
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



THE
PRESENT STATE
OF THE
TINNEVELLY MISSION.

Second Edition, Enlarged,

WITH AN HISTORICAL PREFACE,
AND
REPLY TO MR. STRACHAN'S CRITICISMS;
AND
MR. RHENIUS'S LETTER
TO
THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

BY A. N. GROVES.

LONDON:
JAMES NISBET AND CO. BERNERS STREET.

MDCCLXXXVI.

TRACTS BY MR. RHENIUS.

1. UNION OF ALL CHRISTIANS.

**2. REVIEW OF A WORK, ENTITLED, THE CHURCH,
HER DAUGHTERS, HANDMAIDS, &c.**

Both are now re-published in England, and may be had at Messrs. Nisbet & Co.'s.



PREFACE

TO

THE SECOND EDITION.

TINNEVELLY is the name of a district or province in the extreme South of India, which for ten years and more has been remarkable for the peculiar success granted to the labours of Missionaries. Palamcotta is the principal town, though there is also a town or village named Tinnevelly. Protestant churches were first formed there, by the preaching of Sutyadanen, a native ordained by Schwartz and Jænicke, missionaries in the employ of the Christian Knowledge Society, who appear to have formed high hopes of the progress of the gospel among a population barbarous and untutored, but on that account less wedded to caste and the whole Hindoo system: Jænicke himself laboured at Palamcotta awhile; but the effort was not followed up. A certain advance was made under native teachers, but the Society having withdrawn its aid, the churches soon declined from the measure of purity which they had at first: so that in 1817, Mr. Hough, chaplain to the East-India Company at the station, found them destitute of competent teachers, few in number and interesting chiefly from their docility. He exerted himself for their revival, during four years of his residence there: and forming, as Jænicke, sanguine hopes concerning the whole province, importuned both the Christian Knowledge Society, and again the Church Missionary Society, to send missionaries thither. Each Society attended to the call, but the latter with more promptitude, and sent thither Messrs. Rhenius and Schmid, presbyters of the Reformed Church of Germany, in the year 1820. Mr. Rhenius has continued to labour there, until the events which occasioned this tract: Mr. Schmid separated from the Society a few years back, owing to differences about Church discipline. He afterwards rejoined them, so as to labour under their auspices in another sphere, where these difficulties are for a while suspended. At a later period Mr. Schaffter was joined to them, another German presbyter; and Mr. Fjælstadt, a Danish Episcopalian, who peculiarly gave his attention to instruct the catechists in knowledge that should qualify them as pastors. More recently still, the Society has sent thither Mr. Müller, and not much more than a year ago Mr. Lechler; both of them Germans, who had submitted to ordination from English Bishops. In June 1834 the mission contained 117 native teachers, 127 chapels and houses of prayer, and above 10,000 souls under systematic Christian instruction, of whom (as appears by the table annexed) 1,314 adults and 715 children have been baptized. The testimony given by Mr. Tucker, (Secretary at Madras to the

Church Missionary Society) to the flourishing state of the mission, is the more remarkable, as it was delivered *after* the present Bishop of Calcutta had stated in a public charge that Rhenius was subverting their faith by his novel doctrine concerning Church discipline. Such, however, is the deeply interesting Mission, a nursery perhaps for native Missionaries to preach far and wide in India, the welfare of which is now endangered, by whose fault God will judge. The Society has dissolved their connection with Rhenius, who has now to look for the support of the mission to the Christian public at large.

Note.—The above is compiled from papers left by Mr. Groves, who has sailed for India. The Editor finds a *second* Mr. Schmid named in the "Brief Account," p. 15, of whom nothing is said here.

TABULAR VIEW OF THE TINNEVELLY MISSION.

No. of Catechists.	Assistant Catechists.	No. of the Villages.	Number of the Districts.	No. of the Chapels.	No. of small Prayer Houses.	No. of Families.	Baptized.			Candidates for Baptism.			Total of Souls.
							Men.	Women.	Children.	Men.	Women.	Children.	
4	9	24	District I.	3	10	218	197	153	207	82	89	86	814
4	8	29 II.	5	12	263	93	72	77	190	198	324	954
7	7	28 III.	5	12	466	88	71	122	364	345	517	1507
3	9	24 IV.	3	9	556	96	67	63	499	504	792	2021
2	7	24 V.	3	7	303	63	48	57	297	272	367	1104
3	8	32 VI.	2	9	194	25	13	22	181	156	219	616
2	11	23 VII.	1	11	412	20	6	13	445	394	598	1476
2	7	26 VIII.	0	12	140	53	46	57	86	81	112	435
3	9	18 IX.	0	10	204	60	50	62	172	166	170	680
4	8	29 X.	1	12	248	59	34	35	174	189	281	772
34	83	257	Total at the end of June, 1834.	23	104	3004	754	560	715	2490	2394	3466	10,379
	117												
	112	257	Total at the end of Dec. 1833.	23	104	2991	735	529	700	2423	2387	3512	10,286
0	5	0	Increase	0	0	13	19	31	15	67	7	0	93
			Decrease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	0

A BRIEF ACCOUNT,

&c.

IN bringing the affairs of the Tinnevelly Mission before those whom I am anxious to interest in its behalf, it may be necessary to meet the earlier objection; which will arise against my personal interference in the affairs of a Mission, belonging, in the apprehension of many, to others. To this I will reply by simply relating how it became an object of interest to me; and in doing this, I shall be led into a statement of those facts, which placed me in my present position; as they at once form the basis of my own exertions in Mr. Rhenius' favour, and of the arguments I would use in inducing others to join me in the advancement of an object, which I feel so intimately connected with the prosperity of the Lord's work in India.

On my arrival in Bombay in the Autumn of 1833, I found the Christians there greatly interested in the question pending between Mr. Rhenius and the Church Missionary Society, as to the future mode of conducting the Tinnevelly Mission. Their interest about its welfare had been excited and kept alive from the success granted it in connection with the labours of Mr. Rhenius and Mr. Schmid. They felt that in matters of Church government the consciences of Missionaries should be respected, and greatly deprecated any such interference as might lead to their separation from their people. But the immediate cause of their apprehension was the communication they had received from Mr. R. of his proposed return to Europe for a time; and I was requested by those most interested, to write to him to delay his journey till I had seen him, and had set before him reasons for his not absenting himself from the mission at the present crisis. Indeed these friends had previously written to him in the strongest terms, dissuading him from forsaking the mission; and (what I mention to evidence the strength of their feelings) declared that in case of his withdrawal the mission must not count on their continued contributions.

But that the merits of the case may be more fully understood, I shall (before detailing the result of my visit) endeavour in as few words as possible to give a simple and true statement of things as they then stood, and also of the means by which they had been brought to that position. It is well known to those acquainted with missionary labours, that both the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, and that for Promoting Christian Knowledge, as well as the Church Missionary Society, have in carrying out their operations in the East, availed themselves of the labours of German Christians, who, as belonging to the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, held of course with them, Protestant principles. The case of Schwartz and others,—whose success as to labours in India, were matters of notoriety, seemed doubtless not only to justify, but to encourage the succeeding managers of these Societies in pursuing the plan of their predecessors, by availing themselves of the same help as opportunity offered; and that, without any reference to peculiarities of Church government.

In the Year 1820, whilst Mr. Rhenius was labouring in Madras, disputes* first arose between the Committee and him; relative to the degree of conformity with the Church of England that was to be expected from the German brethren. Mr. R. so tenaciously contended for the liberty of his own Church, (which in its fullest extent had been advantageously exercised by Schwartz and other approved missionaries,) that for the sake of peace, it was thought best to send him away from Madras to Tinnevely; a mission† founded and continued by Germans of the same principles with himself. These principles were then thoroughly understood, nor have they since changed. When Mr. Rhenius arrived, he entered into his field of labour with his characteristic zeal and steadiness of purpose. The Lord greatly prospered his labours, until the mission from a very small beginning grew to what it now is; under the carrying out of those simple principles, which as I before observed had been so blessed under Schwartz and others. Indeed, as long as India was without a Bishop patronizing the Church Missionary Society, Mr. Rhenius remained quite unmolested as to the question of episcopal interference; and so far from the Church Missionary Society discountenancing ordination by the German brethren, it is a remarkable fact, that on Bishop Middleton's refusing to ordain Mr. Bowley of Chunar, the Church Missionary Society applied to the German brethren, to confer the authority they considered necessary. In this instance, as in others, the qualification of the German brethren to set apart for the ministry was entirely recognized. No one will be at a loss therefore to comprehend the ground of the present differences, which sprang up the instant that application was made to the Home Committee for leave to ordain some of their catechists in 1831. The mission had then grown to such an extent, as to render the European brethren perfectly unequal to the discharge of their ministerial duties; and therefore it required the native assistance to carry them on, particularly in reference to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Mr. Rhenius having experienced the inestimable value, in such a country, of native help in those ministrations on which they had already entered; was anxious to tread in the steps of his able and successful predecessors, and to allow these men whom he had proved so efficient in what he esteemed the more difficult ministry of *the word*, to be recognized as competent to the discharge of ministries which he thought needed less care and qualification, I mean the administering *the Lord's Supper*, to the churches in which they already dispensed the word of life, and *baptizing* those, whom they had been themselves mainly instrumental in bringing into the fold of Christ.

This necessity then as I have observed of native help, recognized as competent fully to assist them in all their labours, gave birth to the present differences. For on communicating to the Society these necessities, the present question at issue, viz.—Who should ordain them? was for the first time originated. On applying for the exercise of that which they felt to be their privilege, the German brethren were naturally aggrieved in finding themselves excluded from the rights their predecessors had fully enjoyed; which the Society had in the case of Mr. Bowley not only sanctioned, but solicited; and which for above half a century, the two elder societies had fully recognized and encouraged in their German Missionaries. In fact I might add, every native missionary connected with these two societies has been ordained by the Germans; as well those labouring in Tinnevely, as those now in Tanjore. The instances of such ordinations are too numerous

* See Reply, p. 22.

† See Reply, pp. 23, 24.

‡ See Reply, p. 25.

to be recorded here;* and prove, that while the services of the Germans were accepted by the said societies, their claims as a church of Christ were likewise respected and recognized in carrying on their work. The aged Kholof, now alive in Tanjore, was himself ordained by Schwartz, and under the sanction of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, as I observed above; and has ordained a large number of their missionaries, now labouring both in Tanjore and Tinnevely.—But to return to the case of Mr. Rhenius; it should be distinctly understood, that notwithstanding *Mr. R. had not in the least† changed in his views,—but the change had flowed out of the altered circumstances of those who appointed him*, yet so far from desiring to claim exclusive right to ordain his converts, he had no objection to the laying on of the Bishop's hands, considered in itself; but only to *those obligations and subscriptions*, which he conscientiously believed wrong: which had never been required of himself, nor of his predecessors; and which, so far from being able to press upon his spiritual children, he felt bound to dissuade and oppose by all the influence he might have over their minds, if others should urge it upon them: feeling at least this authority resting in him, with respect to the great majority of them, that “though he were not a missionary unto others, yet doubtless he was to them,” and had been owned as such of God.

It is not by any means my purpose to institute a comparison between the relative excellence of the Church of England system, and that which Mr. Rhenius has followed, and is disposed to follow; of neither of which I am a member: but I would only allude to them as matters of opinion, in which both parties seem equally confident. Mr. R. has however this advantage in his favour, that his success and that of his brethren under their own system is a tangible fact, visible to the eye; while the suitability of the other to India, is as yet in any equal degree an unrealized hope. For it is notorious that none of the Indian missions are to be compared to that of Tinnevely, save those of Nagercoil and Neyoor in the kingdom of Travancore, which are conducted on similar simple principles. Yet so anxious was Mr. Rhenius to remain in connexion with the society to which he had been so long united, that he made all the proposals he could devise, to meet the exigency. *First*; he offered that the Bishop should ordain them, either on the Bible (as he himself was ordained,) or, with such modifications of the subscriptions as he felt to be essential to truth. This was rejected. *Secondly*; he wished, if this could not be, that they might be allowed the same privileges as the elder societies had allowed their missionaries. This proposition suffered the same fate. *Thirdly*, and subsequent to the whole, he would have been willing that neither the one nor the other should ordain, if they might without ordination be allowed to administer the Lord's Supper to their flocks, and to baptize; esteeming the mere form of ordination of little moment. He also had offered, and subsequently agreed, to go to England to consult with the committee there, as to the possibility of arranging with them some plan of labour which would not involve his conscience. This he had at length decided upon, and was on the point of leaving India for that purpose, when he was stopped in the prosecution of his plan by the united and all but universal remonstrance of his friends in India, (*including all his colleagues in service, and most of the committee in Madras,*) who considered his presence essential to the prosperity of the mission. It was after weighing

* Mr. Strachan seems to doubt this, or to try to make his readers doubt it; but the fact is most certain.

† See Reply, p. 22.

‡ See Reply, p. 25.

together all these arguments during my visit to him, that it became his deliberate judgment to give up his plans for Europe, and under any circumstances to remain by the work which he felt the Lord had made his by prospering him in it. And it was with these mature and final views of the course of conduct he should pursue, and with these impressions on his mind, that he and his colleagues wrote a joint letter to the committee, intimating at once his intention to give up the idea of going to England, and his desire henceforth to go on with his work, upon such principles as the word of God and the welfare of his flock might demand. In settling on this as the only plan, and as the step best suited to the interest of the mission, it was fully his impression, though not my own,* that the Church Missionary Society would themselves see the inexpediency of pressing episcopal ordination on the catechists, or of attempting to new-model on their own plans a rising and thriving mission, which as to church government had entirely imbibed the ideas of its spiritual fathers; and when none could suppose many of the converts very competent to discuss questions which their elders in the Lord could so little set at rest. But after an interesting interview with Mr. Tucker of Madras, (whom I shall ever love and most highly value,) I fully thought the stay of Mr. Rhenius would not affect his connection with the society, if only the desired permission were quietly ceded to him, (and to this effect I wrote to the friends in Bombay,) either to ordain his own catechists, or to allow them to baptize and administer the Lord's Supper without ordination; as they preached without it and had done so for years. I found however on my arrival in England, that these hopes were quite disappointed, and that the long efforts at reconciliation had terminated in the resolution of the Church Missionary Society to withdraw their support and dissolve the connexion which has for eighteen years subsisted between them, and during which one of the most interesting missions in India, and perhaps in the world, has arisen. It now contains about one hundred and twenty native catechists, and more than ten thousand natives either baptized, or fully under christian instruction.

Many have of late been endeavouring to attribute the cause of the final rupture between the Church Missionary Society and Mr. Rhenius, to his publishing two pamphlets, in which principles were advanced utterly subversive of the discipline and practice of the Church of England. But to those who know the rise and progress of the struggle of opinions, and the point to which things had advanced previous to their publication, it must be clear, that however these tracts may have been the *occasion*, the real *cause* lay much deeper.

