

# The Church.

VOLUME VII.—No. 36.]

COBOURG, CANADA, FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1844.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCCXLVIII.]

## Poetry.

### UNITY.

One Lord, one faith, one baptism.—Ephesians iv. 5.  
That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.—John xvii. 21.  
Let us love one another, for love is of God.—1 John iv. 7.

1 One baptism, and one faith,  
One Lord, below, above!  
The fellowship of Zion hath  
One only watchword,—Love,  
From different Temples though it rise,  
One song ascendeth to the skies.

2 Our Sacrifice is one;  
One Priest before the Throne,—  
The crucified, the risen Son,  
Redeemer, Lord alone!  
And signs from contrite hearts that spring,  
Our chief, our choicest offering.

3 Oh, why should they who love  
One Gospel to unfold;  
Who look for one bright home above,  
On earth, be strange and cold?  
Why, subjects of the Prince of Peace,  
In strife abide, and bitterness?

4 Oh, may that holy prayer,  
His tenderest and His last,  
The attendance of His latest care,  
Ere to His Throne He pass'd,—  
No longer unfulfill'd remain,  
The world's offence, His people's stain!

5 Head of Thy Church beneath,  
The catholic,—the true,—  
On her divided members breathe,  
Her broken frame renew!  
Then shall Thy perfect will be done,  
When Christians love and live as one.

—Episcopal Recorder. E. ROBINSON.

### THE DISCIPLINE AND UNITY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

(From the Rev. J. J. Hunt's "Sketch of the Church in the first two Centuries.")

Having established the three orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, as pertaining to the Church of the first two centuries, I proceed to show that these were not empty titles; but that they who bore them were the accredited organs by which the functions of the Church were fulfilled; that they exercised wholesome discipline and superintendence over the great Christian household, being charged with the preservation of sound doctrine, and with the economical dispensation of the same to the world, according to their proper offices, and within their proper limits; the whole serving to prove, as I said on a former occasion, that the primitive Church was not the loose, unorganized body, which some seem to suppose it, but was a well-arranged structure.

I. Now the elements of such a restricted Institution may be gathered out of Scripture itself. Our blessed Lord observed it, in a measure, in the very first conception of His Church. He chose twelve disciples, and no more, though the harvest was such as to require many labourers. He afterwards added other seventy; but to that number he still confined his teachers. As the Church grew after His ascension, Deacons were appointed by the Apostles, they too limited in number and limited in their duties. After a while, the wants of the infant Church increasing, the means of supply were adapted to the wants; and St. Paul, duly taught of God, lays down certain qualifications for the ministry, and appoints certain channels in which it shall be transmitted, and provided those qualifications be found in the candidate for the office, and those channels convey to him the office itself, the numbers are no longer tied up, but are left to justify themselves to the expansion of the Church. Furthermore, the surface occupied by it being now great, it is found that a division of labour for the due cultivation thereof is become needful, instead of that itinerant system which prevailed at the first; and a Paul begins to circumscribe himself, and will not stretch himself beyond his measure, but according to the measure of the rule which God hath distributed to him, (2 Cor. x. 13.); and a Timothy is appointed "to abide still at Ephesus," (1 Tim. i. 3.), and to apply himself to the construction and guidance of the Church there; and a Titus is to do the same by Crete, (Tit. i. 5.); and a Synod fixes itself at Jerusalem, with James at its head, to govern the whole Church; and a maintenance is now claimed as a right for him that teacheth, (1 Cor. ix. 7, 11); and the supply of it enjoined as a duty on him that is taught; the Church having attained unto a stage beyond that elementary state, when its ministers were to have "neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in their purses," (Matt. x. 9). And being so far fashioned and formed, it falls into the hands of the Primitive Fathers.

Having thus launched ourselves into our subject from off the Scriptures, even as we did before, let us proceed to observe how the ark of our Church rode in the times which followed.

II. Now the impression there was amongst the early Fathers of the necessity of a regularly constructed Church, may be seen in a remarkable passage in Clement Romanus. The Church of Corinth, which seems from the very first to have been more rent by divisions than any other of which we read, is addressed by Clement in a letter persuasive of peace. The call, therefore, for this interposition on his part, naturally suggests the following reflections on the subject of a Church, which I submit to your attention before we advance further, as furnishing a good foundation for what will ensue.

