

Charles Simeon – through the eyes of an American Lutheran

RUDOLPH W. HEINZE

*This paper was given at the Islington Conference
on 22 January 1979*

In the year marking the bicentennial of Charles Simeon's conversion, it is especially fitting that those who owe a great debt to his teaching and work should reflect on the significance of his contributions. However, it may at first seem somewhat unusual that one who is separated from him both by national origin and denominational affiliation should be asked to help commemorate this bicentennial. In fact, when I first received this assignment I faced it with a great deal of apprehension. Not only was I unfamiliar with most of Simeon's work, but the few things I could recall from my reading about him were anything but positive. My most striking recollection of his role in English church history was that he had used his wealth and that of other wealthy Englishmen to buy spheres of influence for his particular brand of Christianity in the Church of England—an activity which led Ford Brown to comment caustically that Simeon 'regarded without a moment's questioning as wholly admirable a practice that if it had been the High Church party's he would at once have seen as unscrupulous and unchristian.'¹

This is where my study of Simeon began five months ago, but I am happy to report that it has come a long way since that time. During the past five months I have tried very hard to learn to know him as his friends, his congregation and, most importantly, his students knew him. I have read his autobiography, his sermons and his letters. I have perused the many contemporary comments about him in the recollections of his students. I have even used his sermon outlines to help write one of my own sermons. And sometimes in the past five months Charles Simeon became more than just a subject of scholarly interest. He became my teacher!

In the space available I can only share a small fraction of what I have learned from him, but I hope that the way in which Charles Simeon affected someone living in a very different environment, and representing a significantly different theological position, will make some contribution towards helping assess the wider significance of his work. Curiously, despite the wide gap between Simeon's environment and my own, he spoke very directly to me in my contemporary situation. Consequently what follows is an attempt to describe what I learned from the teaching and example of Charles Simeon that I hope

will help me to face the future in my own church, which has just undergone a bitter theological struggle and experienced a major schism.

In order to do this, I have selected seven characteristics of Charles Simeon's ministry which I particularly admire. They are, in brief: 1) his patience in the face of opposition, 2) his realism about his own weakness, 3) his moderation in the midst of controversy, 4) his independence of thought, 5) his biblical outlook, 6) his churchmanship, and 7) his loyalty to the gospel.

Patience with opposition

Charles Simeon began his work in the most difficult environment imaginable. He was despised by his congregation as an interloper, he was rejected by his colleagues at Cambridge as an enthusiast, and he was mocked and insulted by his students. The congregation at Holy Trinity so completely rejected him that seat-holders locked their pews and refused to attend, leaving only the aisles available for worshippers. His colleagues in academic circles snubbed him and treated him with cool contempt. Students not only made fun of him, but rowdy bands of undergraduates even disrupted his services. And the opposition was not short-lived. At least in the congregation it did not completely die out for thirty years. Furthermore, for twelve years he was denied the use of his pulpit on Sunday afternoons while someone else held the position of appointed lecturer.

His response to all this was incredible, almost saintly patience. When seat-holders locked the pews and the church wardens even threw out the seats he had purchased for the aisles at his own expense, he responded: 'I saw no remedy but faith and patience.' When he tried evening lectures and the church wardens locked the church and carried off the keys, he answered with prayer: 'May God bless them with enlightening, sanctifying and saving grace.'² Despite the fact that he was not by nature a patient and a tolerant person, he disciplined himself to respond to opposition in the most positive and effective manner. Hugh Evan Hopkins, in his recent biography of Simeon, cites a parable which Simeon once related to advise an over-zealous clergyman on how to deal with difficult church members. It clearly must have provided a guide for his dealings with his own opposition:

Two ships were aground at London Bridge. The proprietors of the one sent for a hundred horses and pulled it to pieces. Proprietors of the other waited for the tide: and with sails and rudder directed it as they pleased.³

It took a long time, but Simeon's parable eventually came true in his own experience. By the end of his career, his congregation was filled to overflowing, a goodly number of students had become his

zealous disciples, and even those who rejected his teachings showed a grudging respect for the man they affectionately called 'The Old Apostle'. Clearly patience and perseverance had its rewards, and it is one of the lessons from Simeon's career that is worth emulating.