To prove that it is not a mere surmise of mine, that the final rupture between the Committee and Mr. Rhenius was occasioned by other and weightier circumstances than the publication of his tracts, I need only say that Mr. Schmid had to his great trial,† separated from the Society before they were published. In reference to this subject he wrote thus to a friend during the period of his separation: "It is useless to spend our strength, health, and spirits in striving any longer with the Committee. My mind is already too much worn out in contending with them, and my body has

* I do not say this because I had any doubt of the real desire of the Members of the Church Missionary Society to concede all they could, but the discussion having become *openly* one of principles, in the present state of these questions in England, I felt they could no longer do that which had been done by their predecessors without risking more than they could gain, considering them as a party.

† See Reply, p. 31.

“suffered seriously thereby. And if they get Mr. Rhenius away from Tinnevely, what can such a poor invalid as I, subject to nervous irritability and low spiritedness do there? However, if requested to go back, I am resolved to go; though it is hardly probable they would send any but their own episcopally ordained men. Experience will teach them in due time, that *their* plans and Church principles draw down no blessing on the work; and they will perhaps hereafter have but to retrace their steps, when it is too late.”

This language may* be thought strong and intemperate, but it was from a man driven from the work on which his heart was set, and in which he had spent his strength, by the endeavour to superinduce on their prosperous mission, principles of action that he felt would be destructive to its prosperity; and the reality of this feeling was found by his casting himself, his wife and family into a state of painful dependence by the step he took rather than submit to it.

[So much I had written in the first edition. More recent events yet more decidedly confirm my statement; for now the three missionaries who remained behind at Tinnevely when Rhenius left, have all thrown up the Mission, rather than accede to the demands of the Committee. Yet two of these had received episcopalian ordination, and none of them had to do with the publication of the tracts.]

These tracts, or rather the more objectionable one to the Society, was written under the following circumstances. The senior chaplain at Madras, who had long been one of the most active members of the Church Missionary Committee, published a little pamphlet, entitled, “The Church and her Handmaids;” and when it was published, the author sent a copy of it to Mr. Rhenius to desire him to review it, knowing how opposed his views were to those contained in the pamphlet. Mr. Harper, the author, promised to publish Mr. Rhenius’ review in a periodical work of which he was the editor. This challenge Mr. Rhenius met with his usual energy, and wrote a reply containing strictures on the principles advocated in Mr. Harper’s pamphlet, and calling on Mr. H. to fulfil his promise of inserting it in his periodical. This for eight months he declined, till at last being† out of patience with this delay, Mr. Rhenius published it himself. Now I can quite feel, that under all the circumstances of Mr. Rhenius’ position, it might have been *wise* to have overlooked the provocation of Mr. Harper’s challenge; and when I saw the position of pain into which it brought Mr. Tucker, I was led to regret that I had ever joined in advising Mr. Rhenius to publish it; insomuch that I never circulated any copies of it in India, and only one or two elsewhere, till after the separation took place. But when this act is alleged as that without which the separation would not have taken place, I entirely disallow it. *The differences had commenced previous to the publication of the pamphlet*, and were not at all likely to be settled. But should the Church Missionary Society or its friends declare that they might have been settled

* I must warn the reader not to suppose with Mr. Strachan, that *I myself* think this “strong and intemperate”—I think it painfully true. Gentlemen in London can exercise “patience” at a cheap rate, in waiting as the Church of Rome has always waited, for the most opportune moment of enforcing her sway. This may be play to them, but it is death to the anxious Missionary.

† Mr. Strachan takes advantage of my expression, as though I meant to charge Mr. Rhenius with *causeless* impatience.

but for this pamphlet, I would ask for a simple answer to the three following questions; and let that answer decide.

1st. Can the Bishop ordain irrespective of the Church of England subscriptions?

2nd. Can the Society allow the Germans to ordain Catechists, contrary to their resolution communicated to Mr. Rhenius in their reply to his letter of 1831, wherein they declared it could *no longer* be allowed?

3rd. Can they allow the Catechists, without any laying on of hands, to act as though they had been so ordained?

If they can accept either of these alternatives, their connection with Mr. Rhenius *may be renewed to-day*;* but if they cannot, it is in vain to attribute an inability to act together to the *publication* of these pamphlets, rather than to that *internal* essential dissimilarity of principles, which never did and never could harmonize; as many years of misunderstanding have proved. Myself I cannot but believe that though for a time they might have wavered about casting off such a servant, they would have found it difficult to persevere in countenancing a person, who so decisively held, and so distinctly announced to them, sentiments which they could not permit *published* to the world: sentiments, be it remembered, not new to Mr. Rhenius, but avowed by him to them from the beginning of his connection with them. Mr. Rhenius also would have had as much reason to doubt the honesty of his own position while concealing them; for it is one of the simplest principles of truth, that what I would not† justify before the world, I would not allow at all. And it should be remembered that Mr. Rhenius, independent of his pamphlet, was no longer capable of throwing the question into the back ground, in the manner which, it appears, was possible before the Church Missionary Society, (contrary to his most earnest desire, and the universal previous practice,) sent among his people men episcopally ordained. If the society wished to suppress the discussion of these questions, their plain and obvious plan was to continue the previous practice of sending men of one mind together. And my impression is now, what it was when contemplating all the circumstances of the case on the spot; that for the peace of the Society, of the Missionaries, and above all, of the native members of the mission; if the prosperity of truth and the Lord's kingdom be the supremely absorbing question; it is infinitely better that the division should take place, than that such elements of constant discord should be brought into the midst of this simple people. Those who believe the Spirit to be every thing, and forms, as such, to be nothing; and who do not believe the Spirit to be connected with any forms; may well live together in unity in spite of their preferring different forms. But forcibly to introduce brethren who not only prefer their own forms,‡ but prefer them with a

* So I wrote in the first edition.

† Mr. Strachan quotes my words as, *publish to the world*; and imputes to me the absurd sentiment, that honesty forces a man to obtrude on the world all his opinions however crude, on every subject however doubtful. My language perhaps was not logically exact, yet I think a candid interpreter needed not to doubt the meaning. Mr. Rhenius had been *attacked* for his opinions, and was *challenged to reply*; and I repeat, it was right that he should be ready to *justify them before the world*. Besides, a little attention to the facts would show, (what ought to have been allowed to modify or explain my meaning,) that Rhenius was *acting* on his opinions. They were not half-formed thoughts, concealed in his bosom, but long matured matters of practical judgment. And might he not naturally and justly be anxious, lest any of the catechists should think that he was either unable or afraid to reply to an attack on the practice, nay on the very existence of his Church, as a Church of Christ?

‡ Perhaps it is not wonderful that Mr. Strachan here misunderstood. For the expla-

preference so exclusive, that they cannot allow of any others as comely and pleasing to God; whose episcopal views force them to unchurch all Protestant churches except that of England, or at least to treat others as insubordinate and disorderly; in this I can see nothing but a source of constant jealousy, controversy, division and evil surmisings. I feel therefore individually called upon as an eye-witness and one who acknowledges the interests and prosperity of truth and of the Lord's kingdom, to have a demand on my exertions above and independent of all human thoughts and views, to state the following details, in the hope of obtaining the co-operation and support of those who view the case as I do, and thereby relieve the Tinnevelly Mission from its anxious position.

Our present object then is, by pecuniary means as simply as we can to support Mr. Rhenius, his fellow labourers and the numerous catechists, in their work; and to provide further help for them in the prosecution of their labours, should it be needful, on their own footing, without in any measure joining ourselves to the mission as fellow workers within it; that the existing confidence of the christian public may not be shaken in a mission in the prosperity of which they have felt and manifested so deep an interest.

The current expenses of the Mission are considerable, not less than between two and three thousand pounds a year, and besides this there will be at first many incidental expenses, as Mr. Rhenius* has of course to give up to the Church Missionary Society, their houses, churches, &c. and must provide others, though these will be of the simplest kind. The catechists and families cost less on an average than ten pounds a year each; the churches, containing each two hundred people, cost not more in erecting than ten pounds each, being principally mud, with palmyra leaf roofs, and the natives willingly give their labour to help their erection. The object of this letter is to get as many to subscribe as we can, towards the support of these catechists, who will be paid at the rate of from seven to ten pounds a year each, that these poor people may not be left destitute on the one hand, nor forced from under the paternal care of Mr. Rhenius on the other, by the pressing necessities of their circumstances; and any farther help for the schools and general purposes of the mission that we can.

Of their attachment to Mr. Rhenius, I can bear testimony; for on going among their churches after I had been in God's hand the instrument of preventing his leaving them for Europe, nothing could exceed their expressions of thankfulness and delight. Another interesting proof of their attachment to their teachers was manifested when Mr. Schmid † was by these contentions, relative to the enforcing Church of England views in Tinnevelly, at length driven from his post. The catechists, fearing he might with his family be in want, of their own accord united in raising among themselves two hundred and forty rupees, (about twenty-four pounds) which, though he refused to receive from them, they would not take back, but applied it to the purposes of the Tamul Tract Society.

It may be urged by some, why bring forward a question that involves in all probability such discussions and contention, in order to support one man? The fact is, it is not *one* man, or at least not such an one as can

nation, see Reply, pp. 26, 27. Mr. Groves' language certainly implies that the new missionaries had actually wrought mischief; which it appears was not the case. [Editor's Note.]

* Yet I feel it would be not merely *unkind*; it will be *unjust* in them to demand this. See Reply, p. 20.

† See Reply, p. 31.

supplied : for I may truly say, there is not a missionary among the Tamul population belonging to the Church Missionary Society, that could for one moment supply the place of Mr. Rhenius ; not only from comparative ignorance of the language, but from want of those peculiar sources of influence and weight that centre in him ; arising from his experience of their characters, and knowledge of their abilities, after a residence of near twenty years among them.

He is also a man of indefatigable zeal, and endued of God with those gifts which enable him to rule the minds of others completely but quietly.—His industry, aided by constitutional soundness, and a frame thoroughly inured to the climate, enables him to do more than two or three ordinary labourers could do,—for not only does he superintend the affairs of the Mission with a watchful care, but is engaged in translation till eleven or twelve o'clock at night ; I speak this, from personal knowledge of his habits during a residence of six weeks with him. He speaks and writes Tamul with a facility, which, if at all equalled by any on that field of Missionary labour, is equalled only by Schmid ; whose views on the question at issue are even stronger than those of Mr. Rhenius, (and who left this Mission in consequence of those feelings) and one or two brethren of the London Missionary Society, and one or two of the brethren of the American Missionary Society labouring in Ceylon.

The question then is not whether Mr. Rhenius shall be supported in his labours among these interesting people, but whether these one hundred and seventeen Catechists, and above ten thousand* Catechumens, (and I trust many of them true Christians,) shall be left without any adequate teacher. My judgment is not singular as to Mr. Rhenius' position in that Mission : I say, without danger of contradiction, that all his coadjutors, episcopally ordained, or otherwise, feel, that humanly speaking, in its present state it hangs upon him ; and whether they join him or not, should the Society cast him off, they were fully determined never to act against him.—I believe they will every one join him ; so important does the supporting him in the Mission appear to them, above all the questions for which its prosperity is endangered, or would be, were they all to withdraw.

In conclusion, I would only add that nothing is farther from my desire, than unnecessarily to wound the members of the Church Missionary Society, or to detail circumstances that may have come to my knowledge. For I am deeply impressed with this truth, that the majority of those who seek the knowledge of defects in the carrying out of any system, seek it not with a desire to mend, but rather to find pretence either for glorying in their own system, or for doing nothing at all. Hence my desire has ever been to keep the defects of every system as much in the shade as I could, consistently with the substantial interest of truth.

No one can be more fully persuaded than I am, that the issue of the Tinnevely question is most deeply mourned over by a large portion of the members of the Church Missionary Society ; and their not ceding all which Mr. Rhenius wished, and which their predecessors had granted without question, arose not so much from a peculiar want of personal liberality, as from circumstances which they could not controul, connected with the Church of England in India.

The course of conduct they have pursued, is only that choice of evils

† It was *professed Christians* in the first edition. This is *one* statement which Mr. Groves "has had to modify." See Reply p. 17. [Ed.]

which affords clearest present relief; but if I do not greatly mistake, it will produce portentous future evil, by uniting against their exclusive principles, every other body of professed Christians. However, these are only my own thoughts, and causes of regret in the matter; for I would have brethren to dwell together in unity: yet when this cannot be, always, as far as I can discern it, would I prefer the interest of the whole body to that of any section of it.

[To my statements in the first edition, I shall now only add some circumstances which have since happened. Mr. Rhenius's communications with me when in India, led me to feel that his sense of the moral power of the bond that knit him to his people, would prevent his leaving them, let the pecuniary supplies be either withheld or granted. But after the determination to separate him from the Society had led the Committee at Madras to claim absolutely, not only all the property of the Mission, but also the souls of the people; so that he saw there was no hope but of a most fearful exhibition of discord, if he remained: he determined, (as he says, "for peace sake,") to leave the Mission. His three brethren Schaffter, Müller, and Lechler, had agreed, notwithstanding Mr. Rhenius' departure, to remain; provided that no change took place in the internal structure of the Mission, till an answer came from the Home Committee. To this, Mr. Tucker, who was then present, acceded, subject to the approval of the Committee in Madras: and Mr. Rhenius had departed as far as Tutocorin with his family, to embark for Madras. But before he had actually embarked, a letter arrived from the Brethren who had remained behind, stating that the Committee at Madras had refused to accede to what Mr. Tucker had allowed; and that contrary to all custom and *the understanding under which the German Missionaries entered the service of the Society*, English Episcopalians were to be brought down into the Mission as its future conductors: and besides this, they were to make a written declaration, that they considered themselves as having no title whatever to the Mission, not even to the souls *converted* by their instrumentality; but that they all belonged to the Church Missionary Society: so that if the answer from home were to be unfavorable, they would quietly leave. Relative to the surrender of the souls of those given to them of the Lord, they could not consent. All left and found Mr. Rhenius at Tutocorin. The Church Missionary Society then entered on the Mission, assisted by John Devashayam, and however, as might naturally be expected, the Catechists were not happy in the change. About 90 out of 120 wrote to the Committee at Madras, to beg their Teachers might be restored to them. Letters also from them and many others were sent to Mr. Rhenius and the rest of the Brethren, entreating them to return, whether the Society would consent or no. Various letters also were sent to him, stating that in punishment for signing the letters just named, several of the Catechists had been dismissed, and many of the Seminarists severely flogged. The latter are young men preparing to become Catechists. Mr. Rhenius had his mind much exercised by these repeated entreaties to return, and distressing accounts concerning his spiritual children. He had no reason to doubt the truth of the facts, and therefore felt it his duty to return to Palamcotta, and take care that the flocks be not scattered nor the Catechists forsaken, for their attachment to the principles which he had felt it his duty, as an unfettered minister of Christ, to inculcate upon them. In fact he felt now by experience, what long before appeared to myself and many others to be his

plain and imperative path of duty; to take care of the children the Lord had given him. For this purpose he has now returned to Palamcotta, to see the actual state of things there. If he finds that the desire for his return which a large majority of the Catechists have expressed, is really a fixed feeling based upon principle, and no mere momentary ebullition of disappointment, I have no doubt that he will remain there.]