"Wherefore," says he, "having searched into the depths of divine knowledge, we must do all things in order, whatsoever the Lord hath commanded us; to wit, make our prayers and oblations at the stated seasons, and not irregularly and by chance, but at the times and hours appointed. Moreover he hath determined, by his sovereign will, where and by whom they shall be offered up; that every thing being done holily, and according to his good pleasure, the same may be acceptable unto him. They, therefore, who make their offerings at the seasons appointed, are accepted and blessed; for following, as they do, the commands of their Lord, they err not. For his own proper services are assigned to the High Priest; and their own proper place is prescribed to the Priests; and their own proper ministrations are imposed on the Levites; and the layman is bound by law rules. Each of you, then, my brethren, give thanks to God, abiding in your own order, in all good conscience; not overstepping the established line of your own ministry, in all gravity. For sacrifices are not offered in every place, neither those which are daily, nor vows, nor sin-offerings, nor trespass-offerings, but in Jerusalem only; Temple, at the altar, having been first examined by the High Priest and the Ministers." When it is considered that Clement is here addressing a Christian Church; a Church not under the old covenant, but under the new; and that his argument is worth-while to apply to this Church; nothing can well plead more strongly for the general question of an establishment, a hierarchy, discipline, ordinances, under the Gospel, than this reference to the construction of the Levitical Church. The animals of the early Fathers is hereby rendered clear.

Thinking this enough to say on the general question, I will now bespeak your attention to the manner in which the theory of the Church was in several particulars reduced to practice; to some of the ligaments, traced together, making it one whole; and if at this interval, and after the loss of so many documents

which would illustrate the subject, we cannot get at every point in the detail, it is only fair to judge of what we have not by what we have.

II. By the twenty-seventh canon it is ordained that "the Bishops of every nation shall acknowledge a Chief Bishop, and regard him as their head." I do not quote the canons as an authority falling within the limits I have laid down—the two first centuries—though it is impossible to affirm how early they were; or to deny that they were very early; but I quote them as proving that an ordinance of which I discover traces, as I will show, certainly within the age I have prescribed myself, is found established beyond all dispute in an age, perhaps, but little later—I mean the office of a Metropolitan Bishop; he, not of a distinct order, otherwise I would have spoken of him in my last address to you, or capable of any ministrations for which his episcopal brethren were incapacitated, but simply a *Primus inter pares*, a priority expedient for discipline. And I adduce the fact itself, as one of many incidents which go to prove that the primitive Church possessed a constitution; was not that rope of sand which some would have us believe it.

Ignatius is deposed from the see of Antioch, and carried to Rome to die a martyr. On his way thither he addresses several letters to Churches of Asia, as well as one to Polycarp; and the solicitude he feels that his own place should be speedily supplied at Antioch, and the manner suggested by him for conducting the election, show the more than common importance of that see, and the decent and orderly way in which the early government of the Church was carried on.

"It is for you, most blessed Polycarp," so he writes, "to assemble a most reverend council, and to ordain (χρησασθαι) one whom you hold right dear, and who will be zealous, so that it may deserve to be said of him, that he is running the race of God; him to charge with the honour of proceeding to Syria, that he may set forth your unwearied desire for the glory of Christ." Then follow more minute directions for the gathering of this council. "Since I have not been able," says he, "to write to all the Churches, by reason of having to sail on the sudden from Troas to Neapolis, such being God's pleasure, you will write to the neighbouring Churches, for you are in the councils of God, that they may concur in this same object."—Ignatius then adds certain salutations, and this amongst the rest: "I salute him who shall be accounted worthy of proceeding to Syria. Grace will be with him in every thing, and with Polycarp who sends him."

