed to “do what is right in his own eyes.”

This form of liberalism is represented by the position taken up by the ultra-Ritualists and the Romanizing party within our pale. What they are continually claiming is more liberty,—liberty to introduce one bit of Popery after another, liberty for the Mass, liberty for auricular confession, liberty for prayers for the dead, liberty for the doctrine of purgatory, liberty for Mary-worship, liberty for the most thorough sacerdotalism. He who opposes them is held up to public execration as a bitter, narrow-minded, bigoted persecutor. And most Englishmen, I am sorry to say, are so extremely kind and liberal when they see a great show of zeal, that a cry is soon raised, “Give the zealous, devout Ritualists liberty; they mean well: leave them alone.”

The other form of extreme liberalism is to be seen in the position taken up by the ultra-Broad Churchmen of this day. These men also, from their point of view, claim liberty as much as the ultra-Ritualists. But liberty for what? Why, liberty to ignore or disregard Articles, Creeds, and Confessions of Faith; liberty to deny the inspiration of Scripture, the atonement, the personality of the Holy Ghost, the reality of future punishment, the obligation of the Lord’s day. He that opposes them is sneered at as an ignorant, obsolete old fossil. And Englishmen, who dearly love to make an idol of cleverness, and liberalism so called, cry out again, “Let them alone: don’t discourage free thought, the clever fellow cannot be far wrong.”

Now my objections to all this morbid liberalism, which bids us tolerate every kind of opinion, lie in a nut-shell. It is utterly destructive of order in the
Church of England, and substitutes complete anarchy in its place. Every Scriptural Church must have a Creed and certain fixed principles, and by them its ministers must abide. The use of a Church is gone if its lay members are to be obliged to submit to every vagary which may enter a minister's mind. No doubt the English lay Churchman is a very patient and enduring creature, and, like Issachar, will crouch for a long time under burdens. But there is a limit to patience and toleration. If the principles of extreme liberalism are to prevail,—if the clergy are to be allowed to teach either Popery or Scepticism, and neither Bishops nor Courts of Law are ever to interfere,—if every diversity of opinion and practice is to be tolerated in our parish churches, and nothing is ever to be checked or stopped, however unscriptural and mischievous,—then I believe the Established Church will soon fall, and fall deservedly. The laity will leave her, and God will forsake her.

II. The other view of our subject which I shall protest against is that of extreme narrowness. This is the view of those who maintain that no diversity whatever of opinion, practice, or ritual ought to be tolerated within our pale, that even about the non-essentials of religion no liberty of judgment should be permitted, that a cast-iron uniformity about every jot and tittle of worship ought to be required, and that the slightest departure from one hard-and-fast line ought to be regarded with suspicion, if not visited with pains, penalties, and prosecutions.

This was the position taken up by Archbishop Whitgift, in the reign of our last Tudor sovereign, Queen Elizabeth. True toleration was unhappily not understood by men just emancipated from the bondage of Rome. The wretched attempts made at that time to compel uniformity, and to silence men like Travers Cartwright, the authors of the “Admonition,” and the “Martin Marprelate” tracts, I am bold to say, laid the first foundation of English dissent.

This, again, was the position taken up by that weak zealot, Archbishop Laud. He vainly endeavoured to stamp out what he ignorantly called “Calvinism,” and to silence all who were thoroughgoing Protestants. He reaped according as he sowed. He ruined the Church of England for a season, and brought himself and his king to the block.

This, again, was the position taken up by the Puritans of the Long Parliament in the Commonwealth times, when they came into power. Smarting under Laud’s tyranny, they retaliated by deposing the Bishops and prohibiting the use of the Liturgy, and cramming down every throat the “Solemn League and Covenant.” How true it is that “Oppression maketh a wise man mad”! The stupid intolerance of the Puritans produced its natural result. A violent reaction took place when Charles II. returned to the throne, and the Episcopal Church regained its old position. The disgraceful Act of Uniformity was passed; 2000 of the best ministers of the day were shamefully driven out of their livings, in violation of royal promises made at Breda; and the Church of England received a blow from her own hands which has injured her irretrievably.