Money will be received by Messrs. Puget and Bainbridge, St. Paul's Church Yard, London; also by Henry Menzies, Esq. Exchange Rooms, Liverpool. I thus then conclude the case of the claims of the Tinnevelly Mission, and leave them to the prayerful regard and sympathy of my Christian brethren. I would earnestly solicit from them, such help as they feel themselves enabled *freely to give*, under the sense of having *freely received*; for the Lord loveth a cheerful giver. Any sums committed to my care, in conjunction with Henry Young, Esq. of the Bombay Civil Service, we will pledge ourselves to see faithfully administered, and as far as God gives ability, wisely, for the advancement of that cause, we have both so deeply at heart.

A. N. GROVES.

P. S. I had originally intended only to *print* a short account of the circumstances of the Tinnevelly Mission, and circulate it among those whom I more immediately knew; but a statement of the grounds of separation between Mr. Rhenius and the Church Missionary Society having been *privately circulated*, and the Charge of the Bishop of Calcutta having been *published* in England, (in which are contained reflections injurious to the character of Mr. Rhenius, as well as to the best interests of the Tinnevelly Mission;) I feel called upon to *publish* the preceding statement, and to make a few observations on the Bishop of Calcutta's reflections. In pages viii and ix of the Charge, the following passage is contained: "When, in addition to this, I discovered a system at work in the extreme South, (where I supposed the Missionaries of the Church Missionary Society, though the senior was a *Lutheran*, were *CONTINUING* to follow our general Doctrine and Discipline,) in direct opposition to our Protestant Episcopal Church, by the members of which they were sent out—a system so ruinous, in my judgment, to the holiness and peace of the new converts, as to threaten a subversion among them of Christianity itself."*

On these remarks I would observe, *first*, neither Mr. Rhenius nor Schmid are Lutherans at all; neither did they subscribe a Lutheran confession of faith, (the Augsburg.) nor any formal confession; but they were ordained on the Bible in, the Reformed Church.—*Secondly*; I confess my surprise is very great, to see the Bishop of Calcutta stating, that he supposed the Missionaries there "were *continuing* to follow the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England." Was the Bishop of Calcutta really allowed to be so ignorant, as not to be informed that that had never *been begun*, the *not continuing* in which he charges on Mr. Rhenius as an offence? But this really being the case, and the Mission having been founded, and having continued to flourish, *without* the adoption of the peculiar Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, I would entreat his Lordship to allow the whole force of his reasoning to stand for Mr. Rhenius; and join me in saying: "Therefore it will be ruinous to

* It may be proper to add, that I understand Mr. Tucker and the Committee at Madras to have so felt the injustice of these statements as to expostulate with the Bishop concerning them.

“ the holiness and peace of the new converts to attempt to force upon them the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England ; to which they had never been accustomed ;* as it would evidently threaten the subversion of their yet unestablished Christianity altogether.”

And is it not a practical refutation of the necessity existing at all for the adoption of this Doctrine and Discipline among the simple people in the South of India, that the two most prosperous Missions in India, (the Tinnevely and Travancore,) have risen and flourished without being in the least sensible of this necessity? And certainly the prosperous days for Tanjore were when none of this *peculiar* Doctrine and Discipline was known among them, or infused into their labours. What they then were, let Dean Pearson's Life of Schwartz shew ; and for what they now are, see the note of the Bishop of Calcutta to the eighty-ninth page of his Charge. I do not mean to say that in the days of Schwartz those evils did not exist ; but still I believe there was then mixed up with them much of a far more pleasing character. But when I was there last year, a most pious and excellent Missionary labouring among them told me, that to such a height had the corruptions grown, and so impracticable had the people become, that he much questioned whether it would not be better to forsake the whole Mission and begin somewhere else *de novo*: so little at least have the efforts of the Incorporated Society, with all the aid it could procure from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, been able to do in preserving, *much less extending*, what Schwartz and his immediate successors left accomplished ; if spiritual life, and not a name to which they now are an infamy and a disgrace, be that which our hearts dwell on as success.

In page 105, after alleging against Mr. Rhenius, (which is much easier than proving) “ perversion of ecclesiastical Records” and “ garbled quotations of all kinds ;” the Bishop of Calcutta concludes with the following sentence: “ There is such a thing as common honesty.” My own full conviction is, that Rhenius's name and work will remain in India as durable as lead in a rock, when all the accusations against him will be as records written in sand.

I am not willing to believe that such expressions ought to be attributed to any worse cause, than the most perfect unacquaintance with the real state of the case, and of Mr. Rhenius' person and character, and a natural unwillingness to enquire into it. But whatever opinion the Bishop of Calcutta may have formed of Mr. Rhenius' honesty, the Society who knew him much better, formed a very different one ; as I have the means of proving, if I felt at liberty to publish that which was communicated to another privately. And the ground of this charge of want of common honesty is so notoriously unjustifiable, that I again cannot but express my surprise at the following sentence of the Bishop of Calcutta's charge, p. 105. “ But the infatuation which could lead an eminent and most able and successful Missionary to attempt throwing the whole of the South of India, with its twenty thousand new Christians, into confusion, by a public attack on the Church in WHICH he was acting, speaks for itself.” This statement is far from the truth. Mr. Rhenius never did and never would act in the Church of ENGLAND, and so notorious was this feeling, that eighteen years ago he was sent from Madras FOR THIS VERY REASON, that he would *not* submit to Church of England rules.

* I have been amazed to find Mr. Strachan meet me by a direct denial. Has the Bishop deceived him, or what is to be thought? See on this, pp. 23, 24, 25, of the Reply.

The fact is, that Mr. Rhenius and the two Mr. Schmids were sent out without *the question ever being put to them in any shape* as to the FORM of Christianity which they intended to teach, and this they took as an honest evidence that the Society, like the Bishop, were "*not seeking to propagate their Episcopal polity, but the Gospel, the Good News, Christ the hope of Glory.*" And this case of the Tinnevelly Mission will afford a most favourable opportunity for all who hold similar views with these expressed by the Bishop of Calcutta on this point, not to *say*, but to *prove*, that it is not "*their Episcopal polity they are anxious to propagate,*" but the glorious hope of the everlasting Gospel.

If Mr. Rhenius has done this, (as the Bishop fully allows, in calling him *an eminent most able and successful Missionary,*) would it not be a most unchristian exercise of power, to use the aggregate influence of an ecclesiastical body, to the end of driving him from his people or even disturbing him in his work ?

R E P L Y

TO

MR. STRACHAN'S EXAMINATION OF MR. GROVES'S BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE TINNEVELLY MISSION.

IN the first edition of my "Brief Account," I endeavoured to state just so much, as would give the reader to know that Mr. Rhenius ought to be supported by the Christian Church, in ministering to his flock at Tinnevelly. In common with many of his friends, I felt that the question was not, whether his views of discipline were such as we individually approved; but whether he ought to be allowed freedom of conscience as a minister of Christ. I therefore touched as lightly as possible on any thing that seemed to inculcate the Church Missionary Society, and then only, when it was necessary to Rhenius's justification. I can truly say, that I bear them hearty good will, nor have I sought to expose any of what I thought their failings. While travelling in India, I felt it a pleasure to be able to serve their Missions, in any way that lay in my power: and was happy to be there the almoner of bounty to them by money committed to my discretion, to the amount of 300*l*. And in England, I have not volunteered to make known any of their defects; though not from wanting opportunity. This I name, to show how very far I am from hostility to the Society; whom I can never oppose at all, except where I feel they are opposing the will and work of God.

But since Mr. Strachan has published a pamphlet against my "Brief Account," broadly denying so many of my facts, as to make the whole appear a tissue of ignorance or of misstatement; and moreover stating or implying that I am a stirrer-up of division against the Society; I am brought into a different position. It is no longer possible to confine my reply to those things which really affect Rhenius's character and cause; but, if it were only in justice to those friends who have already contributed to him at my representation, it becomes incumbent on me to justify the statements I have made. Without this, their confidence in me would be most justly shaken, and their opinion likewise of Rhenius, (so far as dependent on my representation,) be proportionably uncertain. It is not to be expected that I, who was no actor in the affairs, should have much detailed knowledge for twenty years past, or be able to cope with Mr. Strachan and the Committee in minute accuracy: this I must leave to Mr. Rhenius. But it is a great satisfaction to add, that on the most careful perusal and reperusal of my "Brief Account," with all the light that Mr. Strachan has undertaken to throw on the subject, I do not find an occasion to modify a single statement in this second edition; though I have now tried to make my meaning more perspicuous.

There is doubtless something very imposing in Mr. Strachan's position, as a controversialist on this question. Having been a personal actor in it from the beginning; being now a member of the Committee, with access to all the documents of the Society, and upheld by all the ability of the Committee; it seems to place an isolated individual like myself at fearful odds. Yet, it is the cause of the Lord: and my heart is unconscious of a wish, but that truth may triumph. Should Mr. Strachan's pamphlet with all these advantages go unanswered, it cannot but be considered as truth; especially as the large majority who will read it must naturally wish it true. Yet in balancing the argument, it must be remembered that Mr. Strachan does not stand in these transactions as a disinterested witness. He has been an active agent in all the measures pursued towards Messrs. Rhenius and Schmid these twenty years; I believe, most truly from what he felt to be conscience; yet this is the *fact*. Also his access to the records of the Society, while it seems to ensure for him a correctness in minor matters unattainable by myself, does also enable him to select from a correspondence of many years, just as much as he pleases. That the impression which he thus sometimes makes is unfair, I think I shall show.

I have to complain of Mr. Strachan's at all events most careless misquotations of my words. For instance, I said Mr. Rhenius's pamphlet was "subversive of the discipline and practice of the Church of England," which Mr. S. twice quotes "*doctrine and discipline*," pp. 34, 64. Again: I have spoken of one of Mr. Rhenius's tracts, as "that one which was more objectionable to the Society:" but Mr. Strachan refers to my words, as though I had called it an *objectionable publication*, p. 34. Again: I said, The Church of England system had not succeeded in Indian Missions in any equal degree with the Independent systems. These limiting words are left out, and the sentiment is made absolute. This is at least careless. Again: in speaking of Mr. Schmid's letter, Mr. Strachan makes me say: *The tone is strong and in-*

temperate : whereas I said, *This may be thought strong and intemperate*, and went on to deprecate such a judgment by referring to the circumstances of aggravation under which it was written. Again, p. 35, he imputes to me the words, *publish to the world*, where I said, *justify to the world* ; and then says that my proposition “refutes itself.” But the proposition is his, not mine. Again, p. 64, he represents Mr. Rhenius as “having stated in the early period of his connexion “with the Society, that he and Mr. Schmid *professedly adhered from principle to the doctrine “and discipline of the Church of England.”* I can only suppose this to be another version of the words quoted in p. 8, where Rhenius and Schmid say : “They are attached to the “Church of England, and from principle have introduced her *Liturgy.*” Rhenius has since then learnt much more about the Anglican system, and does not love it the more ; yet even now, to the Church of England, considered as a body of men, he is doubtless attached—but never at any time was he attached to the *discipline* of the Church of England. With the measure of knowledge which he then had, and situated as he was, he was then from principle attached to the *Liturgy.* But rightly to appreciate the value of such a profession on Rhenius’s part, the reader ought to be informed that in Germany the Manuals of public prayer are not *compulsory* on the clergy ; but they use as much or as little as they please, modifying also and adding at discretion : insomuch that the Lutheran and Reformed Churches worship together indiscriminately. Nor is it until of late, that endeavours have been made by the Royal authority in Prussia, to subvert the liberty of the Churches in this particular. Rhenius would thus judge of our *Liturgy*,* as of the German Liturgies ; without a thought of subjecting himself to it, and much less to the *discipline* of the Anglican Church. And I feel satisfied that if the whole of the letter were produced from which Mr. Strachan is quoting, we should find that Rhenius is using words of courtesy and kindness, to modify (as far as truth would allow) something that he has been advancing *against* the system of the Church of England.

Indeed generally I must express my conviction that Mr. Strachan has not made the fairest use of the correspondence of Mr. Rhenius and Mr. Schmid. Mr. Strachan seems throughout his whole tract to refer to *my* ignorance of circumstances. My complaint of him is the reverse ; that knowing so much, he quoted so partially. I have seen, have heard, and have read : I cannot now *quote* (though perhaps Mr. S. can) : but I say, let any one have access to the *whole correspondence* of Rhenius and Schmid with the Society ; yes, to Mr. Schmid’s even since his rejoining them ; let only his voluminous letters written from the Hills to the Committee at Madras be fairly read ; and then let any one judge how far Mr. Strachan’s representations are borne out by facts.

I might further remark on the extreme confusion of his historical matter ; which I trust is accidental, but to persons unacquainted with the subject, tends to leave a most fallacious impression. As however I mean to dwell on the details of this subject, I shall say no more about it now. I mean to arrange my matter under the following heads :—

- (1) On the Relation between the Missionaries and the Society.
- (2) On the Causes which removed Rhenius from Madras.
- (3) On the Foundership of the Tinnevely Mission, and the Results of Mr. Hough’s Services.
- (4) Systems and Forms used in that Mission.
- (5) Co-operation of Episcopalians with Rhenius.
- (6) Want of Success in certain Missions.
- (7) Mr. Groves’s Interference.
- (8) Mr. Schmid’s Case.

RELATION BETWEEN THE SOCIETY AND ITS MISSIONARIES.

I know that some would briefly dispose of the whole case, by asking, *May not the Society claim to command its own servants?* But even hired servants have some contract and stipula-

* An extract from Rhenius’s pamphlet entitled, “Union of all Christians,” will show his views on this head.