Here we have directions given by Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, to summon a council at Smyrna, of which Polycarp himself was to be President, with a view of filling up the see of Antioch. We do not find any volunteer allowed to thrust himself into the vacant chair, but the appointment is left in the hands of the Bishops and Clergy, with the utmost regularity and attention to ecclesiastical rules. But this is not all. There is that in the passage before us, as well as in other passages of the early Fathers, which would seem to imply, as I have said, that even amongst the Bishops themselves there was a Head, a Primate, though we may not have the means of developing the matter in complete detail.—But it is perceived that Ignatius addresses himself, as his superior, to Polycarp; and that, in general, he delivers his injunctions in these letters to various Churches in Asia Minor, Smyrna, Magnesia, Ephesus, Philadelphia, Tralles, with the air of one who has a right and title so to do; every one of which Churches we know, nevertheless, from these self-same letters, had its own Bishop, as well as its Priests and Deacons. Moreover, in one of the letters he is designated *Bishop of Syria*; not of Antioch, but of Syria; a title conferring a province of great extent, and such as certainly contained many subordinate sees, which in those days were universally very small. Accordingly it appears that even Cilicia, which had doubtless Bishops of its own, was still in some sort subject to the ecclesiastical superintendence of Antioch; for there exists a fragment, preserved by Eusebius, of a document addressed by Serapion, a Bishop of Antioch, about the end of the second century, to Rhossion, a city of Cilicia, in the course of which it is discovered that he had visited that city officially, with a view to examine into the religious condition of the people, and that he meant to visit it again. The existence of Primates in the early Church is further confirmed by the remains of certain Epistles, or rather the titles and substance of them, found in Eusebius, written by Dionysius, a Bishop of Corinth, of the second century. One of these, it seems, was addressed to the Church of Gortyna, together with the other Churches (ναπολιτικῶν) of Crete; and commendation is bestowed on Philip their Bishop; as though he had the oversight of the whole island. Yet another of them is written to the Gnostians, of which particular Church in Crete Pinytus is said to be the Bishop; in some manner, therefore, he must be subordinate to Philip—the latter a Prelate, the other a Metropolitan. And there is still another example, in the same document, of the like Episcopal arrangement, in the case of Palma, who is styled Bishop of Amnistris, and of the Churches of Pontus in general; he, therefore, like Philip, a Primate. Furthermore, it should seem that both the limits of the Diocese and of the Province, were defined, so methodical did the regulations of the Church very soon become. Of the Diocese,—for it is incidentally said in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, "Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the will of the Father, as the Bishops, who are settled according to their districts, are of the will of Jesus Christ." Of the Province,—for we find a phrase no less incidentally dropped in his Epistle to the Romans, relating to his own journey, to this effect: "The Churches which do not belong to me have assisted in forwarding me by city;"<sup>2</sup> as though the extent of his jurisdiction, and what cities were included within it, were matters perfectly ascertained and understood. It may, perhaps, be added, that these limits of the Province and the Diocese could scarcely be so definite, and those of the Parishes, which were the spheres of labour of the Presbyters and Deacons be left undetermined.

THE NESTORIAN MASSACRE.—No. I.  
(To the Editor of The Banner of the Cross.)

My Dear Friend:—You ask me to give you some account of the recent events among the Nestorians, and of the causes which led to that awful massacre, of which the heart-rending details have reached your ears. I gladly comply with your request, and the more so because I have been myself most accurately and minutely informed of the whole matter from the

beginning. Those brutal murders of innocent Christians, which are to you a great and solitary tragedy, standing out in bold relief, unconnected with the causes that preceded and the consequences that followed them, are to me but a link in a chain of events which reached back through a long succession of years. You ask if it be true that they indeed arose from "the jealousies of rival Missionaries," as some of the newspapers have reported. Let me tell you the tale as it actually occurred, and you may then judge whether religious strife had any part in the matter. But let me first say whence the report to which you allude arose. A young man regaling himself with the summer air of the Bosphorus, has a weekly task of writing a letter to one of the London Journals. His stock of news is exhausted, and he turns in his mind how he shall accomplish his regular stint. He seeks for some easy subject of speculation, and the Nestorian Massacre presents itself. He has already given the details of it, and now he imagines that he may fill his sheet with an ingenious theory as to its causes. He pitches upon the differences which he knows are existing among certain missionaries in Mossoul, a city indeed far removed from the scene of action; but what can distant readers know of that? He frames his theory. In the place of facts he puts surmises, and by means of sundry vague insinuations and one rumour, which to a hasty penman may pass for a fact, he weaves the web of his story. Is one word of it true? Does he himself believe it? This is a matter of little importance. He has accomplished his task, and may now enjoy his repose. The letter goes to London, is published in one of the leading papers, and is seized upon by others. It passes to America, and there again runs through the papers. In how many I have seen it I can hardly tell, the self-same letter emanating from the idle brain of a young man on the Bosphorus. How much evil may come from one inconsiderate act! Did he reflect that he was injuring the good names of men to whom in many respects he might well look up for example and instruction? Not for a moment. He was amusing himself with his own ingenuity, and performing his task of a letter. He never dreamed of consequences. I brought the matter back to his recollection the other day. He had not a word to say in defence of his theory.

And it is possible, I have asked myself over and over again, that these idle lubrications of an idle letter-writer are taken by grave and intelligent men as sober truth? When I first saw the said letter in print, its gross absurdity, to me who knew the facts of the case, was so palpable, that I pointed it out to one or two others as a most eminent specimen of nonsense. But a little knowledge of facts and circumstances makes all the difference in the world; and of this story it may at least be said, that it is not more erroneous than some others that have been told of the East, and believed to.