This, finally, is the position which some Churchmen seem disposed to take up in the present day. This is a delicate point to handle, I know; but it is one which I shall not shrink from handling. It is a plain duty in these perilous times to throw aside reserve and to speak out. I say, then, that there is a growing disposition in some quarters to measure clergymen entirely by what they do or not do, think or not think, about the non-necessaries and non-essentials of re-
ligion. There is a generation of men who seem utterly unable to see any good in a clergyman, however blameless both in preaching and life, if he does not see eye to eye with themselves about externals. The man may preach the three R’s—ruin, redemption, and regeneration—as fully and faithfully as Latimer or Whitfield; yes, far better than his accusers preach themselves. He may be a most diligent, self-denying pastor, far more diligent than they are. It all goes for nothing, if certain other things are lacking! Does the man preach in a surplice? Does he have the Psalms chanted? Does he turn to the East in saying the Belief? Does he keep Saints’ days? If he does any of these things, all the preaching, working, and living go for nothing. He is an unsound man! He is not trustworthy! He is a compromiser! He is a trimmer! He is to be gibbeted in the press, and held up as a butt for slander and suspicion! He is hedging off towards Rome! He has the incipient marks of the Beast! In short, the narrowness of Whitgift, of Laud, and of the Commonwealth Puritans is not dead. It lives; and is to be seen among us in the present day.

Now, against this extreme narrowness I desire to protest as strongly as I do against extreme liberalism. I will never consent, on the one side, to tolerate all diversities of opinion and turn our Church into a Pantheon. But neither will I consent, on the other side, to tolerate no diversities at all, and to denounce every one as “unsound.” who does not agree with me about non-essentials In non-necessaries liberty is the great principle which I am determined to maintain. In things needful to salvation, I would have him “persuaded in his own mind.”

(a) Narrowness about non-essentials appears to me utterly unscriptural. I see no proof that government and worship in the early Churches were always one and the same. About meats offered to idols, St. Paul clearly allowed diversity of judgment. Read the 14th of Romans. “The kingdom of God,” he says, “is not meat and drink.” On another point he is content to close his argument with the gentle remark, “We have no such custom “(1 Cor. xi. 16).

(b) Narrowness about non-essentials appears to me eminently calculated to wound and crush tender consciences. To do this is a downright sin against Christ. A man may be very weak and silly and scrupulous in some matters, but he ought not on that account to be crushed, and pushed, and snubbed, and held up to scorn. “For meat destroy not the work of God” (Rom. xiv. 20). For wearing a surplice in the pulpit, do not dub a man a heretic. I declare I think better of a man who has a tender conscience in spite of all his mistakes, than I do of a violent, coarse partisan who has got no conscience at all.

(c) Narrowness about non-essentials is presumptuous. To speak positively about things which God has not thought fit to decide, and to lay down the law stringently about questions which the Scripture has left open, is as good as saying, “We are the men: knowledge shall die with us. We are infallible, and whoever differs from us must be wrong.” To say the least, this is not humility.

(d) Narrowness about non-essentials exhibits gross ignorance of human nature. It is utterly absurd to suppose that poor sinful creatures like Adam’s children will ever be entirely of one mind about anything which God has not clearly revealed to them. Diversities of judgment are precisely what common sense should lead us to expect in a fallen world, and to denounce them roughly is childish waste of time.

(e) Narrowness about non-essentials was certainly not approved by the first Protestant Reformers. When Hooper refused to wear the usual Episcopal dress,
and went to prison rather than give way, both Peter Martyr and Bucer told him he was wrong. When Calvin gave his judgment about the English Liturgy, he said that its defects were “tolerable,” that is, such as might be borne and were not worth quarrelling about.

(f) Narrowness about non-essentials shows forgetfulness of the lessons of our own Church history. What indeed has been the true cause of almost all the dissent, and strifes, and divisions, and secessions, and persecutions which have constantly plagued English Christianity for the last three centuries? What but the incessant and persistent effort to compel people to be of one mind about things which are not needful to salvation, and the exaltation of the minor parts of religion to the neglect of the weightier matters of the gospel?

(g) Finally, narrowness about non-essentials is one of the principal things at this moment which bring Evangelical Churchmanship into contempt. At Oxford and at Cambridge, on the Bench and at the Bar, in the Army and Navy, in the City and in Parliament, the thing which men dislike most in the Evangelical school is alleged illiberality about non-essentials. When we are zealous about great leading doctrines, they very likely do not approve it much, but they do not openly condemn it. But when they see us making a violent disturbance about things indifferent, they make no secret of their disgust. And I really do not wonder. We give occasion, and needlessly increase the offence of the cross.