“With these views it will be easy to allow others to differ in the form of worship. This does not imply, that each party shall give up his form or esteem it lightly, if he is convinced that his form is most agreeable to Scripture, and most tending to the great ends of edification and sanctification, let him retain it : but at the same time exercise modesty with respect to others, who claim equal conviction. And this modesty must not be merely as a compliment paid to others, with a secret dislike both to the person and his form, but cheerfully admitting that though he thinks *his* best, yet the other may be as good, if not better ; and that God can make use of the meanest instrument to extend his kingdom and the salvation of sinners : *he ought not to disdain occasionally to join also with his brethren, who worship in another form, and to assist in ministering there, also whenever need be.* This difference in forms of worship should be considered just as different customs are in the common course of life. A person has a certain order in his household, which he thinks best, and prefers to that of others : but on that account he does not disdain to accommodate himself to the rules of another man’s house, even though he might not approve of them. Sociability and good feeling are not at all disturbed thereby. Now let the various forms of worship be looked upon in the same view, and we shall soon see an end of all evil feelings and heart-burnings which have so long harassed the Christian Church.”

tion; and as I am convinced, that, in any point of view, Rhenius will be shown to be in the right, I shall not abrink from this mode of statement. Rhenius and Schmid were members of the Reformed Church of Prussia. Such they professed themselves to the Society; as such they were engaged and sent forth. They were not warned that they would be required to conform as to matters of discipline, nor was it enquired of them after what system they would model their Churches. Rhenius and Schmid were brought up at the Missionary Seminary of Berlin, over which John Jænicke presided, brother of Joseph Jænicke, the fellow-labourer of Schwartz. Having before their eyes their example, and indeed the uniform dealing of the Christian Knowledge Society with its Missionaries, they supposed that they would be allowed altogether the same liberty. In the absence of any disavowal from the Church Missionary Committee, I appeal to any man whether Rhenius was not justified in expecting that he would be treated as Schwartz was treated? The Committee indeed (Aug. 2, 1831, p. 27 of Mr. Strachan) allege that *rules cannot be overturned by exceptions*, and that the liberty given to Schwartz and others was but an exception to a rule. But this I am justified in positively denying. It was no exception, but the very rule itself. No counter rule had ever been laid down, and the undeviating practice was according to that, which is now termed an *exception*. The Committee do not pretend that they ever hinted to him the new modes of dealing which they have lately assumed. Mr. Strachan says that the case of Schwartz is dissimilar, and that Mr. Rhenius had no right to count on being treated similarly. But the ground alleged, (as indeed in the letter of the Committee, Aug. 2, 1831,) is not that the case of Schwartz and the case of Rhenius is dissimilar, but that the situations of the two Societies are dissimilar. Their position has changed, not the position of the Missionaries. It is easy for the Committee to say, *We have a rule*; but I ask, At what period was that rule made? when was it published? did they inform Rhenius and Schmid of this rule of theirs, when they engaged them? *We have now a Bishop in India*, says the Committee. So they had when they formed their connexion first with Rhenius. True; but he had not then letters patent for ordaining natives. This may be a weighty argument with the Society, yet at least they ought to justify Rhenius in treating it as worthless. His church knows nothing of His Majesty's letters patent. He could never have foreseen that on such an event, as His Majesty's enlarging the Bishop's powers, the Society would claim to modify the principle of their contract with their Missionaries. Nay, however high the Committee may now talk about their Church principles, we well know that it was not always so. Twenty years ago, though individuals may have whispered to themselves, *If ever we can get a Bishop in India to ordain the natives, we will extinguish German ordination among our Missionaries*; yet certainly no such maxim had seen the light as a Rule of the Society. Those who have inherited the power and influence of their predecessors, must abide by those *predecessors' contracts*. And if now the existing Committee say with some strict Churchmen,—Our predecessors were to blame; they ought never to have engaged Missionaries opposed to our Church discipline:—this will leave them but one mode of proceeding consistent with equity. They must not visit on the Missionaries the error of the Society. They must not struggle to force them to yield up *their principles*, because the Society twenty years ago was unwise, and made (be it supposed) an *unlawful contract*. But if it was unlawful, the Committee must now absolve Rhenius and Schmidt from all allegiance to the Society, must confess and lament the past, must lovingly commend Rhenius and the Mission to the good wishes and fostering care of all who love Christ, and who can, without compromise of principle, support it; retiring themselves from their position, only because their different views of Church discipline incapacitate them from yielding to Rhenius that help which is his due.

But if they are not able to condemn their predecessors and the venerable* Christian Knowledge Society, as guilty of indefensible compromise, and as betrayers of sound Church principle; then they have only to abide by the contract which those predecessors made; and allow Rhenius to the full the same liberty as he would have had, if no Bishop had ever visited India. If necessity justified them as Churchmen in forming a connexion, the necessity of continuing the connexion when formed was infinitely greater; and as such, Mr. Strachan ought to find room for it among the exceptions to his alleged rule.

That the latter is the real path which the Society is called to pursue, I shall proceed to evince by the Regulations made in 1818, with which Mr. Strachan furnishes me, (p. 52,) and to which he refers, as the rule of conduct "which has guided the proceedings of the Committees ever since." Therein, the affairs of a Mission are divided into External and Internal; the External being those about which no controversy has arisen. The Internal affairs of a Mission are defined, as *those spiritual powers and authorities, for the due exercise of which, a Missionary is responsible to the Ecclesiastical Rulers of the Church to WHICH HE MAY BELONG*. And in the said internal affairs, it is declared, *the Missionaries must be directed by the Bishop, OR CONSISTORY, or OTHER REGULAR ECCLESIASTICAL POWER, if such be in exercise; but in all cases they must act, as far as possible, with the concurrence*

* Perhaps some of my readers may not know that Archbishop Wake being then Primate of the Church of England, wrote to recommend the German missionaries to ordain the natives; which also Bishop Middleton equally sanctioned.

and approbation of the Society's representatives. The right of ordination is certainly included among the spiritual powers and authorities, which belong to the internal affairs of a Mission; and by the principles of the Reformed Church in which Rhenius was ordained, he (as a Presbyter) is as much entitled to ordain, as to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. The regulation of the Society is manifestly framed to include the case of German Missionaries; and in these internal concerns, they are declared amenable to their own tribunals, (be they what they may,) and not to the Bishop. Does the Committee pretend, that Rhenius is cognizable of an offence, before the authorities of the Prussian Church, or that he is exceeding the powers with which they have invested him? True, "he ought to act in all things, as far as possible, in concurrence with the Society's representatives;" and so he has been desirous of doing. But they must deal with him as with an equal,—not, command him, as one who in the internal affairs of the Mission were subject to the law of their Church. In fact, their conduct is in principle no less unreasonable, as towards him, than if they were now to forbid his baptizing, alleging that the Bishop must baptize all Rhenius's converts. For the Society makes itself supreme judge of its own laws; and, *We have a law*, would as well enforce the one thing as the other. After all, it must be remembered that Rhenius has no personal ambition in the matter. He cares not who baptizes nor who ordains, abstractedly. He only cares to prevent the consciences of his catechists being entangled in subscriptions and vows of obedience, which he believes likely to be highly injurious to themselves and to others.

I am aware that this brings up a new subject; which is indeed the very nucleus of the whole controversy; the point of *essential disagreement* between Rhenius and the Society, which must ever have prevented their permanent co-operation; as I continue to assert notwithstanding Mr. Strachan's allegations. Towards the converts, Rhenius has and ever must have a father's heart; he regards them as the souls whom God has given him for his hire; he feels a responsibility to care for their nurture and education, and will never admit that any one, presuming on benefits to the parent, is to spoil the children by pampering, or to break their spirit by rigor. He will consult the feelings of such friends, as far as may be, but never up to the point which would risk the children's welfare. In short, he holds them to be *his own* spiritual children, and not the children of the Society. He it is who has travelled in birth till Christ was formed within them: the Society has but nursed and fed him during his labor. But indeed, to urge the claim of money against Mr. Rhenius would be too gross. "He has lived on our money! therefore his spiritual children are become ours." I feel as though every sensitive and generous mind must shrink from and repudiate such a sentiment. In fact, as regards money, Tinnevely has conferred on the Society more than it has received. Even the fixed property, (schools, churches, and villages,) cannot in equity be called the Society's sole possession. Large sums were often spent by Rhenius, from the contributions of his private friends; many of whom, to my personal knowledge, would never have given the same into the general funds of the Society. Some years he has thus received nearly 800*l.*, and ordinarily as much as a fourth part of the annual expences of the Mission. As one example; out of 2,000 rupees and upwards, spent on the chapel at Palamcotta, only 800 were contributed by the Society. Nay, I scruple not to say, that the Society has increased its funds vastly beyond the disbursements for that Mission, by telling at its various meetings all over England the tidings of success at Tinnevely. In short, whatever of love there has been from the Society, for this he is indebted, and this he will gladly acknowledge; but a pecuniary debtor he is not; nor was the money given to him, but to his Lord; nor is he their servant, but his Lord's. And should a Christian body pretend, that by virtue of money, by right of purchase, (for they have confessedly no right of ecclesiastical control,) they shall dictate how Rhenius shall educate the children whom God has given him? Yet strange to say, the Society not only make the claim very explicitly, but seem to think or pretend that he is of one mind about it. A letter from the Committee, quoted by Mr. Strachan (p. 29) with date, Aug. 2d, 1831, declares: "The Committee only [only!] claim that those who are converted to the Christian faith through 'the instrumentality of the Society' [that is, by help of the money] 'shall not be formed into a community, on the model of a Church different from that to which the Society belongs.' *We confidently appeal to your own good sense for the reasonableness of this proceeding.*" Any plausibility that such an argument may have, is dependent on their omitting to state, that they had already engaged labourers of a different Church. Might we not as justly say: "We confidently appeal to the good sense of the Committee, for the reasonableness of having no Missionaries except of the Church to which the Society belongs?" Or if they could put up with teachers of a different communion, why cannot they be satisfied that the disciple be as his master? Is it according to their conscience to have German missionaries, against their conscience to have German catechists? Bishops were in Europe, when they were not in India; and they might have exacted of Rhenius to receive Episcopal ordination before leaving Europe, as easily and as justly as they were exacting the same in India with regard to the catechists: or if German ordination did not then disqualify Rhenius, why should the very same thing received from the hands of Rhenius, now disqualify the catechists? Rhenius also may far more justly retort: *I confidently appeal to your own good sense for the reasonableness of allowing me to abide by the liberty of my own Church and my uniform professions: (especially since the Committee*

say, [p. 9, of Mr. Strachan], "*We are all supposed conscientiously to prefer our own views, in discipline as well as doctrine:*" while the language of this letter abundantly justifies his complaints, (which the Committee strongly disavowed,) that they wished to make him a tool. For what else do they say to him, but—that they were sorry they could not get a better labourer than he; they would have preferred any Episcopalian; but extreme necessity and dearth of Episcopalian volunteers drove them to employ him; and that they do not mean his churches to enjoy the ordinances of Christ at all (for such is the real case), until they can set him aside and erect an Episcopal system. To return to the letter of the Committee, it will be observed that they appeal to Rhenius to admit as axiomatic, that which they ought to have known was utterly opposed to his heart and judgment. I say: *ought to have known*: for let us attend to Mr. Strachan's words, (p. 7): "They [the Missionaries] as Mr. Schmid at a subsequent period avowed, considered that *the Committee should be subject to Missionaries*, when the latter were duly experienced; and *the principle was adopted by them from the beginning.*" Here if Mr. S. has stated their views in a naked and unqualified form, it at least shows that they were not wanting in plain speaking. But of this, more will be said hereafter.

Recent events have brought out very plainly the truth and importance of the above. When Mr. Rhenius at length saw fit to quit Tinnevely, in the vain hope of preventing disunion; the other brethren, Schaffier, Müller and Lechler determined to remain behind another year, until an answer could be received from the Home Committee to their communications. But this arrangement, in which Mr. Tucker had acquiesced, was disallowed by the Madras Committee; who insisted on having from them *written declaration* to the effect that *they had no right in the Mission, nor in the souls of the people*. The three brethren, although two of them had been Episcopally ordained, immediately determined on quitting their post, and did quit it, rather than make any such declaration. Now here we see the whole matter clear. This was the declaration, that *ought* to have been required of Rhenius at the beginning, and of every German Missionary: (quære, and of the Episcopally ordained also?) in which case no single German would probably have joined the Society; or certainly, not one of the Tinnevely band. But the very result shows beyond contradiction, that the Society had never before given them to understand this as a condition of their connection, but was now *imposing new terms*. And again we may ask, If the Missionaries are to have no personal union and interest in the converts, what are they but machines and tools in the hand of the Committee?

But as Mr. Strachan has contrasted Mr. Rhenius's unwillingness to give up his spiritual children, with Mr. Duff's liberality in allowing his convert Banajee to choose for himself; I feel at liberty to touch this point also. Perhaps Mr. Strachan might feel less pleasure in the matter, if he better knew what my friend Mr. Duff really thinks of this and similar cases, where his converts have joined the Church of England. Mr. Duff is now in England, and could well answer for himself: and perhaps he would state other reasons for desiring Anglican ordination, which unhappily prove as weighty to a Hindoo mind, as the pomp of a Cathedral service; the witnessing of which, Mr. Strachan tells us, convinced the judgment of Banajee.—But when Mr. Rhenius's catechists are equally convinced, and yet find him refuse his consent to their ordination; then it will be time to contrast his conduct with that of Mr. Duff: especially if he should be found threatening to get them removed, unless they renounce the idea. But I have in my hands letters from Rhenius, professing his fullest willingness that all the catechists who desire it shall join the Church of England. Meanwhile, it is obvious that the Committee fall under Mr. Strachan's censure, if they now refuse to imitate Mr. Duff's conduct. Ninety catechists have strongly expressed their attachment to Mr. Rhenius and his associates, and to the modes which he employed. If these are to be ejected for attachment to Mr. Rhenius, it is neither following nor setting a good example.

The idea may be conceived by some, (through unacquaintance with facts and with Rhenius's character,) that the earnest entreaties of the catechists, first, to the Committee to send back their beloved pastors, next, to those pastors, to return at any rate; are attributable to some underhand exertions of Rhenius himself. But those who know that Rhenius was far distant; while the representatives of the Society were on the spot: that he did but give the catechists from seven to fourteen rupees a month, while they give their ordained servants fifty, with travelling expenses besides: that he is an isolated person, with neither wealth, rank nor patronage, while they are supported by a wealthy and influential body: I say, it needs no personal acquaintance with his integrity and nobleness of mind, to be convinced that nothing but his own virtues and services has so acted on the minds of his flock.

CAUSES WHICH REMOVED RHENIUS FROM MADRAS.