But the subject is a serious one, and I will therefore proceed at once to give you some serious reasons why this strange speculation of the letter-writer is and must be, a false one, a mere fabrication that never had existence out of the writer's brains. No one here at Constantinople, I believe, ever dreamed of imputing the massacre to such a cause, excepting the author himself; and whether he believes it seriously or not, to one single cause, the lust of Mohammedan chiefs for dominion. The Nestorians, you well know, have been an independent people for centuries. Living in the retreats of their snow-clad mountains, they have escaped the action of changes which have swept over their country. They have been unmolested, excepting their occasional quarrels with the Kurds, among whom they dwelt for ages; and they might still have been unmolested, if the ambition of the Mussulman rulers had not looked with envy upon their liberty. The Turkish government has long been anxious to subject them to its sway, for they live within the nominal boundaries of Turkey, although owing no allegiance to its authority. A powerful Pasha was some years ago sent to subdue all the refractory and lawless tribes of Kurdistan, and bring them into subjection to the Sultan. This he had well nigh accomplished, when he was cut off by death. In the execution of his commission he advanced almost to the borders of the Nestorian country, and if his career had not so suddenly terminated, that would doubtless have yielded to his arms and intrigues, as did most of Kurdistan, to the west of it. But though arrested, the Turkish authorities did not abandon their purpose, and unfortunately they soon found an ally within the country itself. Nouroullah Bey, the chief of the powerful tribe of Hakkeri Kurds had long looked with a jealous eye on the power of the Nestorian Patriarch, who was a civil as well as a spiritual ruler, and as head of the Christians, was first chief of the mountains. Nouroullah Bey wished at once to break the strength of the Patriarch, and make himself a sort of Pasha over the whole country. For this purpose he courted alliance with some of the Turkish Pashas, promising that if they would aid him to subdue the country, he would rule as a subject of the Sultan. They listened to his suggestions, and helped him with means, and I believe also with men. With their assistance he gradually acquired strength, and in 1841 had an open rupture with the Patriarch. He even deceived some of the Patriarch's own people and attached them to his interests. All this happened before there was a Missionary in the land. In 1841 the Patriarch fled for refuge to another part of the country, (the Tevazi district), where among his own people he was safe at least from the Bey's design upon his person.

The Bey then sought to get him into his toils by stratagem, and sent him messages of peace, proposing to heal all their strifes by friendly conference. But the Patriarch would not listen to his proposals. Last winter, Nouroullah Bey sent two messages to the Patriarch, inviting him to come to a certain village and settle their differences in a fraternal interview. The Patriarch was warned by his own people that a snare was laid for him, and he evily declined the invitation. Nouroullah Bey, seeing that all hope of accomplishing his purpose by intrigue was cut off, set to Bedi Khan Bey, another powerful Kurdish chief, on the borders of Kurdistan, and proposed a joint expedition for invading the Nestorian country. Bedi Khan Bey, as eager for power as the other, readily accepted it.—The plan was formed, their forces joined, and they suddenly made an irruption into the Tevazi district, burning, slaughtering, and leading captive, as you have heard. This was the Nestorian Massacre.

And now, in all this, where is there any appearance of missionary or religious discord? The events were in progress before there was a missionary in the country. When Nouroullah Bey sent his last message to the Patriarch, the English missionary, who has had so much of the blame to bear, had but just reached Mossoul, and whatever contentions arose afterwards,—Neither Nouroullah Bey nor Bedi Khan Bey, probably ever heard of rival missionaries, or could now tell, if the question were put to them, that the missionaries in Mossoul are not all one body. It is idle to say that such men, wild barbarous Kurds, who know no more of western Christianity than of the religion of the South Sea Islands, could be governed by such a motive to make war upon the Nestorian Christians. These men were, I presume, never in Mossoul. Certainly they have not been there for years. They are Kurdish chiefs, who are as ignorant of most things beyond their own territories as of the regions of the

moon. There is one little incident that may serve to show you how little idea they have of rival missionaries or anything of the kind. It was necessary, before commencing their invasion, to give some pretext for it to the Pasha of Mossoul, whose country lay close upon that of the Nestorians, and whose sanction, or at least indifference, it was most important for them to secure. Dr. Grant, one of the American missionaries, had erected a spacious building on the mountains, which was intended for the use of his prospective mission. He had erected it with the knowledge and sanction of Nouroullah Bey, who was under special obligations to him for medical aid, and who well knew that his purpose was simply to educate the Nestorians and do good. But a pretext for the war was necessary, and a report was sent to the Pasha of Mossoul that the English were building a fort in the mountains, and might afterwards come and possess the land. The Kurds did not know enough to distinguish between English and Americans, but confounded them, as ignorant people generally do in this country. How little this looks like being moved by the rival jealousies of missionaries you will at once see. They did not even know that there were different bodies of foreigners at Mossoul.