Realism about personal defects

A second characteristic of Simeon that I particularly admire is his realism and persistence in dealing with his own weaknesses. Much like Martin Luther, Charles Simeon was not an easy man to work with. Like Luther he was by nature temperamental, proud, and at times even arrogant. Charles Jerram, who attended Simeon's classes at Cambridge, has probably left the most famous and widely accepted contemporary description of his personality:

He was naturally of a haughty, impatient, and impetuous temper, and these defects were sometimes exhibited in a way which was painful to the feelings of others. He was not always strictly observant of those rules of respect and courtesy which the conventional intercourse of his life has prescribed, and occasionally gave offence by an imperious mode of address. Being constitutionally of a very sensitive temperament, he has been known to express himself with undue severity on trifling and imaginary affronts: and, in the moment of excitement, would now and then redress his own grievances in a way which afterwards occasioned him pain and annoyance.⁴

These characteristics made some of the early evangelical leaders uncomfortable with Simeon. Ford Brown suggests that William Wilberforce never felt close to him,⁵ and Michael Hennell discusses in some detail the tensions that existed in the relationship between Simeon and John Venn.⁶ They could have also undermined his ministry and effectiveness; but he recognized them, realistically did not expect them to be changed overnight, and spent a lifetime seeking to overcome them.

Charles Simeon understood something that enthusiastic Christians need to be reminded of again and again. Religion does not change personality suddenly. Rather it takes a great deal of persistent effort to overcome one's weaknesses. His realistic appraisal of how conversion affects character is well known, but we are so prone to forget that it is worth repeating:

Remember, religion does not so alter the character as to leave nothing remaining. An ardent and enthusiastic man, when he becomes religious, will still be of the same temperment . . . the timid will be timid still: the person who shuddered at a toad before his conversion, will do the same afterwards. Religion gives, indeed, a new direction and tone to the mind. We are vessels, and religion, when poured into us, will taste . . . of the tan or the wood of our natural dispositions . . . it will eventually and gradually correct our natural failings, but will not obliterate the effects of nervous or constitutional weakness or infirmity.⁷

Simeon's life bore out the truth of that statement. He faced his personality defects with great realism and persistence and, in the

end, he made significant progress in overcoming them. The same writer who used earlier to describe Simeon's personality also tells us:

Few men, I believe, felt the struggle between nature and grace more severe, or maintained it with more determination than Mr Simeon. There were times, indeed, when he found himself unequal to the conflict and the enemy from within and without gained a temporary advantage: and then it was that the power of corrupt nature showed itself in the occasional outbreak of the evils to which I have adverted. But the discomfiture was only of short duration . . . and he never thus recovered himself without renewing his strength and again engaging in the conflict with redoubled determination and vigour.⁸

By the end of his life he had made great strides in conquering his temper and had won the battle against pride to such a degree that in advanced age he was known for his humility. But he never forgot the lessons of the battle, and he tried to instil them in those he taught. Abner Brown informs us that Simeon once remarked in a letter: 'The three lessons which a minister has to learn are 1) Humility, 2) Humility, 3) Humility.'⁹

Moderation in controversy

A third lesson which Simeon taught, both by words and example, seems in striking contrast to the personality characteristics I have just described. Moderation is not normally associated with a man of Simeon's temperament; consequently it is all the more surprising that in the midst of the bitter theological controversies of the day, he was able to maintain a remarkably broad-minded attitude on a great number of issues. There is always a serious danger that conservative Christians can become intolerant bigots who can only see their own point of view. Simeon recognized this, and was suspicious of ministers who were too narrow-minded. He once turned down a man whom he described as 'one of the holiest men of our age' as unfit for a particular post because he wanted elasticity of mind. 'He could not, I am sure, become all things to all men. It is a minister's duty to be so.'¹⁰ In a letter to a friend who had asked him to attack the work of another clergyman, who did not believe the Jews would be restored to Palestine, Simeon warned of the dangers of heresy hunting: 'Let a man once engage in it, and it is surprising how the love of it will grow upon him, and he will both find a hare in every bush, and follow it with something of a huntsman's feelings.' Although he accepted his friend's position on the issue in controversy, he reminded him that 'all these things are about religion: but they have very little to do with religion itself.' Finally, he gave his friend some very good advice on how to proceed in advancing his point of view: 'If you are gentle toward all men, and instruct in meekness them that oppose themselves, your arguments will appear stronger than they will if maintained in language of severity and triumph.'¹¹