Mr. Strachan objects to my asserting that Mr. Rhenius left Madras in consequence of the disputes which arose between him and the Committee, relative "to the degree of conformity with the Church of England, which was to be expected from the German brethren;" and while he states many things, as *not* forming the grounds of his removal thence, he does not define what was. Rhenius however himself, in a letter to friends in Bombay, dated Oct. 23,

1833, says: "You know that not only now, but for many years past, we have had to combat about the spirit of formality, which we saw to be hostile to the spirit of Christian liberty. . . . *It was on this account* and because we would not suffer ourselves to be cramped into the narrow chair of the Church of England *Rubrics and Canons*, [observe; not *Liturgy*], that we were removed from Madras to Palamcotta in 1820." But Mr. Strachan himself incidentally shows, in quoting words of Mr. Rhenius, what ever has been and is to this day the nucleus of their controversy with the Committee. "We cannot but wish that in the *ministerial parts of our labour* we be left unfettered:" and Mr. S. likewise (pp. 8, 9) speaks of the other subject of difference; viz. that when the German brethren wished to join in public acts of worship with brethren of other denominations, they were thus forbidden by the Church Missionary Committee, in a letter of Jan. 21st, 1820: "We are all supposed conscientiously to prefer our own views of discipline, as well as doctrine: while therefore we may heartily pray for the success of a *minister sent forth* by Christians differing from our views, it is not real charity that would lead us to take a public part in the *AUTHORITATIVE SENDING FORTH of that minister.*" These expressions, as indicating the nature of the service they wished to sanction, show that the question between them had, even at that early stage, reached the point of *ordination*. And this letter seems to justify my statement that the Committee were demanding "from the German brethren a degree of conformity with the Church of England," which they were unwilling to yield. I do not therefore know why Mr. Strachan finds fault with my statement. He says: "You will judge how far the following particulars in Mr. Groves's 'Brief Account' are borne out or disproved by the actual circumstances." And he appeals to Mr. Hough, that it was *not* the affair of the *Union Chapel* that caused this removal from Madras. Whereas I had never said one word about the Union Chapel. I had stated on Rhenius's authority that he was removed *because of disagreement about conformity to the Church of England*, and I find Mr. Strachan not to deny this, but rather to confirm it. But I have here to complain that he chooses rather to say *what is not*, than *what is*; and to imply, than to assert. A reader may peruse six pages of his book, and ask in vain *Why* it was, after all, that Rhenius left Madras. Political causes are insinuated; but in Rhenius's letters, nothing of the kind appears. After all, if there were such, what has this to do with the main question? It is enough that Mr. Strachan admits that in Jan. 1820, Rhenius and the Society were differing on the matter of ordination. This may be among what Mr. Strachan calls the "*trivial things* (p. 7) *which with such opposite views between the parties, necessarily involved collision.*" But surely neither my words nor those of Mr. Rhenius tend to impress the mind more strongly with the essential difference of views which *from the beginning* existed. And when Mr. Strachan allows, and the letter of the Committee in 1820 shows that Rhenius and Schmid, while yet in Madras, contended for their right to partake in the "*authoritative sending forth*" of a dissenting minister, (a right which in the case of Mr. Addis the London Missionary of Coimbatore, Rhenius actually exercised)—what is the sense of Mr. Strachan's extraordinary assertion: (p. 36) "that Mr. Rhenius's first avowal to the Society of his opinions on any of the points contained in his Review, was made in his 'letter of October 1830.'" *On any of the points!* on the value of Prelatical Succession, for instance? Probably indeed he had not been called to avow his thoughts concerning a variety of matters contained in his Review; but the Committee's letter shows that they knew his views of discipline to be *substantially opposed* to their own. In short, they knew that he was *ordained by Presbyters*, and as a *Presbyter wished to help in ordaining*. It is then childish to pretend ignorance of his views. The utmost that can in candor be allowed, is, that as Rhenius has come to know more and more of the Church of England, he has liked it less and less. He once, (as a by-stander only in the contest,) said that he believed English dissenters to be wrong in dissenting. Now he evidently thinks them right. If this be the *avowal* that so shocked the Committee, I can understand what is meant, and I can make allowance for their being annoyed. But I cannot justify Mr. Strachan in giving the public to suppose, that Rhenius had never avowed, till October 1830, his decided *personal* aversion to be subjected to Church of England rules.

But I will leave this part of the subject to Mr. Rhenius's much more efficient hand, and only now say, that knowing as much as I do of the correspondence that has passed from the *very first* between him and the Society, if persons will suspend their judgments till they see his full statement of the whole case, it will then appear what value ought to have been allowed to Mr. Strachan's *two-line* quotation from a letter sixteen years old: the *only* document in his pamphlet which has even the appearance of favoring his case.

But I think no one can read Mr. Strachan's book attentively, without coming to this conclusion: that the Society are not really offended so much by *knowing* Mr. Rhenius's views, as by having the *world know* that they know them: and that the newness of Rhenius's *avowal* is really in this, that now not the Committee only, but the whole body of Subscribers, nay and the public at large, have heard him speak: and this may hurt the Society's credit in some quarters. But so long as the Committee, and the Committee alone, had access to the proof of

* I might ask, Are not these the *parts* of his labour over which "conformity to the Church of England" has to do?

his thoroughly antiprelatical views, they would have been satisfied to appropriate to themselves the credit of his successful mission, and "wait patiently" (as Mr. Strachan takes credit for their doing) until they could supplant him by men willing to promote the exclusive interests of the Church of England.

ON THE FOUNDERSHIP OF THE TINNEVELLY MISSION, AND THE RESULTS OF MR. HOUGH'S SERVICES.

Mr. Strachan opposes my statement respecting the founding of the mission to which Mr. Rhenius was sent. He remarks: "In regard to the mission itself, so far from its being *founded* and continued by Germans of the same principles with himself, [Rhenius] as Mr. Groves states, principles which, he adds, were then thoroughly understood nor have they since changed; the mission to which Messrs. Rhenius and Schmid were sent was founded by a clergyman of our Church."

Then in the next page, after speaking of Mr. Hough's most active exertions for the revival of the missions of the Christian Knowledge Society, he says: "And such was the fostering aid of this first application of the system of the Church of England to the state of Christianity in that province; that during the period of Mr. Hough's continuance, the addition to their members by conversions among the heathen were, respectively in 1816, sixty-nine—1817, twenty-five—1818, eighty-two—1819, thirty-four—1820, one hundred and twenty—in all three hundred and two."

Again, p. 13, Mr. Strachan says: "During the same period the translation of the Common Prayer Book being executed by the venerable Dr. Rouler, a missionary originally of the Tranquebar Mission, a supply was sent for the native congregations in Tinnevelly. Mr. Hough assembled the catechists and instructed them in the use of the book. It was thankfully accepted by them; so that Mr. Rhenius, on his arrival in Tinnevelly, found the Christian community there already ACCUSTOMED to the mode of worship and system of our Church, so far as the state of the people and the supply of teachers admitted."

Any simple mind reading the above extracts, relating to a period from 1816 to 1820, will suppose that during this period Mr. Hough was engaged in establishing the mission of the Christian Knowledge Society on strictly Church of England principles: and that the successes of those years are to be ascribed to the fostering aids of this first application of the system of the English Church.

On the contrary now listen to the following letter of Mr. Hough, dated Palamcottah, September 2d, 1819, only a few months before he left Tinnevelly for ever. After stating the arrival of a native priest ordained by Lutherans (as every native priest has been, who has laboured in Tinnevelly under the Christian Knowledge Society up to this day), he describes the women, spinning cotton and singing Lutheran hymns to a late hour: "I spoke to the priests of the Tamul Liturgy, that YOU PROPOSE SENDING hither—and recommended them to adopt it in all the churches, in room of the German form of worship NOW IN USE." Now remark that instead of the system of the Church of England having been introduced and being the source of every blessing in 1816, 1817, 1818, 1819, 1820—we arrive at September, 1819, and the Liturgies had not arrived, but the German form of worship was in force. How far then the natives could have become "accustomed to the mode of worship and system of our Church," in the few months that Mr. Hough further remained among them, I leave those to judge, who know that Mr. Hough was in ill health, distant about thirty miles from Nazareth and Mootaloor, then the principal of those Missions, and engaged in the responsible occupation of chaplain to the station of Palamcottah. Nor does it appear from Mr. Strachan's statement, whether Mr. Hough ever re-visited the churches after receiving the Tamul Liturgy; or did more than assemble the catechists and show them how to use the book. They naturally thanked him for his kindness; but Mr. Strachan seems to infer, that the Christian community hereby became accustomed to the "system" of our Church. Were all this true, I again say: the Liturgy is not the Church of England.

But Mr. Strachan further contests my statement, that the Tinnevelly Mission was founded and continued by Germans of the same sentiments as Rhenius. For, says he, p. 11: "The Mission to which Messrs. Rhenius and Schmid were sent, was founded by a clergyman of our Church." P. 12, he goes on to state, that "There was in the same province an ancient Mission of the Christian Knowledge Society;" but that "it was not to that Mission" that Rhenius was sent. He adds, p. 13, that through Mr. Hough's labours, "Mr. Rhenius, on his arrival at Tinnevelly, found the Christian community there already accustomed to the Church of England mode of worship"—and further: that for four years Mr. Hough had been employed in raising up the Christian community from its ruins. The only consistent meaning here apparent, is, that Mr. Hough performed a double office: that is, he raised from its ruins one Mission, that of the Christian Knowledge Society; and he founded another, that which Rhenius continued. If this is the meaning, it is perfectly opposed to the fact. Palamcottah, to which Mr. Rhenius came, was not only in the same province, but an actual seat of the older

Mission: nor did Mr. Hough by converting natives and gathering them together become the founder of new congregations to which Mr. Rhenius afterwards ministered: much less did Mr. Hough model new churches into *Anglican discipline*. I again assert that the Tinnevely Mission was founded and carried on by Germans not episcopally ordained: for even during Mr. Hough's kind assistance, the Mission was under the management of native Presbyters, having German ordination, which is the real point in question. It appears also by a letter of Bishop Middleton to Dr. Gaskin, dated Calcutta 1822, that when the new Society had occupied Palamcotta, he looked on it as no new Mission, but as an intrusion into the work of the Christian Knowledge Society. For the letter says: "Palamcotta, a dependency of the Tanjore Mission, has lately been occupied by the Missionaries of another Society. I have caused an intimation to be given to the parties concerned, that our party are sending out a Missionary to Palamcotta. *I hope* [Italics] all will be right, and yet the new Missionaries have purchased property at Palamcotta."

The following extract from "Williams's Missionary Gazetteer," will confirm my statement, that the Tinnevely or Palamcotta Mission was founded by Germans:

"Palamcotta, a fortified town in Tinnevely district Carnatic country, Hindoostan, about three miles from Tinnevely, 55 E. N. E. Cape Comorin, and 200 S. W. Tanjore. In the latter part of the last century, the Rev. Mr. Swartz and his associates at Tanjore, from the Christian Knowledge Society, were active and successful here. Previous to the death of Mr. S. in 1798, a church was built, and a congregation collected of more than 200 persons. At his expense, chapels were also erected for the Christians in Padpanadaburam and Parani. Besides the provincial schools, he employed a schoolmaster and catechist at his own expense, to instruct in English and Malabar schools, and take charge of the congregations. Since 1800, the Christian Knowledge Society has placed here a native catechist, or country priest. The Rev. J. Hough, for many years previous to 1822, was chaplain to this station, and was very active in forwarding plans of benevolence. When he left it, 283 children were instructed in nine schools, under the patronage of the Society; and in 1819, there were thirty-four converts from the heathen, and 174 communicants. Mr. Hough's congregation contributed liberally to the support of schools."

"The Rev. Messrs. Rhenius and Schmid, and Mr. R. Lyon, country-born English assistant, David, native assistant, and fifteen Tamul schoolmasters, from the Church Missionary Society, commenced a mission here in 1820, and opened a seminary for the education of native schoolmasters and catechists; the happy influence of which begins to be perceived, by enabling them to furnish competent teachers in the schools, which Mr. Hough had established previous to their arrival in 1820, and also to provide for this extensive establishment of schools in different parts of the district."

In what however I have said concerning Mr. Hough, I hope no one will conceive I intend any word of disrespect towards him. He is entitled to honor and love for his voluntary zeal, which led him to care for the neglected Missions: and I doubt not that his personal labors were accepted, and in their measure prospered. But I feel that Mr. Strachan injures him, by putting in a claim on his part of being founder of a new mission; which I am sure he would not make himself. Indeed Mr. S., p. 11, represents him as "writing earnestly" to the Committee of the Church Missionary Society to send a missionary to Palamcotta; neglecting to state, (what I learn by the life of Bishop Middleton,) that he wrote also to that prelate, preferring the same request to the Christian Knowledge Society. As a Chaplain of the Company, an avowed friend and member of the latter Society, he is by Mr. Strachan certainly put into a strange position: especially when he is made to claim to have founded a new mission, in the very spot where Schwartz and Jænicke labored, or rather out of their very churches. Indeed Mr. Strachan himself shows, p. 13, that the "rudiments" of congregations in five places, which he seems to imply, were a fruit of Mr. Hough's labors, could not even be supplied by him with catechists: while I have shown from Mr. Hough's own letter, that in September 1819, he had not yet received the Tamul Liturgy. After all, how very strange is it for Mr. Strachan to entitle Mr. Hough's labours, the commencement of the Mission of the *Church Missionary Society!* At least he implies that it began before Rhenius, and no one can read his 13th page, without supposing that he means to identify Mr. Hough with the Society.

Certainly also if the Committee had sent Germans to continue a work begun by an Episcopalian and superintendent churches already accustomed to Anglican discipline, the thing would hardly be so creditable to the Church principles now avowed by the conductors of the Church Missionary Society, as the representation which I have made: more especially when the German brethren even at Madras, are acknowledged to have been in conflict against Church of England rules.

SYSTEMS OR FORMS USED IN THE TINNEVELLY MISSION.

I find it stated by Mr. S., p. 46, that "From the beginning of their labours in the Tinnevely Mission, the form of worship of the English Church (the only feature [says he] of that system that could be called into operation) was observed by the Missionaries, so far as circumstances allowed; as that form had been previously adopted in the same district by the Rev. J. Hough."

Again, p. 47: "As regards the question of the comparative merits of the system of Mr. Rhenius or that of the Church of England, viewed in their bearing upon the history of this Mission, the whole argument of the 'Brief Account' is a fiction. Certainly so far as any system may be said to have been in operation in Tinnevelly, it has been that of the Church of England."

It is painful to reply by denying what is stated as fact. How Mr. S. has been misled, others may inquire; but assuredly he repeats with imposing effect, statements the very reverse of which I affirm and am able to prove. There is also a colouring pervading the Pamphlet, which I feel to be painfully delusive. "Such and such forms were observed, so far as circumstances allowed:" this seems with Mr. Strachan another way of saying, that they were *not* observed at all, because circumstances did *not* allow. "Mr. Hough had adopted them in the same district;" may mean that he had read the *English* Liturgy somewhere to Europeans: at least I have already shown, that certainly up to a late period he had no *Tamil* Liturgies. Again: "so far as any system was in operation, it was that of the Church of England." Am I to expound this, that there was no system in operation at all? in other words, that it was the unrestricted principles of Mr. Rhenius which alone were in operation? Such at any rate is the fact. But, says Mr. Strachan, so far as the progress of the Mission allowed, the Church of England system was used from the beginning; and he specifies the form of worship as the only thing practicable. Was it impracticable to use the Catechism of the Church of England? Mr. Rhenius had *Catechists*: what are they for, (in the view of a Churchman), but to teach and expound the Catechism? A form for instructing candidates for baptism, is needed earlier than a form of worship for the baptised. Does Mr. S. then mean to say that Mr. R. introduced the Church Catechism?