English as well as Americans were involved by this pretext, and I happen to know that it gave the English missionary no small trouble. How idle then, and how wicked, how wicked, the insinuation, half conveyed, half withheld, by the letter-writer to whom I have alluded, that the English missionary himself was the author of the report to the Pasha? I cannot say with such dreadful trifling with truth and men's characters. It deserves the severest reprehension. The statement which I have given of the real and only cause of the massacre, is drawn chiefly from documents which have recently been before me from the Patriarch himself, and he, we must allow, ought to know the real origin of his troubles better than I. The history of the thing has been familiar to me for years. I was the first American who ever visited Mossoul, and I believe the first Protestant traveller who made inquiries among the Nestorians in that quarter. I knew of the state of things then or soon after, and more than a year ago, (before the English mission had reached Mossoul,) I was making efforts here to arrest the evils that were coming upon the Nestorians. How futile then to say that that mission, contending with the Americans, brought about these evils!

Trust I have said enough to show you that missionary operations or missionary jealousies, had nothing to do with the Nestorian massacre. You remark that the course of the Rev. Mr. Badger, the English missionary, has been much condemned. I agree with you in thinking that his hostile bearing towards the American missionaries is deserving of censure. No one regrets it more than I. No good, but much evil, must come of such contentions. But I should not do justice to the man, if I were not to say, that he is a friend to the Nestorians, and has been indefatigable in his efforts for their welfare. He has now with him three Nestorian priests, with their families, who have fled from their ravaged country, and are dependent upon him for their support. He has spared neither time nor labour to secure to the Nestorians their violated rights, to procure the restoration of the prisoners, and the re-establishment of the Patriarch in his own land. He is the last man to be suspected of injuring the Nestorians. He has shown himself, throughout these troubles, their unwearied benefactor; and of this all must give him the praise, however much his line of policy with regard to the other missionaries is liable to exception. You already know that I have no partialities which would lead me to speak better of him than he deserves, but I would render all his due.

Believe me, truly yours,  
H. S.  
CONSTANTINOPLE, Dec. 6th, 1843.

### THE SPIRITUAL RIGHTS OF THE POOR.

(From the Bishop of Exeter's Speech at the Meeting of the Plymouth District Association of the National Society.)

His Lordship, on taking the chair, said he felt great pleasure in being able to come among them to preside at their meeting on the present occasion. He said this with an especial reference to the incidents of the times in which they were living; for, however peaceable the state of things might be, however comfortable might be the prospect which now blessed the country through the better spirit manifested by all classes of the community, yet the memories of those present could not be so very weak as not to carry their minds back over a few years that had passed; and how full of fear were those years! A short time since to contemplate the prospects of the country for the year ensuing. A combination of circumstances had overwhelmed the country; while there raged an insurrection, such as had never before been beheld in Christian England, inasmuch as it was against religion as well as against the government of the country. That was the tremendous prospect a short time since. But now, by the blessing of God, that prospect had been ameliorated, and there appeared on the surface of things peace, harmony, and comfort. He presumed that he was now addressing persons who were satisfied that a great national sin had been committed by their neglect to instruct the people in the truths of religion—a sin which had extended over a long series of years, and with regard to which the people should, with bended knees, and contrite and humble hearts, fervently implore that, by the grace of God on their exertions, the country might be purged of it. The government of the country—and here he wished it to be distinctly understood that it was not for him to say whether the government had done wisely or not, done rightly or not, in looking at the question, not as once the government of the country would have met it, by making a demand on the public income, on the public revenues, for the instruction of the people—the government had not stood forward and said, "England shall be at the charge of sustaining those principles which have ministered so much to the honour and happiness, the stability and security of the country." He repeated, the security and stability of the country; and no country could be favoured with blessing, no country had a right to hope for that blessing, which forgot the task, the duty, of instructing her people, and in the neglect of that duty forgot the due sense of what belonged to the true dignity and honour of the nation. The grounds on which he justified the bringing before them of these considerations were to be found in the present state of the population of Great Britain. He thanked God that the lack of instruction and demoralization in the two counties which constituted the Diocese over which he presided, was comparatively speaking, very small; though, nevertheless, their condition was not so moral as it ought to be. But infidelity, apostasy, declared hostility, not alone to the institutions of men, but to the high behests of God, were the tenets of hundreds in other districts of the country. Fearful was it to contemplate this guilt; but then, had due efforts been made to implant good principles? They had seen in the manufacturing districts extensive populations in a short time spring up; millions of people had arisen in the course of half a century, in what were merely agricultural districts. Could they be astonished, when these large bodies of people lived to manhood, died, and then were succeeded by others, without due care for that most important knowledge, the fear of God, and above all the saving knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ—of their corrupt state—without the knowledge of the necessity of the