I will say no more about this branch of my subject; but before I leave it I must say a few words to prevent slander, misconstruction, and misunderstanding. I think all changes, needless changes, in the ceremonies and conduct of public worship a very serious error; and if the man who introduces them loses the confidence of his people and drives away many of his congregation, I consider that he has no right to be surprised. He will find they regard his outward changes in matters of worship as symptoms of inward changes of opinion, and him accordingly. All needless changes are unwilling, mischievous, and create suspicion. It was when the Galatians changed their ways, and began to “observe days and months and times and years,” that St. Paul cried, “I am afraid of you” (Gal. iv. 11).

My only contention is this, that whatever our private opinion is on matters not necessary to salvation, we must not lightly condemn men who do not see them as we do. To brand clergymen as unsound and heretical, who have been always accustomed since their ordination to do things in public worship which do not do, because they do not agree with ourselves is contrary alike to Scripture, charity, and sense.

So much for extreme liberalism and extreme narrowness. Both states of mind are so painfully common that I make no apology for discussing them at full length, and trying to show that both are grossly erroneous, of mischievous tendency.

III. I shall next try to show what diversities of opinions, practice, and ritual cannot justly claim to be tolerable within the pale of the Church of England. I shall do this as briefly as possible.

I say, then, first and foremost, that nothing ought to be tolerated in the Church of England which contradicts the Bible, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Prayer-book. If we once allow men openly to contradict the Scriptures, and the authorized formularies to which they have publicly declared their assent, I
see nothing before us but chaos and confusion. If, for example, a clergyman
denies the inspiration of the Bible, or the doctrine of the Trinity, or the God-
head of Christ, or the atonement, or the personality of the Holy Ghost, or the
necessity of repentance and faith, and of holiness as the fruit of faith, or the
judgment to come,—if he teaches justification by works, Mariolatry, the sacri-
fice of the Mass, the necessity of auricular confession and priestly absolution,
the “opus operatum” view of the sacraments, and purgatory,—in any such
cases I hold that his parishioners cannot be justly and reasonably expected to
tolerate it. It is perfectly monstrous to say that they ought to be quiet for the
sake of peace, and to put up with it. Parishioners so aggrieved have a right to
bring the matter before the Bishop. The Bishop has a right to call the clergy-
man to account, and ought so to call him. If he persists and refuses to obey the
Bishop’s admonition, in spite of his oaths and declarations, the Bishop has a
right to remit the matter to an Ecclesiastical Court, or in some way to call in
the aid of the law. And to say, as some do, that all this is intolerance and per-
secution, is simply ridiculous, and a gross misapplication of language. The of-
fending clergyman in this instance transgresses the terms on which he holds
his position as an Anglican clergyman, and is guilty of a breach of contract.
He has broken his promise to abide by the Thirty-nine Articles. His conduct is
such as would not be tolerated in a civilian, or in the army or the navy, or the
legal or the medical profession. As an Englishman he has an undoubtedly
right to hold and teach what opinions he pleases; but as a clergyman he has cer-
tainly no right to contravene, contradict, or deny the doctrine of the Church of
England within the pale of the Establishment. To talk of persecution in such a
case is absurd! It is he who persecutes the Church of England, and not the
Church of England which persecutes him.

I say, furthermore, that no practice or ritual ought to be tolerated in the
Church of England which tends to reintroduce distinctive Romish doctrines
which the Church has formally repudiated in her formularies. If, for instance, a
clergyman chooses to wear a peculiar dress in administering the Lord’s Supper,
as if he were offering a material sacrifice, and teaches his people that he does
so because he is a sacrificing priest,—if he consecrates the elements with such
gestures and postures that he appears to ordinary minds to be doing a sacrifi-
cial action,—if he treats the consecrated elements with such exaggerated rever-
ence that he appears to believe there is an actual change in the elements, and
that Christ’s body and blood are locally present under the forms of bread and
wine,—in such a case I hold firmly that he exceeds the just and reasonable
limits of toleration in the pale of the Church of England. His actions express a
doctrine which has been distinctly, precisely, and conspicuously rejected by
the Church, and notably in the Thirty-first Article,—I mean the sacrifice of the
Mass. It is a doctrine which lies at the root of the whole system of the Church
of Rome. It is a doctrine which lies at the root of the whole system of the Church
of Rome. It is the doctrine which, above all others, our Reformers rejected,
and rather than submit to it, they died at the stake. It is a doctrine which cannot
be got out of the Prayer-book by any fair and impartial interpretation. The ac-
tions, gestures, and dress which express the doctrine (in spite of that unhappy
tangle, the Ornaments Rubric) have been for three centuries disused in our
Church, with such rare exceptions (in some obscure parishes) that they only
help to confirm the rule. I assert without hesitation, that, in a case like this, no
offending clergyman has any just right to complain if the laity refuse to toler-
ate his ways, if the Bishop admonishes him that he is wrong, and if he finally
comes under the censure of the law. To talk of all this as intolerance, I repeat, is childish and silly. Intolerance indeed! In a free country like this, a man has a perfect right to be a Roman Catholic if he pleases; but he has no right to be a Roman Catholic and at the same time to be a beneficed or licensed clergyman of the Church of England, and to receive her pay. Once admit the principle that it is legal to teach the sacrifice of the Mass in the Anglican Church, and there is nothing worth fighting for in our controversy with Rome. Once admit the Mass, and the sooner we go down on our knees to the Pope, confess our schism, beg his pardon, and ask to be taken back into his fold, the better! We have not a leg to stand on outside the Roman communion. Never, I repeat emphatically, never, never let us tolerate the least attempt to reintroduce the Mass. For the honour of Christ and His finished work, let us resist the sacrifice of the Mass while we have breath in our bodies.