I think it providential that I have now by me in my Journal, an account of what I witnessed at Tinnevelly, and of the impression made on me at the time.—"Palamcottta, Nov. 1833.—"I was this evening at the native congregation at Tinnevelly. Mr. Schaffter expounded the Scriptures to them in a catechetical way, and I said a few words, which were interpreted; and then John Devasahayam concluded with prayer *extempore* and most fluently." This was at the stated Week-day Service: there was not, I think, much of the Church of England system here. Again: "Dec. 4th, We went out this morning to a few of the native congregations, and the whole impression was a most interesting one. The simplicity of the people and of the mode of address used to them in the worship; the opportunity that all have to give an answer or to say what they feel; gave me an idea of approximation to the times of the Apostles as to mode. Never did I feel my heart so drawn to any people. The striking contrast of their manners to those of the Heathen around them,—especially their women,—speaks volumes as to the real advancement. When you enter a *Heathen* village, all the women run up alleys or over hedges, to get out of the way and out of sight. Here, the wife with the little children and the mother come to the little wicket gate to give you a salaam of welcome and peace." These were my impressions at the time, and what I then saw, I have in the 'Brief Account' named *simple worship*, and contrasted with that of the Church of England. In fact, all who know any thing about it, know that the modes adopted at Tinnevelly are, and always were, precisely similar to those in Neyoor and Nagercoil, under the London Missionary Society. Indeed, I do not believe that one *Tamil* Common Prayer Book will be found *in use* among them all. The method in these three Missions was, first, a short *extempore* prayer, then reading a chapter, asking questions indiscriminately from men and women, concluding with another *extempore* prayer: the whole, interspersed with hymns from a Collection made by Mr. Rhenius. So strangely opposed to the truth is Mr. Strachan's representation.

CO-OPERATION OF EPISCOPALIANS WITH RHENIUS.

He moreover says, that Episcopal ministers "EXERCISED THEIR FUNCTIONS without compromising their obligations:" an assertion whose vagueness is such, that it may mean something or nothing. If he would imply, that their work contained any part which they could not have executed without Episcopal ordination; or that any one could have learnt from their conduct, that they had been ordained at all; I again feel that only extraordinary ignorance of facts could lead him to such an assertion.

But "since 1830" (says he) "the majority of the ordained Missionaries has consisted of Episcopal ministers, exercising their functions without compromising their obligations, and without obstructing the good work." On this I remark that Mr. Fjellstedt was only a *Danish* Episcopalian, and not subject to Church of England *Discipline*. Mr. Müller, like many others of the German Brethren, had subscribed (as he declared to me and others) he knew not what—from his imperfect acquaintance with English. Indeed I heard at Basle, from Mr. Blumhardt and others, the distinct and positive declaration, that no German Missionary by receiving Episcopalian ordination subjects himself to the control of any Bishop. Mr. Müller had made but small progress in the *Tamil* language, so as to be competent only to subordinate Missionary work, and all his principles coincided with those of Rhenius, to whose plans he readily conformed. Mr. Lechler had arrived since my departure, and could have hardly been

acquainted with the first elements of the language, and therefore, had he been disposed, was unable to thwart the plans of Mr. Rhenius. Such then were the causes why the work was not obstructed by them. Yet this result, which the Committee could not have foreseen, did not diminish Rhenius's painful sense of the inexpediency of introducing into the Mission principles of Church Government so opposed to his own. Nor can any one praise the Society for candor, in having permitted for so many years the students at Basle to be allured into a reception of Anglican ordination, by explaining so inadequately the submission entailed. When they ask, what means the Church of England, they are shown the Thirty-nine Articles, and perhaps the Liturgy. Of Rubrics and Canons and Episcopal control, compulsory reading of forms, prohibition to pray extempore in the public assembly, and numerous other things, they do not learn till a late stage, perhaps only after their ordination. This is in conformity with Mr. Strachan's own endeavour, to pass off the Liturgy as the Church of England: whereas to the Liturgy I myself have no sort of objection, any more than Rhenius has, so that only due discretion be left as to its use, and no constraint be put on the conscience of the minister.

WANT OF SUCCESS IN CERTAIN MISSIONS.

Mr. Strachan is hurt that I have stated the *fact*, that Indian Missions, conducted on the principles of the Church of England, have not succeeded in any equal degree with those managed on Independent principles. The object of my statement, was to enforce the common saying: *Let well alone*: leave Rhenius unmolested in the system under which his mission and some others have prospered. I wished also to show causes which strengthened Rhenius's objections to change. I certainly never meant to say, that this single test would decide whether a Church system was good or bad. I neither said that a good system will certainly make a prosperous Mission, nor that a bad system was the only cause of failure. But there is one help towards success, which I think might well be attended to in the present case; namely, a long duration of time spent by the same Missionaries on a spot. At Vizagapatam, (a station of the London Missionary Society,) Mr. Strachan remarks, there has been no success. Two devoted men founded it, but died very shortly. May not the failure be owing to such causes?

The Travancore Mission was occupied by Messrs. Mead and Mault for near twenty years, and the benefit was very perceptible. So also has Tinnevely reaped much advantage, from the long stay of Rhenius and Schmid there; and this makes me anxious that Rhenius may not now be forced to leave. In him are united a constitution inured to the climate, the confidence of the churches and of the heathen, with familiarity with the language, and numerous other advantages: to throw all which away by doing violence to his conscience would appear to me a wanton affront to the Great Head of the Church.

Mr. Strachan seems to resent my even implying, that the Church of England system does not so well succeed in Missions. Yet I have said nothing to compare in strength and decision, to that which he quotes with approbation from a Sermon "preached at the Consecration of the Bishop of Madras, and printed by command of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury." (p. 60.) The preacher declared: "No sooner did the spirit of a Missionary church begin to live and act with vigour in our community, than it was found by the labourers whom she sent forth, that *her discipline*, however admirably suited to the settled church of a Christian country, *was not only destitute of provisions conducive to the extension of her influence, but even presented obstacles to her enlargement. Every step properly Missionary, was, in India, to be adventured upon by transgressing the strict boundaries of her discipline.*" On reading this, I am ready to exclaim: For what then are Mr. Strachan and I contending? Does he not concede, and even maintain, all that Rhenius wants? "The discipline of the Church of England," says Rhenius, "impedes the work, and will injure the catechists, if they are subjected to it." "The boundaries of discipline must be broken through," says Mr. Strachan, "in order to take a single step properly missionary." If his own words do not convince him, how unreasonable it is to wish to fetter Rhenius by the discipline of the Church of England, no words of mine are likely to be of avail.

But I must avow my full belief in the doctrine of the Sermon: for to maintain the opposite is to make (in numerous cases) the laws of men more valuable than those of God. For what else is it, to prefer the entire disuse of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, rather than permit them to be celebrated to the violation of the discipline of one particular Church? Truly I cannot feel sanguine about the success of those, who so lord it over God's heritage, and who make void his commands by their traditions.

I hardly knew whether this is the place to notice what I would gladly pass by,—Mr. Strachan's disavowal of my assertion, that Episcopalians "unchurch all other Protestant Churches." He seems to suppose that I spoke of the opinions of the Committee as individuals, whereas I spoke of the practical and real doctrine of their Church. They may have many liberal and many sound notions on this subject, and they may quote from the Thirty-nine Articles in defence of their own views. But this does not alter the fact, that by a regulation of times later to those in which such articles were compiled, (a regulation which is still in force,)

no Romish priest is ever re-ordained by an English bishop; while Presbyters of the Scotch Church, the Lutheran, the Reformed or Congregational Churches, are inadmissible into the pulpits or communion rails of the Church of England without re-ordination. She thus acknowledges Romish, Greek, Armenian *Orders*, but rejects the Orders of nearly all the Protestant Churches. And this is what I call, *unchurching them*.

But Mr. Strachan has touched a topic personal to myself. To the history of my own stay at Bagdad he has alluded in a very kind and feeling manner, as I am bound cordially to acknowledge. Yet as I had never argued that *clergymen* were incompetent judges of missionary work, I think he had no occasion to deduce from my principles, that my "failure" at Bagdad rendered me an incompetent judge in these matters. But I must remark, that if I held in the strongest manner the belief, that a system must be judged of by its missionary fruits, I surely could not mean to extend this to a case, where through physical obstacles a system has really never been tried. If a Mission is swallowed by an earthquake, or the Missionaries die before they have acquired the language, no one could hereby disprove the excellence of their ecclesiastical system. So too, beginning from the second year of my residence, Bagdad was afflicted by pestilence, inundation, war and famine; in course of which two-thirds of the city fell, the country was depopulated and became a nest of banditti; while the Government was so disorganized, that there was no security for a day. In result, we no longer judged it expedient to spend our personal service there, not thinking it the place of the maximum of our influence. Yet we retain our house; and one of my first efforts (and I trust a most successful effort) on reaching England, was to provide brethren to occupy this position; who being acquainted with some handicraft employment, would in our judgment be much more useful than we there, as we hoped to be more effectually employed in India. One direct fruit moreover the Lord gave us in the conversion of a native youth; who, in company with another converted in India through him and one of my colleagues, is now gone to Birmah as a preacher of the Gospel. To myself there are many indirect, yet valuable results, which, of course, could not have been aimed at, but which I yet regard as compensating my personal trials. The sympathy which I met from persons unknown, the supplies of all my wants from sources unexpected, the gracious protection as in the hollow of God's hand under overwhelming difficulties, to this hour fill my heart with gratitude and confidence; while by these circumstances of trial, I had a moral and spiritual preparation for future admission into the hearts of God's church, (purely through the common fellowship of suffering,) that has often been a solace to me for the bitterest days that I passed in Bagdad. So much have I stated, because I felt that Mr. Strachan's words might tend to convey some false impression on the subject.

INTERFERENCE OF MR. GROVES.

The point of view in which Mr. Strachan endeavours to put my interference in the matter of Rhenius, expressed by him in a pathetic appeal, requires particular attention. He says: "The subjects comprised in this fine passage [just quoted] set before my mind, in a vivid manner, the lamentable consequences of Mr. Groves's interference in the matter connected with Mr. Rhenius and the Society. It has been shown, past contradiction, that all other points of difference between him and Mr. Schmidt had been settled, and the ordination question, by mutual forbearance, was prevented from producing a breach between Mr. R. and the Society. The work at Tinnevely was steadily advancing amidst much opposition from without; but in harmony within." pp. 62, 63. The grave charge is herein made against me of having caused all the evils of Rhenius's separation. To exonerate myself, I trust I need only detail the circumstances that preceded, accompanied, and followed my visit to Palamcotta. Mr. Strachan says that Mr. Rhenius, in the envelope accompanying his review, informed them of his determination to quit Tinnevely. His reasons are explained by himself in the following letter to friends in Bombay. Having received from thence repeated entreaties to abide at all hazards with his flock, he wrote thus:—"My dear Friend,—I had the pleasure of receiving yours of Oct. 9, 1833, yesterday. You must know that not only now, but for many years past, we have had to contend about the spirit of formality, which we saw to be hostile to the spirit of Christian liberty according to the Gospel, and to the progress of the cause of God in the world. It was on this account, and because we would not suffer ourselves to be cramped into the narrow chair of the Church of England rubrics and canons, that we were removed from Madras to Palamcotta in 1820. We were then left alone, and permitted to go on in the work until we wanted more ordained men. When we could not advise our native brethren to make those objectionable subscriptions, we wrote to the Home-Committee the following requests:—1st. That we be permitted to go on as we have these many years (errors excepted) without being harassed and disquieted by questions about forms and other non-essential things, whereby the Churches are neither enlarged nor edified. 2dly. That in case the Bishops of Calcutta cannot possibly ordain our native candidates without requiring from them those objectionable subscriptions, we German clergymen be authorised to ordain them in our sphere of labour according to our German form, as has been the practice in India for many years. To this we received an answer from the Home Committee, that they cannot

“allow German ordination any more; that they will not force our native candidates to be ordained by an English Bishop, if they have scruples; but they cannot authorize our ordaining them, nor the Churches to be formed on any other model but that of the Church of England; that they will however allow us to go on as before in our work. To this I wrote in reply, June 16, 1832, that this permission will not remove the difficulty. The Committee will send to us ministers, who have made those objectionable subscriptions, and who are of course expected to act accordingly. If the brethren do so, then there will be immediately differences of action; explanations must follow; we shall be divided, and the cause will be injured. If they do not do so, and are allowed to deviate from the letter of their subscription (as is nearly universally done by all clergymen), then why make them subscribe at all? Why expose them to the guilt of perjury? Besides, the Bishop may at any time come and enforce their subscriptions: which will likewise create division. If then the Society cannot send Missionaries to Tinnevely who have the same ecclesiastical liberties with ourselves, nor permit us to ordain our native brethren upon the same liberal principle upon which we ourselves have been; I do not see how the work can go on *as heretofore*. You will plainly see to what end this state of things must lead. Painful as a separation from the Society would be to me, because I am cordially united with them, love and revere them, as having been faithful helpers to us nearly twenty years; yet conscience will compel me to choose it, rather than to consent to proceedings contrary to the simplicity of the Holy Scriptures, and injurious to the Mission cause. In conclusion, I beg to say that as the Committee have determined not to accede to our request, and as I also cannot conscientiously accede to their determination, and as moreover our present course must upon your plan be, sooner or later, disturbed again, necessity seems to be laid upon me to request a change in our connexion. On this painful subject I thought to propose to leave Tinnevely and enter a new field of labour in India, still under the patronage of the Society; but as this would in process of time subject us to the same difficulties as at present, I must relinquish such proposition. But there are three other ways in one of which these unhappy differences may be brought to a conclusion.

“I. That the Committee permit me to return to Europe, where we may consider, God please, in what manner I may devote myself further to the Mission cause, agreeably to my principles and circumstances.

“II. To retire to Madras, and spend there the remainder of my days, still in connexion with the Society, in the work of translating the Holy Scriptures in Tamul, (which is yet far from being finished,) and in the publication of religious books, for the benefit of our Tamul congregations and the country at large.

“III. To attach myself at once here to another Society. Which of these three propositions is the best and most advisable, I am unwilling to decide; but leave it to the decision of the Committee.

“Their decision arrived here in July last; and they say thus: ‘The Committee could not for a moment entertain the idea of Mr. Rhenius connecting himself with another Society, according to his 3d proposition. The 2d, That he should retire to Madras, and employ himself in translations, is more worthy of consideration. All circumstances considered however, they have deemed it more advisable to adopt the 1st, that Mr. Rhenius should return to Europe, that they may have an opportunity to confer personally with him; with a view, if possible, to settle some plan by which the continuance of his valuable labors may be secured to the Society.’