Holy Ghost, to tell them their duty to God and man and to strengthen them in their faith in his mercy—could they wonder that blasphemy and infidelity and moral degradation abounded? Where lay the sin? not merely in the deluded ones, but in the people; and it was in the people, because they were plainly told that it was their duty to redress the evil, as far as it lay within their power to do so. He saw around him a large number of respectable persons representing the large population and property of this neighbourhood. Seeing them there he must tell them, that even in that parish there was much that required amendment in reference to the points on which he was speaking, and that beside having a share in that local evil, they also shared in the common responsibility of the nation for permitting the accumulation of sin within its confines. He ventured, however, to assume, that if any one who now heard him had forgotten that they shared in that responsibility, they would now no longer forget it, but that they would show themselves alive to the duty which devolved upon them, and join in co-operating with those plans he was speaking in an exaggerated tone of the spiritual amelioration which had been devised, and which promised, under the blessing of God, to restore the happiness which the country once had, in being a Christian land. He begged them not to think that destitution, and consequent sinfulness of the land. He held in his hand the report of the National Society—he would not trouble them with many extracts—but what he had said in reference to the manufacturing districts, and the neglected destitute condition of the country, was corroborated by the report.—(Hear his lordship read several extracts from the Report of the National Society and of the Factory Commissioners.) He was satisfied that the country at large was animated by the feeling that the evil should no longer exist. He must, however, be permitted to tell them that there were considerations of a peculiar nature in their own town, which should impel them to be active in this work. In their own town a most enormous injustice to the poor was committed, even by those persons, wealthy and respectable as they were, whom he now saw around him. A most enormous injustice (continued his lordship emphatically)—an injustice committed in that part, in that very place, in which it might reasonably be thought it was impossible that injustice could be shown in the Church. They went to church in the hope that they were well-doing; they prayed to God, they acknowledged Him to be the God of all men; they prayed to God for forgiveness, they prayed to Him to give them grace to discharge the duties which the love of God, and the love of man for the sake of God, had imposed upon them; and there, in that very hour, in that very building, they took to themselves the exclusive privilege of worshipping God, the common God of all people, high and low. Yes, those who regarded God as the common God of all mankind, actually managed to thrust out from the walls of their churches all those who were too poor to pay for accommodation—for really the miserable pence assigned for the use of the poor was not worth mentioning. He repeated, it was a most enormous injustice, the discredit of which attached to every one present, for he concluded that every one present had availed himself of the means which were afforded of obtaining seats in these churches. And how were seats obtained? By paying money for them. But while they were paying money for themselves, had they not been careless, whether others, the poor, had the means of paying or not? They who had the means of doing so ought to pay money that the poor might be accommodated; but instead of that they paid for themselves, and caused the exclusion of the poor from their churches. He said this as their Bishop with authority, but not with arrogant authority, God forbid; but yet with authority he emphatically said it, that this wrong of the poor should be redressed. He would not come to that place year after year, and see the right of the poor man to be accommodated in his parish church stolen from him, for it was stolen.—The rich had no right to pews or accommodation beyond the poor man. They paid for their pews at church it was true; but no one, no churchwarden had a right to raise a revenue from the letting of pews in church. Yesterday he had had the opportunity of seeing the beautiful church which was the decoration of Plymouth. He had inquired when it was built; and he had been informed in the reign of Edward the Third. Now there must have been at that early period a lively sense of the benefits arising from a Christian population; for all the inhabitants of the town were then able to worship God. How many churches had been built since? One; and when? In the reign of Charles the First, and it was very remarkable that the act of parliament which separated Plymouth into two parishes gave the following reason. He quoted; he should state, from a bill which was brought into parliament thirty years since, and which might have done some good, but which had been abandoned, and perhaps, not one thought given to it since. In that bill he found a reference to an act of 16th and 17th Charles I, the act which at that period divided Plymouth into two parishes. The preamble of that bill stated that the population of the borough was so much increased, that the parish church was incapable of enabling all the people to attend Divine Service; and gave permission to the corporation to build a new church, that of the parish of Charles. Now in the reign of Charles, the noble church of St. Andrew was not large enough to contain the people; and it was felt that a necessity existed for building another. What was the population at that period? He was not able to say; but he was able to say what the amount of the population was in 1801. In 1801 the population was largely increased, and it amounted to 16,000. In the last census it was 36,520, thus they would see that the population had nearly doubled in about forty years. Now what had been done to provide church accommodation for this increased population? Absolutely nothing. As for the two proprietary chapels which were occupied by the rich, he accounted them as nothing—he scorned them; those chapels were built for the rich—they entirely excluded the poor. They were not Christian congregations; for to constitute a Christian congregation there must be a bending of the knees, the outpouring of the heart, and the uplifting of the prayers of all classes; in these proprietary chapels the rich had the opportunity of cheating themselves with the idea that they were doing their duty in attending divine worship; though at the very time they excluded the poor from performing their duty to God. Now he said that they robbed the poor by taking pews. They allowed the poor to crowd into the aisles and in the corners of the church; but what right had they, the rich, to pews more than the poor? The poor had as good a right to accommodation in the parish church as the rich; and he would tell them that no churchwardens were either morally or legally justified in appropriating pews while the mass of the population of the parish was not fully accommodated. The law relating to pews, the common law of the land, was that where the church was large enough to accommodate the whole population, then the churchwardens might proceed to appropriate pews; not so much with regard to rank of the parishioner—though they ought not to disregard the distinction of ranks—but rather in reference to the requirements of the case. But even in church there ought to be no broad distinction; the seats should be so arranged as to humble the rich with the reflection that whatever station and wealth they enjoyed here, all distinction must cease above, and to elevate those who knew they were hum-