CHURCHMAN

Although Simeon was uncompromising on the essentials of the faith which, he maintained, were clearly taught in Scripture, he was deeply concerned that controversies among Christians were too often fought over obscure points of doctrine on which the Scriptures did not speak clearly. One of his curates, Matthew Preston, informs us that on questions like the millenium, and other matters 'only briefly and obscurely alluded to in Scripture . . . He allowed others to judge for themselves: but he did not deem it necessary or expedient to expand upon them much of his own time and attention.'¹² In 1830 he wrote to Ellen Elliot, the granddaughter of Henry Venn, warning her about placing too much emphasis on millenarian thought:

Instead of looking to find in some detached passages, what may appear to establish the idea of the personal reign of Christ, you will read the Scriptures to see what is their great scope and what the means of effecting the moral revolution wrought upon mankind, you and I shall soon agree. I have no objection to your believing the personal reign of Christ and his saints: I object to the prominence given it, and to its thrusting in the background all the wonders of redeeming love.¹³

He held this position on a great variety of issues. Even on questions like sabbath observance, which later evangelicals were to stress so strongly, he condemned making one's 'own standard a standard for all others.'¹⁴ On church government, he showed the same moderation. He pointed out that:

There is no precise line in Scripture drawn with respect to Church government: yet the whole Christian Church is filled with dissensions and animosities, because all will dogmatize for others, instead of conceding to each other a liberty to judge for themselves and being content with that apostolic dogma. Let all things be done decently and in order.¹⁵

He also recognized that differing circumstances often demanded different reactions. In a letter to the Duchess of Beaufort concerning the statements of another clergyman dealing with overcoming the world, he cautioned:

A person who views the subject broadly, and without reference to the different circumstances of men, finds it easy to adduce strong and sweeping expressions and to require a full conformity to them, without any modification whatever. But one who takes into account all the varieties of situations in which Christians move, and all the diversities of circumstances under which they may be placed, will feel it his duty to consider what those situations and circumstances call for, and what influence they ought to have on the conduct of those who are found in them. They will be led to distinguish between the spirit and the letter of a command and to modify the latter, whilst in the strictest possible way they adhere to and require the former.¹⁶

Independence of thought

Simeon's moderation is closely related to the fourth characteristic I mentioned in my introductory remarks—his independence of

thought. Abner Brown, who attended Simeon's conversation parties for four years, tells us: 'He thought for himself, seldom adopting opinions at second hand, at least without first making them his own and adding to them the stamp of his own modifications.'¹⁷ It is not surprising that a man who thought in this fashion found it difficult to identify with a party or a theological system. In the preface to his twenty-one volumes of sermon outlines, Simeon wrote: 'As for names and parties in religion, he equally disclaims them all.'¹⁸ Simeon's well-known comment on theological systems is related by Abner Brown: 'God has not revealed his truth in a system; the Bible has no system as such. Lay aside system and fly to the Bible; receive its words with simple submission, and without an eye to any system. Be Bible Christians, not system Christians.'¹⁹

Simeon applied these principles to the Calvinist-Arminian controversy which so plagued the church of his day. He did not identify with either party, because he believed that both points of view emphasized certain portions of Scripture at the expense of others. The mistake of both approaches was that they attempted to reconcile truths that could not be harmonized by human reason. Although Simeon maintained 'no doubt that there is a system in the Holy Scriptures (for truth cannot be inconsistent with itself)', he was 'persuaded that neither Calvinists nor Arminians are in exclusive possession of that system.'²⁰ Instead of trying to reconcile seeming opposites, we need to hold God's truth in tension, because different truths speak to different spiritual needs.

As wheels in a complicated machine may move in opposite directions and yet subserve one common end, so may truths apparently opposite be perfectly reconcilable with each other, and equally subserve the purposes of God in the accomplishment of man's salvation.²¹

We should not be surprised that Simeon's position on theological systems brought him a great deal of criticism. In 1821 the *Christian Remembrancer* pointed out the dangers of Simeon's approach, telling its readers that 'if Mr Simeon is in the right, the Church of England is fundamentally and grossly in the wrong: having reduced the contents of the sacred volume to a theological system, and required her ministers to subscribe to that system and acknowledge it as their own.' The same article warned that if 'the plan which Mr Simeon has recommended' were followed, 'it would afford colourable excuses for latitudinarianism and multiply divisions and sects and would ultimately bring the Bible into general disrepute.'²² Even some of Simeon's friends felt that at times he carried his principle of letting the Bible speak for itself too far. Thomas Webster, in his funeral oration, said that at times Simeon 'in discoursing on apparently contradictory passages of Scripture, has stated opposing sentiments somewhat too strongly.'²³ Some modern historians have also been critical, arguing that Simeon's influence was to result in a rather

indefinite evangelical theology and a dangerous degree of theological reductionism.²⁴