“Whether I am wrong in demanding liberty to carry on the work of the Mission and the formation of the Congregations upon simple Scripture ground and authority; or the Committee is right in demanding them to be carried on according to the Rubrics and Canons of the Church of England, is a different question. I am persuaded that with these different principles, we and the Committee shall never go on together. The ordination question has only brought it to a crisis: and now both I and the Committee must abide the consequences. The Lord will judge between us. I know that I have desired nothing but what is according to the truth; and therefore I trust the Lord will be with me, and prosper me further, wherever I may be and labor in His name.”

Mr. Strachan has over and over again asserted, that the system of the Church of England was that with which the Tinnevely Mission commenced and grew up. He represents me as stating “a fiction,” when I spoke of it as unfettered by the Anglican system. Now let the concluding portion of the letter quoted, and my own declarations as an eyewitness, be brought into contrast with Mr. Strachan’s statements. Let it be farther remembered, that thus far every thing had proceeded before I had landed in India; at which time Mr. Rhenius had determined to quit Tinnevely and his flocks for ever. For he did not expect to return, if once he abandoned the spot. Hitherto, at all events, I stand in the question free from blame. Friends in Bombay, alike those attached to the Church of England and those who were not, on hearing I was proceeding south to Tinnevely, explained to me the circumstances of that Mission and the correspondence they had had with Rhenius; and urged me to second their efforts to persuade him to stay. Whatever might be the merits of the question between the Missionaries and the Society, this they did feel; that the causes of disagreement being on his part conscientious, they

desired to see him not interfered with on those grounds whilst engaged in conducting so prosperously this important mission. But that come what might, it seemed to them his duty to abide by his people, and that in so doing he should not want their most strenuous support, as before. On the other hand, if after all they had said, he still adhered to his intention of leaving his people, that their confidence in the future conduct of the Mission would be destroyed and their contributions in all probability cease. To these sentiments, written to himself, Mr. Rhenius thus replied in the letter I have already quoted from, "I assure you I was grieved when I read this sentence: 'We do not see it our duty to send any pecuniary aid after your departure.' Why, why, why? I think it will be still *more* your duty to strengthen the hands of the brethren who are left behind. What have they done, that you should refuse to aid them? If the Lord will, He can support the work when I am gone: but if He will not, but if He permits evil to befall the churches in consequence of my departure, or rather in consequence of the *introduction of spirit deadening modes and ceremonies*; those will have to answer for it who have been the cause of my leaving."

Here then is the point at which my intercourse with Mr. Rhenius commenced; when in consequence of disunion of sentiment with the Society, he was preparing to quit Tinnevely for ever. Let it be moreover observed, that deeply as I was interested with the circumstances of Rhenius, my interfering at all was not an original thought of mine. It was proposed to me by those who were most concerned for the Tinnevely Mission. I then wrote to entreat him to remain at Palamacotta, till I came and set before him motives to dissuade his intention of returning to Europe. I then proceeded with all haste to Tinnevely and found Mr. R. with his things packed and ready to depart. I arrived however, much confirmed from finding friends of the Mission whom I had met, strongly coinciding with those at Bombay. Müller, Schaffter, and Fjellstedt were all united in the desire that he should stay. After two or three meetings for consultation, there was finally one among the brethren on the Monday subsequent to my arrival. After full discussion, he determined finally to remain; and the following letter was written to the Home Committee.

"It gave me pleasure to receive your last, of March 22d, a. c.; and I thank you for your loving remembrance of me. I still recollect you; though I believe I should not know you, were I permitted to see you once more in the flesh: still it would be mutually delightful to recount the various ways our merciful Redeemer has led us these twenty years. But it seems not yet the Lord's will that I once more see you, and all our other Christian friends in England. After the receipt of the Committee's letters, inviting me to pay them a visit in Europe, I had fully resolved to do so, and was preparing for it; but so many voices, both of Europeans and natives, were raised against it from all sides, near and far, that I have at last seen it my duty to change the purpose, and to stay at my post at ANY RATE. It would be heart-breaking were I to leave this field which the Lord has assigned to me, to forsake the souls which he has granted me as *my hire*. I sincerely wish and pray that nothing may again occur to disturb us in our work, and to clash with the principles of the Gospel on which we desire to carry it on, and on which alone we have hitherto been blessed, and can expect to be blessed in future. As the brethren, Schaffter and Müller, are of the same mind with me, desiring to go on according to the word of God, and as the welfare of our congregations shall require, they also will sign this letter. Be so kind as to lay this letter before the Committee. May our Lord and Master Jesus Christ reign among you and us all by His powerful Spirit, and fit us to serve Him in perfect obedience to his Holy Word, the sword of the Spirit, with which he will slay the wicked.— Believe us, with Christian regards, ever your faithful and affectionate brethren,"

(signed) C. RHENIUS, P. SCHAFFTER, J. J. MULLER.

Whatever merit this letter may have in Mr. Strachan's eyes, it was the result of my visit to Palamicotta. But indeed either blame or credit would be misplaced. How Mr. Strachan, with his knowledge of Rhenius's character, and the nature of the differences between them, could interpret the letter as conceding the points at issue, is to me amazing. But to show my impression of Rhenius's then state of feeling, I will quote the following extract from a letter which I wrote at the time to a friend:

"This letter is to explain to you confidentially the state of things as they now are here, relative to the Church Missionary Society and Rhenius, who has determined to stay and go on simply as the Lord shall give him wisdom, standing on the Bible, on which he was ordained, and the Bible ONLY and according to that rule working. My whole soul is satisfied that it is not a question of Lutheranism or Church of Englandism, or one sect against another; and for this reason, that Rhenius says, 'Let any pious bishop come and ordain, if he will ordain on the Bible, or allow the removal from the Church ordination service of such passages as I neither could nor would myself subscribe. I could not desire that my children should subscribe formularies of what they are ignorant on my recommendation, when I believe there are many things erroneous and viciously false, and as I say, such as I could not subscribe. It is a thing I never can nor never will do.' I think then Rhenius will now go on appointing teachers as before, and as to allowing them to baptize and administer the Lord's supper, to this he will also appoint them, as occasion shall require. The brethren here, Schaffter and

Müller are both united thus far with him, that at all events he shall stay, and in the doing of whatever his conscience may suggest as for the edification of the people, even though they might not see the absolute necessity of the step themselves, yet they will abide by him, and at all events rather leave the mission than oppose him. This so far is all happy."

After all the discussions that had passed between the Society and Mr. Rhenius, what interpretation could be put on Mr. R.'s determination to stand at his post "at any rate," but that however they might oppose, still he would stand by his work? and therefore he instantly says: "I wish and pray that nothing may again occur to disturb us in our work, and to clash with the principles of the Gospel on which we desire to carry it on." Why Mr. Strachan quotes this, (and in italics too,) to mean that "nothing should be done on either side to disturb them in their work;" is to me amazing. The fact is, that from the moment Mr. R. determined to stay, he counted the cost; and resolved no longer to contend with the Society in word, but acquit his conscience before God to the flock. If the Society bore it, well; if not, he waited patiently the result: hoping that though they withdrew the annual supply, and however it might grieve them, their generosity would still prefer the true interests of the Church of God in Tinnevely, to their own party; but if they did not, he was prepared to run all hazards in standing by the Lord's work according to his conscience, and look to his own Master for the helping on His own work: feeling that whoever was inconsistent, he was not; and that all he demanded, after all his success, was the exercise of those ministerial functions to which he had been ordained, and the right to exercise which, if questioned, ought to have been questioned before the Society formed its connection with him.

As I have alleged in the "Brief Account," the breach appeared to me *already made*, and incapable of being healed. On arriving indeed afterwards at Madras, my interview with Mr. Tucker made me hope otherwise; but after events proved, *beyond contradiction* that I was right at first. For even the three brethren who remained behind, have been now ejected by the Madras Committee, though two of them are episcopally ordained. So untrue is it that the breach between Rhenius and the Society is of my making.

At all events, Mr. Strachan is certainly misled, in supposing Rhenius's letter to be in any sense a concession. How his mistake arose, may be conjectured. Mr. Rhenius having come to the conviction that ordination was *not* absolutely necessary to justify his catechists in administering the Sacraments, was no longer disposed to press this point. This may have given him a hope, that if he determined to stay at Tinnevely, his proceedings might be quietly acquiesced in, though they could not be definitely approved. Moreover, as he was desirous of writing a letter which should be signed by his colleagues, he probably abstained from entering so much as he might otherwise have done, into his private feelings and opinions. But however this may be, it is certain that the effect of my visit was shortly this. Before I came, he intended to return to Europe, letting the congregation run all hazards as to *spirituals*. After I came, he felt it his duty to stay, running all risks, himself and his family with the catechists, in *temporals*, so that they might minister in *spirituals* as servants of the Lord.

Now as to my part in the publication of the Review, which has given so much offence, Mr. Strachan speaks as though I had confessed to some fault or sin in Rhenius and myself in this matter; which is not the case. I thought and I think that the pamphlet was able and conclusive, and valuable to the Church of Christ: I thought and I think that there was nothing in Mr. Rhenius's relation to the Society, which ought to put him in bondage not to declare his sentiments as publicly as he pleases. But I did not connect it in my own mind with the Society at all: I knew that he was not writing it in hostility to them, and it did not occur to me that they would so take it. But on finding how keenly they were wounded I did regret its publication; only, my expression of this regret must not be understood as an inculpation of Rhenius or as a charge of sentiment concerning the work.

Neither again must the actual effect of my advice in bringing about the publication, be exaggerated. It is again and again confessed by Rhenius, that he would have published without me; and all who know him will well believe how little he is to be swayed by the opinions of others; nay, it was six months after our conversation that he published at all. But Mr. Strachan says (p. 34), "Thus matters stood for *nearly twelve months* prior to the 'publication of the tracts'—(by *Thus*, meaning, in harmony and internal prosperity.) And again (p. 37), "That act" (of publishing) "had placed the Committee in a most distressing dilemma, *nearly twelve months* after the settlement of all previous subjects of difference." The expression *nearly twelve months*, (each time printed in Italics,) seems to imply that so long after the amnesty I advised the publication. Yet his *twelve months* should rather have been *six*. But whatever opinion I gave Mr. Rhenius, was given at the very period of his writing the letter of supposed concession, which so pleased Mr. Strachan, and which (as I have said) was altogether occasioned by my visit to Palamcottah. From that time to the actual publication, I had quite forgotten the question; and if I named to Mr. Tucker, (with whom I had had the sweetest Christian communion and who so kindly exonerates me from all desire of stirring up division,) if I mentioned to him that I had approved the publication, it was not as though I thought my advice had caused it, but because I could not bear to express my regret, without more fully opening my heart; to say how little I had anticipated the construc-

tion that would be put upon the act, and the shock it would give to the Society and to himself, whom I had not at the time the pleasure of knowing.

I know it seems extraordinary to the Society, that Mr. Rhenius and I did not consider the tract as an attack upon them. But indeed at the very time when we were talking about it, Mr. R. said that the Committee, in replying to his letter that contained a copy of the tract, took no notice of the subject. Had they then expressed to him the feelings that they have since, it is quite evident that he would never have published; for even after he had published, he offered to withdraw it from circulation, if he could thereby satisfy the Society. But to relinquish the principles, was to him impossible. I may add, that when Mr. R. had received a definite challenge from a member of the Committee, it seems rather hard that the Society should visit Mr. R. so seriously for replying to it. And though Mr. Strachan seeks to break the force of this fact, by alleging that Mr. Harper was not, at the time of publication, a member of the Committee, (the Home Society having ejected *all* the chaplains, in the interval between the challenge and the publication of the reply,) this did not prevent Mr. Rhenius from feeling it a public call on him in his ministerial capacity, to vindicate the liberties of his own Church, and the validity of his own ministrations.

In concluding this head, which is personal to myself, I must state that I never sought any influence over the Tinnevely Mission, nor is any thing farther from my heart than to intrude into other men's labors. My grand object in England or in India, is to promote the principle of *Congregational Missions*; the design of which is, to make the connexion as close as possible between those who go forth and those who send; so that as far as possible, they may be personally acquainted, and at least acquainted by intimate personal interest; and that the Missionary may stand in the liberty wherewith Christ has made him free, and not be entangled in the bondage of any home system. The helping on of this, is more than enough for any little energy that I have, or means that I can bring to the Lord's work; so that when the brethren left Tinnevely, while I grieved at their giving up the Lord's flock to mute teachers, I yet felt relieved personally. And now that Rhenius has returned, I have no prospect but of increased labor. Control over his Mission I would not take, and he would not give; both of us believing it to be an odious abuse, that he who ministers to the Lord's servants in mere carnal things, should become hereby vested with authority in spiritual things.

MR. SCHMID'S CASE.

I am sorry to find Mr. Strachan charge me with misrepresentations on this head, which, he says, cause him *surprise and regret*, and for which he was not prepared even by my *misstate-ments relative to Rhenius*. He then complains that I have not stated half the facts of the case. The matter stands thus. To prove that (independently of the tracts) there existed but too many sources of variance between Rhenius and the Society, I remarked that Mr. Schmid had *already separated*, before the tracts were published. Mr. Strachan regards it as dishonest, that I omitted to name that Mr. Schmid had since then *rejoined* the Society; and ends by stating, that before my arrival in India, *all matters were amicably adjusted*. Certainly most readers will here think I have somehow committed myself, and Mr. Strachan's general imputations of error, while he quotes my words without saying how much is or is not true, are to me very unpleasant; as I feel convinced that he leads his readers into several misapprehensions. But I will now say, why the fact of Mr. Schmid's reunion, which Mr. Strachan represents as so important an omission, seemed to me quite irrelevant to the argument. The truth is, that Mr. Schmid *never returned to Tinnevely*, much as his heart was there, and valuable as his services would have been. Nay, at the time when Rhenius was preparing to leave, the Committee made no attempt to get Mr. Schmid to take his place, although in such a state of things, nothing was more desirable for them. As Mr. Schmid is in connexion with them in another place, where these ordination difficulties are for a while suspended, I cannot say all that I feel and know, lest I inadvertently widen the breach between him and them. But public facts fully show, that Mr. Schmid's reunion does not imply that there is unanimity. *Were he this day at Tinnevely, he would this day leave it on the same grounds as before*. Hence his rejoining the Society does not affect my argument. I may now in turn complain that Mr. Strachan omits, not indeed half the facts of the case, but the facts *really relevant* to the case.

He farther deduces from my statement, that Mr. Schmid is not only *now* separated from the Society, but is *now* in such destitution, that the Catechists "*have been*" excited to contribute to support him. I neither said nor implied any such thing. But on the other hand, Mr. Strachan's statement does most improperly lead the reader to suppose, that Schmid only *intended* to leave, but never *did* leave; and that my whole story is untrue. Whereas, I must repeat, that he did leave; he did come into great destitution, out of which he was relieved by voluntary liberality; and the Catechists did so subscribe, though he would not receive it. Other friends had anticipated them, and he gave it to the Tamil Tract Society. But Mr. Strachan does not appear to have remarked, that I adduced the fact, not at all to inculpate the Society, but to exhibit the love which the Catechists bore to Mr. Schmid.