ble, but had as good a prospect of heaven as the rich; churchwardens had no right to appropriate any part of the church until all the people were properly accommodated, and then they might assign the church as they liked, bearing in mind that the object was the accommodation of the people. But if this were not the case, then he must tell them that it was their duty to make the church as commodious for all classes as they possibly could. He hoped that he spoke in the presence of those who understood the subject; he ventured to appeal to those legal gentlemen whom he saw around him on the platform, whether he was oversteering the clear right of the poor man to accommodation in his parish church? How did they manage in this town? Why, they paid for pews; by these means the expenses of divine service were defrayed, and thus they escaped from a church-rate. This *quæstio vexata* had been the source of much mischief and disturbance in other parishes; but here they thought best to avoid it by paying for pews, or in other words, by making the poor pay it, by depriving them of church accommodation. The common law of the land was, that the rich should pay the church-rate; it was a charge—not a tax—on the rich, who were bound to provide for the public worship of God. The church-rate was a common law obligation upon the property of the land. But the people of Plymouth chose to say that they would not bear the charge; the rich would not pay it, the poor should, by being shut out of their churches at whatever peril to their immortal souls. He would make no apology for the plainness with which he had spoken; he should have felt ashamed; he dared not refrain from distinctly telling them what had been done, and what was their duty to do.

### WESLEYAN CHURCHMANSHIP.

(From the Wesleyan Chronicle, January 12.)

The controversy respecting the sale of the Church Catechism at the Depository of the Sunday-school Union, has given rise to some discussion in the columns of *The Patriot*, as to the practice of the Wesleyan Church; and, as usual, the writers betray a looseness of information on the subject perfectly unaccountable; considering the opportunities within every body's reach of acquiring accurate knowledge. One writer boldly urges, that, inasmuch as the *Wesleyans regularly use the Book of Common Prayer in all their Churches*, they must be taken to approve of the sale of the Church Catechism, and, consequently, of the sale of that formulary by the Sunday-school Union. We need not tell our readers that in this argument the premises are almost totally false. The dissent of the Prayer Book is the rule; the use of it, the exception. Were it otherwise, the conclusion could not be sustained. The Prayer Book might be both bought and sold without necessarily implying the approval of the Church Catechism; but, when the Catechism, by itself, is either bought or sold, there can be no question that the act implies approbation of its contents.

There being so much misconception in the public mind as to the position of the Wesleyan Church, in relation to the Established Church and to its formularies, it may be useful to state clearly what is the nature and extent of the *Churchism* of our body.

In Mr. Grindrod's *Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism*, under the head of "Rules relating to the Public Worship of God," we find the following regulation, for which the authority is "the large minutes":—"Wherever Divine Service is performed in England on the Lord's day, in Church hours, the officiating preacher shall read, either the service of the Established Church, our venerable Father's abridgment, or at least the lessons appointed by the calendar; but the Conference recommends either the full service or the abridgment." This is all the rule of the Wesleyan Church on the subject. It will be observed, that the lessons only are *imperative*; and that, as to either the full service of the Established Church, or Mr. Wesley's Abridgment, the Conference wisely confines itself to a simple *recommendation*.—The facts of the case are, that "Divine service is performed" in every Wesleyan Chapel in England "in Church hours," and that neither the full service nor the Abridgment is read in one chapel out of a hundred; so little inclination is there in the connection at large to identify itself with the Established Church, that, if the Conference should ever be so ill-advised as to attempt to impose the Liturgy upon the congregations, the consequences would be disastrous in the extreme: There is not in Christendom a body of Christians more tenaciously attached to *freedom of worship*.