Although that danger is certainly present, it is not the inevitable result of Simeon's approach. Reardon points out that although 'evangelical theology was unspeculative, its teaching within its limits was clear and firm.'²⁵ James Manor maintains that although Simeon tended 'to downgrade speculative thought in order to be more persuasive in catalyzing action', his theology retained a 'delicate balance'.²⁶ While some of his students may have lost that balance, it would be unfair to blame that on their teacher. His teaching was neither a compromise nor a 'watered-down version of two opposing systems.'²⁷ It was, as his more observant contemporaries recognized, the historic theology of the Church of England, the teachings of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and it was 'scriptural, in contradistinction to the systematic mode of avowed Calvinists or Arminians.'²⁸

Biblical outlook

That statement provides a natural transition to the fifth characteristic of Simeon's ministry on which I want to comment—the centrality of the Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura* in his teaching. Few Christian ministers have placed a greater emphasis on the Bible, and as a Lutheran I feel particularly comfortable with that position. Abner Brown informs us that Simeon used to say: 'The Bible first, the Prayer Book next, and all other books and doings in subordination to both.'²⁹ In his preface to his sermon outlines Simeon stated that he had

endeavoured to obtain from the Scriptures alone his view of religion and to them it is his wish to adhere, with scrupulous fidelity: never wresting any portion of the word of God to favour a particular opinion, but giving to every part of it that sense which it seems to him to have been designed by its great author to convey.³⁰

Simeon followed that principle scrupulously. His preaching, for example, was solidly based on the Bible. He preached from one end of the Scriptures to the other, so that his massive work of sermon outlines consists of twenty-one volumes and 2,536 sermons stretching from Genesis to Revelation. Furthermore, he avoided the practice too often followed by systematizers of using the Bible as a set of proof-texts to support a theological position. He did not try to impose his own interpretation on the Scriptures, but maintained: 'My endeavour is to bring out of Scripture what is there, and not to thrust in what I think might be there.'³¹

Although he clearly held to the doctrine of verbal inspiration, he did not demand of the Scriptures more than they claimed. While he insisted that the Scriptures cannot err in 'doctrine or other important matter', he allowed that 'there are inexactnesses in reference to

philosophical and scientific matters, because of its popular style.³² We do not know how Simeon would have reacted to the controversies over Scripture which plagued the church later in the century, but Robert Dell, in his essay for the volume commemorating the bicentennial of Simeon's birth, argued:

One feels that the man who wrote 'if there be a doubt which a candid mind would feel, I readily state that doubt', would never have joined the ranks of those who, frightened of the possible results of biblical criticism, fell back on the method, condemned by Simeon in the controversies of his own day, of abusing those who engaged in this work, and calling them by opprobrious names.³³

Simeon certainly would never have compromised on the authority and reliability of the Scriptures, but Dell suggests that he would 'have weighed with care and prayer every legitimate examination of Scripture, believing that there was yet more light to be found there.'³⁴ Later evangelicals were to be criticized for 'a Biblicism, not to say a Bibliolatry, the effect of which was intellectually benumbing.'³⁵ It is hard for me to believe that those who fell into that trap were following in Simeon's footsteps, whose approach to Scripture was so healthy and full of vitality.

Churchmanship

A sixth characteristic of Simeon's ministry, which I assume is especially important to the readers of this journal, was his churchmanship. It has also greatly impressed me, because I have recently witnessed an exodus from my own church of a large group of talented and committed men for differences much less significant than those which divided nineteenth-century Anglicans. I choose that word 'churchmanship' because both Simeon's friends and the opposition used it. Abner Brown spoke of 'Simeon's sound churchmanship', and those who were critical of Simeon's unwillingness to practise itinerancy asked him: 'What right have you to care about church rules when you are holding evangelical doctrine? Shake off your churchmanship and be content to be a Christian.'³⁶ In an age when the Church of England was not only in desperate need of reform, but also to a great extent not preaching the gospel, it would have been easy to take that advice. In an age when fragmentation from the body of the church was a marked feature of early evangelicalism, it would have been easy to follow those who saw continued membership in the Church of England as a hindrance to the gospel, and to pursue one's ministry in a more hospitable environment. But Simeon was, in the great puritan tradition, committed to reform from within rather than schism. So he helped to stop a trend that in the words of Charles Smyth 'would have been a disaster both for the Evangelical Party and for the Church of England.' In fact Smyth argues: 'It was Simeon who, more than any other single individual, taught the younger

evangelicals to love the Church of England and enabled them to feel that they belonged within her body.'³⁷