IV. So much for things which ought not to be tolerated. I will now turn to the other side of the question, and consider what diversities, on all principles of justice, fairness, and common sense, we ought to tolerate. This part of the subject, I feel deeply, is a difficult one. It is much more easy to approach the matter from the negative side than the positive one. I shall try, however, to lay down a few general principles and to supply a few illustrations, which I think deserve the attention of all Churchmen. Starting with the broad principle, that absolute and entire agreement upon all points is unattainable, let us try to find out what diversities we ought to tolerate and allow.

(a) I say, then, that we ought to tolerate diversities of opinion, practice, and ritual, about matters of which the Scriptures have either not spoken at all, or else have spoken so slightly or uncertainly that it is not clear what is the mind of the Spirit. It is a settled principle with me, that you never ought to be positive, intolerant, condemnatory, or censorious about any matter on which you cannot quote a plain text. Hold your own private opinions as tightly as you please; but do not be intolerant.

(b) I say, furthermore, that we ought to tolerate diversities in matters about which both Scripture and Prayer-book rubrics are alike silent, and which involve no question of doctrine. That there are a good many points of this kind we must all be aware. It is vain to expect all persons to see eye to eye about them as long as the world stands. Now, to condemn men as heretical, and unsound, and erring, because they do not arrive at the same conclusions as we do about these points, seems to me the height of intolerance. We may think them very much mistaken; but in the absence of Bible or Prayer-book argument, they have as much right to have an opinion as ourselves.

(c) I say, furthermore, that we ought to tolerate diversities of practice, even about the observance of rubrics, when local circumstances make a strict and literal observance useless and impossible, or even detrimental to the interest of the Church of England. This may sound odd at first hearing, but I will explain further on what I mean.

So much for general principles as to the toleration of diversities. It only remains for me now to offer a few practical illustrations in order to throw light on what I have been saying. I do this with great diffidence and a deep sense of my own fallibility. I cannot expect every one to agree with me; but I have determined to say what I think,
I say, then, that, in my judgment, loyal Churchmen ought to tolerate diversities of opinion, practice, and ritual about such points as the following:—the dress to be worn in the pulpit, whether surplice or black gown,—the quantity of singing in public worship,—the manner of administering the Lord’s Supper, whether by pronouncing words to a whole rail or to each individual,—the selection of voluntary religious societies to be supported,—the books and tracts to be circulated,—the extraordinary means to be used in working parishes. As to daily services, and saints’ day services, a strict observance of the rubrics in many parishes would be perfectly useless and a misapplication of time. There are but twelve hours in the day. There are scores of useful things nowadays, which were either unknown or illegal in the days when saying matins and vespers was enjoined. As to repeating the words of administration to each individual communicant in the Lord’s Supper, the number of communicants in some parishes makes strict compliance almost impossible, and lengthens the service most inconveniently, to the injury, if not the destruction, of the afternoon congregation. To all these points one common remark applies. Not one of them is a thing necessary to salvation. Most of them are things left entirely open by the Church of England, and are not expressive of any principle or doctrine. And even in the two instances where the rubric seems to be against a clergyman, it is a striking example of the old proverb, “Summa lex summa injuria.”