It will serve to open the eyes both of Churchmen and of Dissenters, as to the nature and extent of Mr. Wesley's Churchmanship, and that of those of his followers whose influence is supposed to prevail in the councils of the connection, if we compare his Abridgment with the authorised Book of Common Prayer.—The former is entitled "*The Sunday Service of the Methodists; with other Occasional Services*." London: published by J. Mason, 14, City-road, and sold at 66, Paternoster-row, 1842." It contains prayers for Queen Victoria, and for the Royal Family. This circumstance, as well as the date, proves it to be designed for present use, and to have the continued approbation of the Conference.

Omitting the prefatory matter, the Abridgment begins with the Calendar. Mr. Wesley strikes out of the Epiphany, with Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sundays, and Lent, as relics of popery. Substituting "particular days" for "holidays," he turns all the saints' days, and reduces the long catalogue to three—Christmas-day, Good Friday, and Ascension. The multifarious tables of feasts and fasts, moveable and immovable, are rejected, and the fasts reduced to "all the Fridays in the year, except Christmas-day."

In the order for Morning Prayer, the Abridgment omits more than half the Scripture sentences, curtails the preliminary address, substitutes a brief prayer for the absolution, omits the *Venite, Euclymnia, Benedictio*, and the *Benedictus*, all repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and the sentences preceding the Collects; in the Prayer for the Queen, the words *most and lady* are omitted from the expression "our most gracious sovereign lady;" in the "prayer for the Clergy and people," the words "all the Ministers of Thy Gospel" are substituted for "our Bishops, and Curates, and all congregations committed to their charge;" the Prayer for all Conditions of Men, and the General Thanksgiving, are included, to the exclusion of the Litany; and the service ends with the Prayer for Chrysoptom, and the Benedictio.

In the order for Evening Prayer, we notice the same or similar alterations, curtailments, and omissions.—*The Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis* are retrenched. The Creed of Athanasius is wholly rejected. The Litany, which by the Church is ordered to be said or sung on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times when commanded by the Ordinary, is set down by Mr. Wesley "to be said upon Wednesdays and Fridays" days, however, upon which there is no service in the Wesleyan Chapels, unless in some circuits the week-night preaching may fall on the evenings of those days. In the petition for Christian Ministers, instead of "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," we read, "the Ministers of the Council and all the Nobility," is wholly omitted; and all the occasional prayers and thanksgivings, except the two before mentioned, are left out. The Collects, &c., for what is called holidays and saints' days, are rejected as smacking of popery, and those for Sundays, and for Christmas-day, Good Friday, and Ascension-day, only retained.

Clement Rom. Ep. i. § 40. 41. p. 168. v. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Canon Apostol. 27. p. 442. V. i. τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἐκείνου ὅρους αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἡγέμεθα αὐτῶν ὡς ἐσθλαρὸν &c. &c.  
<sup>2</sup> Ignat. Ep. ad Polycarp. § 7. s. p. 43. V. ii.  
<sup>3</sup> Ignat. Ep. ad Rom. § 2. p. 27. V. ii. τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἑστῆς καθήκοντος ὁ θεὸς σὺν ἡμῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι.  
<sup>4</sup> South. Reliq. Sacr. V. i. p. 470. It may be added, in confirmation of what has been advanced in the text, that there exists a certain spurious Epistle, professing to be from Maris of Cassabolum (a city of Cilicia), and containing a request that he would send a Cassabolum a Bishop from a neighbouring district, and two Presbyters, whom she names.—So that, whenever this Epistle was written, it is clear that Cilicia was then under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Antioch, and so were its Bishops. See the Letter in the Patres Apostol. Cotelier. V. ii. p. 100.  
<sup>5</sup> South. Reliq. Sacr. V. i. p. 170. 183. Φιλιππον ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν.  
<sup>6</sup> Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. § 3. p. 12. V. ii. ἐπίσκοποι αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁμοθυμῶν.  
<sup>7</sup> Ep. ad Rom. § 9. p. 30. καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ μὴ προσηγορεύου, τῷ ὀνόμ τῶν ἐκείνου πρεσβυτέρων.