He was able to do that, because, although he recognized the weaknesses of the Church of England, he loved that Church and did not make the mistake of rejecting her because she was not perfect. Archbishop Coggan, in his lecture on Simeon in 1974, stated: 'He loved the Church of England. He loved its liturgy. And he was content to live and die a son of the Church of England, even though within that Church he suffered so much and saw so much that was weak and unworthy in its priests and people.'³⁸ He was determined to correct the blemishes and to reform the church, but he correctly recognized that you seldom reform a church by leaving it. His major means of reform was to send a generation of students out into the church to call it back to its doctrinal and scriptural heritage. This, he felt, was his most important work: 'Many of those who hear me . . . are legions in themselves, because they are going forth to preach, or else to fill places of influence in society. In that view, I look upon my position here as the highest and most important in the kingdom.'³⁹ But those he sent out needed to find positions in a church that was extremely hostile to evangelicals, and once they were placed, provision had to be made for securing an evangelical succession in that parish. In order to achieve this, Simeon did what an earlier evangelical, John Thornton, had done. He used his wealth, and that of others who contributed to the cause, for the purchase of advowsons; so that, at his death, some twenty-one livings went into the Trust he founded.

Probably no aspect of Simeon's work has received greater criticism. It was attacked at the time on the grounds that it advanced the interests of a single party and promoted schism.⁴⁰ And it has been bitterly resented ever since on similar grounds. Bishop Henson, in his critical essay on the patronage trusts in 1932, accused Simeon of 'enormous egotism and a total lack of any sense of corporate obligation.'⁴¹

We have already heard some of Ford Brown's criticism. Less direct than that of Henson, it was, nevertheless, even more devastating. He pointed out that, even in the nineteenth century,

To the mind of some the organized use of great wealth to purchase 'spheres' of religious influence, the consolidation of the purchased commodities into a legal body and its preservation 'in perpetuity', were strikingly unlike the spirit of Christianity and good churchmanship.⁴²

He also believed that it illustrated the arrogance of Simeon's concept of Christianity, because he made himself the sole judge of 'true religion'.

Although it would be presumptuous for an American Lutheran to make any statement justifying or attacking patronage trusts in the Church of England, I think it only fair to point out that Max Warren

ably responded to the criticisms I have just outlined, in his recent article in *Churchman*.⁴³ Furthermore, in the light of Ford Brown's criticism, I should at least make some attempt to defend my inclusion of this activity under the general heading 'churchmanship'. Although I am not entirely sure I can do so in a convincing manner in the space available, I think it important to point out that if 'churchmanship' involved, in part, keeping evangelicals in the Church of England, it is fairly obvious that the Simeon Trust played a major role in that endeavour.⁴⁴ In addition, even if his critics are correct, and Simeon was building a 'party' in the Church, he was not using a method at variance with accepted procedure. Neither was his 'party' intent on propagating a theology in conflict with the historical position of the Church of England. Patronage has a long history and it had often been used in a highly questionable manner. The Simeon Trust simply used it to try and place in livings those clergymen who put the spiritual needs of their congregation first and who were loyal to the historic formulations of the Church of England. I am not sure that I would advocate patronage trusts for my own church, even if that were possible. But I do believe that if a similar procedure had been available to place in parishes clergymen representing the position of the group that left the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, the schism would not have taken place and in the long run both parties would have benefited.