In all such cases I hold that it is our wisdom to allow diversities of opinion and practice. We ought to think and let think. Upon every point which I have mentioned I have myself a very decided opinion, and I used to act accordingly when I was an incumbent. Even now I privately think every clergyman who disagrees with me a very mistaken man! I am fully persuaded that he is wrong and I am right, and that mine is the more excellent way! But I am equally convinced that these, and many other points which I have not time to specify, are open questions, and are wisely and purposely left open by the comprehensive principles of the Church of England. Whatever I may think, they are diversities which I must tolerate, and tolerate courteously, civilly, and like a Christian gentleman. And as to condemning men as unsound, untrustworthy, heretical, disloyal Churchmen, and the like, on account of these things, I think it downright wrong. Let me cap this by saying that it is also most impolitic. Intolerance is always offensive. Nothing so disgusts and repels a man as to find himself condemned as a heretic for things not necessary to salvation. To be courteously tolerant of diversities, whatever our private opinions may be, is Scriptural charity, Scriptural policy, and Scriptural common sense.

Time would fail me if I dwelt at greater length on this branch of my subject. Perhaps I have said enough to make my meaning plain. I leave it with the broad general remark, that in the minor matters of religion there will be diversities of opinion and practice as long as the world stands, and that as long as these diversities involve no questions of principle and express no doctrine, it is wise to tolerate them and not make a disturbance. There are plenty of weighty matters requiring all our attention, affecting the very foundations of Protestantism and revealed religion. Let us reserve our strength for them, and not waste our time in squabbles about secondary matters which only make us ridiculous in the eye of the public.
And now let me conclude all with a few words of practical application. I give them as words for the times, and I ask my readers to take them for what they are worth.

(a) First and foremost, let us not be moved by the violent language used about the ecclesiastical lawsuits of the last thirty years. “Narrow, party-spirited, violent, bitter, bigoted, coarse, vulgar, persecuting,” and the like; nothing is too bad to say of the promoters of these suits. It matters little. Some people always dislike sentinels, watchmen, and police. But what does it all come to when you look beneath this cloud of hard words? Men have simply desired to preserve the Protestantism of the Church of England, and defend it against the insidious attacks of the Romanizing movement of the day. They have appealed to the Law courts, when no other remedy could be found, in order to get the best legal decisions within reach, about points which people said were doubtful. They have obtained decisions on many of these points, which even the Bishops, who disapprove the suits, are not ashamed to use, and to call “the law.” And where, I should like to know, is the mighty harm of all this? Harm indeed! I believe the suits have saved the Church of England from ruin.

All lawsuits, I am aware, are most unpopular. “Horrid people! going to law.” But I challenge any one to show how law can be ascertained without suits. The simple aim in recent Ecclesiastical Suits has been to establish principles. Whether the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts will ever be adopted by Parliament, and become the law of the land, I cannot tell. For anything I know, the “Clergy Discipline Act” and the “Public Worship Act” may be swept away. Other new tribunals may be set up. But of one thing I am very certain, there will never cease to be Ecclesiastical Suits as long as the world stands. There will be disputes, arguments, decisions, appeals, and angry, disappointed litigants, until the end of time. It is amazing, to my mind, that any one should doubt this,

After all, what saith the Scripture? People sometimes ask whether we think St. Paul would have gone to law? I reply by another question, Would St. Paul have tolerated false teachers, and not recommended discipline Would he recommend us not to interfere with heretics? Read Galatians v. 10. What did he mean when he said of a false teacher: “He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment”? What did he mean when he said, “would they were cut off which trouble you”? Whatever some may say, that phrase, I hold with Bengel, Ferguson, Henry, Estius, Whitby, Gill, and Ellicott, means “cut off from the Church.

Some well-meaning people, I believe, would prevent all lawsuits by the notable plan of throwing open the whole question of usages in the Lord’s Supper, and allowing every clergyman to administer it with any ceremonies he likes. This, I suppose, is the policy of “forbearance and toleration” for which many have petitioned, though how such a policy could be carried out in the face of the decisions of the Queen’s courts, fail to see, except by a special Act of Parliament. more unwise and suicidal policy than this I cannot conceive. You would divide every diocese into two distinct and sharply-cut parties. You would divide the clergy into two separate classes—those who wore chasubles and used incense and the like, and those who did not; and of course there would be no more communion between the two classes. As to the unfortunate Bishops, they must either have no consciences, and see no differences, and be honorary members of all schools of thought, or else they must offend one
party of their clergy and please the other. This is indeed a miserable prospect! “Forbearance and toleration” are fine, high-sounding words; if they mean that every clergyman is to be allowed to do what he likes, they seem to me the certain forerunner of confusion, division, anarchy, disruption, and disestablishment.