Having said this, I realize that it places me on the side of those who, at least, defend the patronage trusts for the nineteenth-century church. I also recognize that much of what I have written seems more like a panegyric extolling the virtues of Simeon's contribution, rather than an unbiased scholarly analysis. Lest I be accused of the type of uncritical analysis which is too often the result of a superficial acquaintance with the subject, let me assure you that I am aware of the less positive aspects of Simeon's heritage, and if space permitted, we could explore them. Furthermore, I accept the wisdom of Max Warren's caution that there is a vast chasm separating Simeon's age from our own. As he stated: 'We breathe different air, confront different problems, in fact, think differently on almost every subject from the men of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century.' He also warned us that unless we recognize this we can slip into the trap of 'pure romanticizing'.⁴⁵

That admonition must be taken seriously. It would be the height of folly to hold up Simeon's teaching as a standard for late twentieth-century Christians in its entirety. But there are certainly aspects of his work and his teaching which transcend the boundaries of time and change. I hope I have isolated some of those. But it was a legacy that was not easy to follow, and much of the criticism of Simeon centres around the fact that his students were unable to maintain the standards of patience, realism, moderation, independence and church-

manship that he taught them both by example and in his sermons and conversation parties. As my colleague, Peter Toon, has ably illustrated in his new book *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856*⁴⁶, the bitterness of the Tractarian controversy helped erode much of Simeon's positive heritage.

Loyalty to the gospel

But there was one part of his heritage that was never lost, which his students stubbornly maintained in the midst of that controversy, and which has remained a central doctrine of those who claim to be his followers to the present day. It is, of course, the crucial Reformation doctrine of justification by faith. And it is fitting that I as a Lutheran should close by acknowledging his great contribution in restoring the Reformation theology to a church that had all but forgotten it. The theme that has again and again emerged from my reading in the past five months is that Charles Simeon preached, taught, and lived the gospel in a way that made him and Martin Luther next of kin, despite their differences in other areas. While not ignoring the importance of good works, Simeon's central message throughout his career was 'that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.' His sermons again and again reminded his congregation that their only hope of glory lay in the atoning death of Jesus Christ. His students remembered that message in their recollections of their teacher, and even his memorial in Holy Trinity Church fittingly testifies that he was 'whether as the ground of his own hopes or as the subject of all his ministrations determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified.'⁴⁷ And the preaching of that doctrine had a remarkable impact on the Church of England, so that even at the time of his death it was recognized that the Church had undergone a significant change in one lifetime.

For me personally this, finally, is the most important lesson I can learn from the ministry of Charles Simeon. In the worst possible environment, against tremendous opposition, in the midst of rejection and persecution, for fifty-four years he preached the gospel with the result that men's lives and the life of an entire church were changed. Francis Close, in his obituary sermon at Cheltenham parish church in 1836, recognized this; and since he witnessed that change it is fitting that we end these remarks with his words. After describing the remarkable turnout at Simeon's funeral, and contrasting it with the rejection he faced in the early years of his ministry, Close commented:

How extensive, how fundamental, a change must have taken place in public opinion . . . That such a change has taken place among the clergy and laity of the Church of England within the last half century; that the doctrines of Scripture and of the Reformers (we might say of the Apostles themselves) are more clearly taught and more generally

welcomed: and that a moral and religious impression has been produced by them throughout the land may be denied, but cannot be disproved. How far this is the result of the faithful labours of our reverend friend, and of others like him, who have gone to rest, time or rather eternity, alone can fully show. But of this we may be assured, that the effects of his ministrations, both oral and by the press, will be felt in succeeding years, and generations yet unborn will rise up and call him blessed.⁴⁸

RUDOLPH W. HEINZE is a Tutor in Church History at Oak Hill College, London. He is currently on a two-year leave from Concordia College, Illinois, USA, where he is an Associate Professor of History.

NOTES

Apart from a small number of stylistic changes, this paper is reproduced in the form in which it was originally given.

- 1 Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians* (University Press : Cambridge 1961) p 293.
- 2 Quoted from M. L. Loane, *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession* (Lutterworth : London 1952) pp 283-4.
- 3 Quoted from Hugh Evan Hopkins, *Charles Simeon of Cambridge* (Hodder and Stoughton : London 1977) p 170.
- 4 James Jerram ed., *The Memoirs and a Selection from the Letters of the Late Rev. Charles Jerram* (Wertheim and Macintosh : London 1855) p 124.
- 5 Brown, *op. cit.*, p 293.
- 6 Michael Hennell, *John Venn and the Clapham Sect* (Lutterworth Press : London 1958) pp 92-7.
- 7 Quoted from Hopkins, *op. cit.*, pp 170-1.
- 8 Jerram, *op. cit.*, p 125.
- 9 Abner W. Brown, *Recollections of the Conversation Parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon* (Hamilton, Adams and Co. : London 1863) p 17.
- 10 Quoted from Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p 171.
- 11 William Carus, ed. *Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Charles Simeon* (Hatchard and Son : London 1847) pp 634-5.
- 12 M. M. Preston, *Memoranda of the Rev. Charles Simeon* (Richard Watts : London 1840) p 76.
- 13 Carus *op. cit.*, p 658.
- 14 Quoted from Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p 172.
- 15 Carus, *op. cit.*, p 585.
- 16 *ibid.* p 583.
- 17 Quoted from Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p 173.
- 18 Charles Simeon, *Horae Homileticae* 7th ed. (Henry G. Bohn : London, 1845) p xiv.
- 19 Brown, *Recollections* p 132.
- 20 Simeon, *op. cit.*, p xxiii.
- 21 *ibid.*
- 22 *Christian Remembrances*, III (August 1821) pp 498-9. I am indebted to Mr Clyde Irvine of Cambridge University for many of the references which reveal a negative reaction to Simeon's teaching. His forthcoming dissertation on 'Anglican Evangelical Clergy 1800-1837' should provide a valuable addition to our knowledge of the Evangelical Movement in the first part of the nineteenth century and help place Simeon's role in a wider perspective.

CHURCHMAN

- 23 *The Christian Guardian and Church of England Magazine*, XXIX (January 1837) p 21.
- 24 Yvge Brilioth, *Three Lectures on Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement* (Oxford University Press : London 1934) p 5.
- 25 B. M. G. Reardon, *From Coleridge to Gore* (Longmans : London 1971) p 25.
- 26 James Manor, 'The Coming of Britain's Age of Empire and Protestant Mission Theology 1750-1839', *Zeitschrift Fur Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* (1977) p 54.
- 27 Douglas Webster, 'Simeon's Pastoral Theology', *Charles Simeon 1759-1836* ed. by Michael Hennell and Arthur Pollard (SPCK : London 1959) p 75.
- 28 Preston, *op. cit.*, p 30. Simeon also states quite clearly: 'If in anything he grounded his sentiments upon human authority, it would not be on the dogma of Calvin or Arminius, but on the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England. He has the happiness to say, that he does *ex animo* from his inmost soul, believe the doctrines to which he has subscribed: but the reason of his believing them is not, that they are made the Creed of the Established Church, but, that he finds them manifestly contained in the Sacred Oracles.' Simeon, *op. cit.*, p xiv.
- 29 Brown, *Recollections* p 12.
- 30 Simeon, *op. cit.*, p xxiii.
- 31 Carus, *op. cit.*, p 703.
- 32 Brown, *Recollections* p 100.
- 33 Robert S. Dell, 'Simeon and the Bible' in *Charles Simeon 1759-1836* p 46.
- 34 *ibid.* p 47.
- 35 Reardon, *op. cit.*, p 29.
- 36 Quoted from Michael Webster, 'Simeon's Doctrine of the Church', in *Charles Simeon 1759-1836* p 126.
- 37 Charles Smyth, *Simeon and Church Order* (University Press : Cambridge 1940) p 311.
- 38 F. D. Coggan, *These Were His Gifts* (University of Exeter Press : Exeter 1974) p 16.
- 39 Quoted from *ibid.* p 17.
- 40 *Christian Guardian and Church of England Magazine*, XXIV (January 1937) p 22.
- 41 Herbert H. Henson, *Sibbes and Simeon: An Essay on Patronage Trusts* (Hodder and Stoughton : London 1932) p 40.
- 42 Brown, *op. cit.*, pp 477-8.
- 43 Max Warren, 'Charles Simeon: His Methods in the Local Church, the Church of England and the Nation', *Churchman* Vol. 92:2 (1978) p 118-19.
- 44 As late as 1808 Evangelicals still had a great difficulty finding livings. James Bean pointed out that 'Almost the whole of the clergy called evangelicals are in the dependent and precarious position of curates.' Quoted by Hopkins *op. cit.*, p 37.
- 45 Warren, *op. cit.*, p 47.
- 46 Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology 1833-1850* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott). At the time of writing, the book had not been published. I am indebted to Dr Toon for allowing me to use the proof copy.
- 47 H. C. G. Moule, *Charles Simeon* (Methuen : London 1892) p 276.
- 48 F. Close, *Occasional Sermons Preached in the Parish Church of Cheltenham* (Seely, Burnside and Seely : London 1844) pp 194-5.