(b) My second word is this. Let us try to understand the times in which we live. They are perilous times, I am convinced, and if the balance of political parties alters, we never know what a day may bring forth. Never, I believe, was it so important for loyal Churchmen to be organized, disciplined, and got ready to meet any emergency. I entreat Evangelical Churchmen to remember that it is unwise to keep aloof from Diocesan Conferences, Church Congresses, and other machinery which is being brought into use in this age. If Disestablishment comes they will all be wanted. The Times newspaper has recently said with much shrewdness, that the day is past when the Church could get on without corporate life and activity. That witness is true! We cannot stop these things, however little we may like them. We ought to assert our right to take part in them, to be heard in them, and to prove that we are as good Churchmen as any in our pale. I am quite certain that men like Romaine and Venn and Cecil and Simeon would have come forward and taken part in them if they had had the opportunity which we have. If we let them fall into the hands of one restless, revolutionary school, and refuse to go anywhere unless we have everything our own way, I do not think we shall be doing our duty.

(c) My third word is this. Let us try to have knowledge as well as zeal. I observe with deep regret that many Churchmen seem to know so little of English Church history, and of theological literature, that they talk and write very strange things. They appear, for example, to suppose that all High Churchmen are like the famous incumbent of St. Alban’s, Holborn, and all Broad Churchmen are like Mr. Voysey! And so, if you say a single favourable word about “High” and “Broad” men, they are filled with horror, cast dust in the air, rush into print, write violent letters to the newspapers, and denounce you as a renegade and as an apostate. But would it not be well if these zealous people would remember that High Churchmen like Hooker, and Andrews, and Beveridge, and Herbert, and Pearson, were just as much opposed to Popery as themselves; and that Broad Churchmen like Burnet, and Tenison, and Patrick, and Stillingfleet, and Clagett, were in their day among the ablest writers against Romanism? Surely to lump all High and Broad Churchmen together in one common condemnation is to make a sad exhibition of our own ignorance! And would it not be well to remember that there have been in the last forty years, and some are living now, not a few Bishops and Deans who were and are as sound as any about Protestantism, and as loyal and true-hearted Churchmen, and yet could not be called members of the Evangelical body? I need hardly mention such men as Archbishop Longley, Bishop Blomfield, Dean Alford, and others whose names are known to any intelligent Churchman. Do these extremely zealous gentlemen really mean to say that we ought to turn away from these Bishops and Deans, refuse to meet them, proclaim a crusade, and try to thrust them out of the Church? And would it not be well to remember that nowadays Evangelical Churchmen have no monopoly of grace, and faith, and holiness, and self-denial, and love to Christ, the Bible, and souls; and that biographies, like some which have been published in late years, show plainly that there is some good outside the Evangelical camp? These things, I
fear, are not sufficiently remembered. I wish some people read a little more than they do. Want of reading is the mother of ignorance, and ignorance is the mother of narrowness and intolerance. I like zeal; but I like it to be zeal according to knowledge.

(d) My closing word is this. Let us all cultivate more and more that blessed grace, true Scriptural charity. It is a plant which is becoming sadly scarce in England, to the great injury of religion. The modern plant is sadly weak and degenerate. Oh that, among other revivals, there was a revival of charity! Old Scriptural charity “believes all things, hopes all things, and rejoices in truth.” Modern charity seems not only to believe all things, but to believe any lie, and to rejoice in spreading it, to hope nothing, and to delight in slandering, suspecting and depreciating brethren on the slightest and most insufficient evidence. I fear that the Ninth Commandment and 1 Cor. xiii. are too much neglected in the nineteenth century. Well says the Litany, “From all uncharitableness, good Lord, deliver us.”

It was a grand saying of that great man Oliver Cromwell, when certain ministers pressed him beyond measure about secondary matters in which he could not agree with them: “I do beseech you by the mercies of God to try to think it possible that you are sometimes in the wrong.” Head-knowledge, and clearness of doctrine, and sound views of the Gospel, no doubt, are excellent things. But even knowledge has its attendant dangers. It is written, “Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth” (1 Cor. viii. 1).