FAREWELL LETTER OF MR. RHENIUS

TO THE

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, AFTER RECEIVING HIS DISMISSAL.

To the Rev. Mr. Jowett, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,

I cannot separate from the Church Missionary Society in accordance with your Resolution of the 15th February last, after a connection of twenty-one years, without giving you a farewell letter, expressive of the sentiments and feelings with which I do separate.*

I need not assure you, that the separation from the Society, and especially from my beloved flock in Tinnevely, which I and my fellow labourers were the honoured instruments of raising and nourishing these fifteen years, has caused me much pain and grief, and that it was only divine grace which enabled me to pass through it with any degree of composure and strength. That pain and grief are only exceeded by those which I feel, when I reflect that your Committee, who must be well aware of the tender connection between me and Tinnevely, should have been the cause of rending this connection asunder. Indeed, I cannot but charge you with cruel injustice towards me, and the people from whom you have separated me.

Reflect, dear Brethren, what you have been doing. In your instructions to Missionaries, you hope and pray that the Lord may give them many souls for their hire. If then the Lord has given me souls in Tinnevely for my hire, you have come and robbed me of my hire! And why? because I published a pamphlet pointing out various particulars in the discipline and formularies of the Church of England, which, as it appears to me, need to be corrected—a pamphlet written upon the express request of a Clergyman of that Church, and at that time a member of your Committee at Madras; and again, not so much because of the nature of its contents, but merely because I *published* it!! Thus then you have separated me from my flock, because I was not a dissembler, but a straight forward Minister of the Gospel, endeavouring to purify a portion of Christ's Church from errors which confessedly have been retained in it from Popery—an endeavour which you must allow to be the duty of every Minister of Christ. And am I alone in this good work? whilst many of your Evangelical Clergy are sighing and groaning under the burthen which the Rubrics and Canons of the Church are laying upon their conscience. Are there not many of them, even at this time, standing forth and boldly pointing out the errors and abuses of the Church? No Bishop, I understand, would dare to do such a thing. But you have outstripped even the Bishop in zeal for forms of the Church, and discontinued from your body one, who during a period of twenty-one years, while in connection with you, endeavoured faithfully to serve the Lord Christ, who was in no way bound to the forms of the Church of England, and who was therefore; the more entitled to speak out freely the convictions of his mind, merely because he exposed what he considered to be errors still existing in that Church. I entreat you again to reflect on this step, and see whether the Antichristian Spirit of Popery is not at the bottom of it?

Were this not the case, you as a Society professing to have only the Glory of God in the establishment of Christ's Kingdom at heart, could not have acted in this way. How much soever the truth told might have pained you, yet knowing that, notwithstanding my diffe-

* It is here necessary to mention for the information of the Reader unacquainted with the affair, that in 1822 the Rev. Mr. Harper, Chaplain of Madras, then a member of the Madras Committee of the Church Missionary Society, and well acquainted with my sentiments about the English Episcopalian Church, sent a publication of his "Church and her Daughters, &c." for me to review, with the express promise to publish it in his monthly periodical, "The Madras Christian Observer." I wrote the Review and sent it to him; he delayed publishing it from month to month, and from year to year, and at last laid it aside altogether. I then published the Review myself in 1834; for doing so the Church Missionary Committee in London, upon the advice very clearly implied, though not actually expressed, of their Committee at Madras, dissolved the connexion with the Society. Their resolution to that effect arrived in Madras in May 1835.

rence from the Church of England forms, Christ's Kingdom was enlarged, and the glory of God was promoted by my ministrations in Tinnevelly through the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit—you might have suffered the work of God in Tinnevelly on account of it. That there *was* such a glorious work of God in that Mission you yourselves have all along acknowledged, you have rejoiced with us therein, you have praised God for it even whilst aware that the Church forms were but partially observed. Yea, your Secretary, Rev. Mr. Tucker, only three or four weeks before he became the hardhearted Executioner of your decree,* paid us a visit in Palamcotta, and not only rejoiced in all that he saw and heard, but upon his return to Madras could publish in the Missionary Record for May last his introduction to our Report, "that he had no hesitation in saying, that as far as he was able to judge, the particulars published (in our Report for 1834) do not convey to the mind of the reader an adequate idea of the prosperous state of this Mission, and the reality of the work which God is working in this district, and at the end calls it an extensive and well ordered Mission."† And yet after three or four weeks he can come flying as it were on wings to execute your decree of spiritual robbery, and disregarding the cries and requests of the people, and the ‡ apology which I offered to the Society for the publishing of the Review, snap asunder ties which have been by the blessing of the Lord between pastor and people—ties which are at least as strong as those which unite father and children together. And why? Simply because I had pointed out what I considered to be the existing errors of the *Church of England*. Is not this the Spirit of Antichrist? The Spirit of Rome itself would have done it only a little more cruelly.

You might indeed have dissolved my connection with *you* if it was dishonourable in you to be united with one who faithfully and conscientiously endeavoured to serve the Lord Christ without respect of persons; and if reasons of consistency made it imperious upon you to do so—but you might have left me undisturbed in the work at Tinnevelly. You had abundance of reasons for it; you might have considered that no immoral conduct—no heretical doctrine on my part made an expulsion necessary; that no pledge existed by which I was bound to the observance of the Church of England forms; that notwithstanding my difference from her in certain respects, I still conformed to her rules as much as I conscientiously could; that the work of the Lord was actually prospering in my hand, and that therefore He was not against me; that there were no suitable persons whom you might place as our successors to the work, that humanly speaking the cause of Christ in Tinnevelly must suffer by my removal; that such removal must strike wounds in me and my people, which cannot easily be healed, and which a Christian public would not see inflicted with calmness and indifference; and that in case you withdraw from Tinnevelly the work of the Lord would still go on as before, and that therefore no injury would arrive to the people in Tinnevelly. But no such consideration moved you and your representatives in Madras; you not only separate me from your Society, but you insist also on my leaving Tinnevelly, and having nothing more to do with the congregations!!! You maintain that the whole Mission is yours, because in the first instance you sent me to Tinnevelly, gave me the temporal support which I needed, and defrayed other expenses of the Mission. I fully admit your right to the Mission to a certain extent, but shall we have none at all, even none to congregations among whom we have laboured day and night, and whom we were the means of bringing to the knowledge of Jesus Christ—you say that we have no right whatever—what monstrous doctrine is this! How deeply striking at the root of every affectionate attachment between pastor and people! How much calculated to make your Missionaries mere hirelings, servants of *men*, and not of the Lord Christ! Henceforth money is to be deemed the principal consideration in the work of converting the Natives, and the bond of connexion between converts from Heathenism and the Church of Christ! The sweat of the Missionary's brow, his anxious labours are nothing to be accounted of in the matter! Had you considered these things maturely, you might have hit upon some other arrangement, by which such inferences might have been avoided:

* I do not use this expression "hardhearted executioner" thoughtlessly, for he himself stated to me, that when in 1834, he as the Secretary of the Madras Committee, sent them dispatches on the subject to the Home Committee, he had charged a relation of his in England, in case the Home Committee should not dissolve my connection with the Society, to tender at once his resignation to the Committee. Mr. Tucker's mind therefore was fully made up on the subject. About six months after he paid his first visit to Palamcotta, he published our Report of the Tinnevelly Mission, with a most favourable introduction to it, as above. He was therefore highly delighted with the state of the Mission; yet three or four weeks afterwards the Home Committee's letter arrives, and he comes to Palamcotta to carry it into effect, with a zeal and promptitude which would have done honour to a better cause, professing all this time his regret and sorrow at the object of his mission. Taking all these proceedings together, I cannot but call him a hardhearted Executioner; and I only mention the foregoing facts in order to show how dreadful the effect of the systems of the Church of England is upon her most amiable sons.

† There, let it be remembered, that Mr. Tucker gave this favourable testimony *after* Bishop Wilson had published several erroneous statements against Tinnevelly in his late charges to the Clergy.

‡ Not for the *contents* of the publication, but because it gave offence to the Society, and produced consequences I did not anticipate or expect.

you might have left me in the possession of the Mission, and contented yourselves with demanding indemnifications for the Mission Houses and other such property (if you considered them as well as my services not to be the Lord's, but your own.) But no: you insist upon my removal altogether—you disconnect me not only from your Society, but also from my people: you insist, in case I do not remove, upon other Missionaries being placed in Tinnevely in opposition to me!! I could not but see, that were I to remain under such circumstances, confusion and every evil work would be the immediate result; and although I felt deeply that you were quite unjustifiable in the course you had resolved to adopt, yet I considered that the leadings of Divine Providence clearly pointed out that it was my duty to withdraw: remembering the word of the Lord, "if they persecute me in one city, flee ye to another," and considering that he may have some work for me elsewhere. But think what will the Lord say to that act? Consider whether the forms of the Church of England were not of greater importance to you than the reality of the Church of Christ? You say that *consistency* obliged you to act as you have done. But dear Brother, what consistency is this which obliges you to tear an acknowledged Minister of Christ, whom the Lord had been pleased to bless, from his flock, merely because he published a Review of the Church, and therein honestly and conscientiously stated some of her errors! If that be consistent with the principles of the Church Missionary Society, or with those of the Church of England, surely those principles must be wrong, they must be inconsistent with the dictates and the spirit of the Gospel. How will they bear the scrutiny of the judgment day? Were not the Popes as much consistent with their principles, when they condemned Huss to be burned and Luther to be excommunicated? Moreover, as a Missionary Society, you had nearly nothing to do with my publication, you might have fairly left the matter to be decided between Mr. Harper and myself. Had he answered my Review reasonably and scripturally, who knows what might have been the consequence with respect to myself? I might have seen my errors respecting the Church of England and relinquished them. You, or rather your representatives, charge me with inconsistency, yea dishonesty, in not resigning that Society before I published such a Review, as I must have known that the Society's Regulations make it necessary that all their Missions be carried on according to the discipline and the formularies of the Church of England; but you never told me or wrote to me that I had to lay aside any German Lutheran form, and to observe that of England; you never put the Rules of the Society in my hands for examination previous to my engagement with the Society. It is only since the ordination question was stirred, during the last three or four years, that you made me attentive to those rules; and even then you declared, again and again, that I might go on in the Mission work as before,* well knowing that all along I had been going on on principles not in conformity with the Rubrics and Canons of the Church of England, because I never hid from you any manner of proceeding in the Mission work, as my Journal and Letters will show. Why then did not you dissolve my connexion with you long before the publication of the Review, if it had been from the beginning really your determination, that also the German Missionaries, ordained on the Continent, should observe the discipline and formularies of the Church of England. I had no need of resigning your Society, because from the beginning I had no other rule for my proceedings but the word of God; the same which you have often declared was also your rule! So long then as I proceeded according to the word of God, you could not, I felt persuaded, object to my proceedings. If you did object, then it was plainly *your* part to dissolve my connection with you and not mine. Now is this publication of my Review contrary to the word of God? But you say, that though no agreement was made between us, yet by the simple fact of uniting myself to a Church Missionary Society, I gave you a tacit acknowledgment of conforming to the rules of the Church of England. To this I may reply, with equal force, that as you never showed me the Regulations of the Society for examination, nor bound me in anywise to the Church of England; by uniting yourselves to me you gave a tacit acknowledgment, that as a German Clergyman I might carry on this Mission work according to the German form. And that this was at least in former years actually your mind with respect to German Clergymen, though not mentioned in your† regulation, will be plain to every one who considers that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had for many years allowed their German Missionaries in Tanjore and Trichinopoly to carry on their Missions, not according to the English, but according to the Lutheran German Churches form, authorizing them repeatedly even to ordain Native Priests according to the German ritual; and that your Society itself, even as late as 1821 or 22, when Bishop Middleton was already in Calcutta, authorized our German Brethren there to ordain Abdee M. and Mr. B. according to the German ritual. On no ground whatever then

* Put Mr. Rhenius's declaration here side by side with Mr. Strachan's misleading statements.

† Mr. Strachan, however, does mention it among the regulations of the Committee. See "Reply to Mr. Strachan," pp. 3, 4.

can I be charged with inconsistency or dishonesty in the matter of publishing my Review. The most that can be said is, that I was incautious in doing so, not considering that the Society would be affected by it. That it was incautious I have before admitted, and do now admit, but who could foresee that you would be so much affected by the publication of truth, as to dissolve my connection with you? Who could imagine that in this nineteenth century the calm discussion of ecclesiastical matters would meet with such repulsive treatment?

It seems, however, that you did so from an apprehension that the contributors to the Church Missionary Society would withdraw their subscriptions, were they to see one of their Missionaries publish a work not in favour of the Church of England.* This might have been the case with some, but I cannot believe that it would be so with the majority. It would be nearly a libel on the Evangelical Members of the Church of England to suppose that they give their aid principally to the spread of the forms of their Church and not to the spread of Christ! They well know, that notwithstanding our departures from that form, the cause of Christ was steadily advancing in Tinnevely. Would they then withdraw their aid now that the publication of my Review exposes certain errors of that form? Or would they consent to my removal from Tinnevely on that account? To their honour I will not believe it. They would, notwithstanding their attachment to the Church of England, continue to aid that Society, persuaded that the chief object of the Society was obtained in Tinnevely. Here in India, at least it has been so, for it is the fact, that even after the publication of my Review, and after all the noise which Mr. Tucker made about it through the newspapers, your Committee, as well as myself, received more contributions than they did some time previous to it. Your apprehensions therefore were, so far as I see, groundless. Moreover, your representatives in Madras acted in a manner calculated to do the greatest possible injury to the Tinnevely Mission. For not only were they extremely urgent in removing me from them, but affairs were so managed that my three fellow labourers, Messrs. Schaffter, Müller, Lechler, felt themselves under the necessity of leaving Tinnevely likewise. These Brethren had resolved still to stay a season there, until your Committee in London should return an answer to a representation which they were to make immediately, under the condition, that until then, no alterations should be made in the mode of proceedings in the Mission; and that no English Episcopalian Missionary be introduced to them. But not only was this reasonable request refused by the Madras Committee, but they were desired to give a written declaration to this effect: that they recognize the full and undisputed right of the Church Missionary Society to the Tinnevely Mission, its congregations, and every member of the same; even those souls which might by the instrumentality of the Brethren have been brought to the knowledge of Christ, and that, should the Home Committee's answer be unfavourable to their representation, they leave the Mission quietly then or at any time: when they might have known, that the Brethren would never give such a declaration, and that they could not give up their condition, yet they made such strange demands, and thereby forced the Brethren to resign, and to leave Tinnevely with me: whereby the congregations were at once deprived of ALL their beloved teachers, and put under others, who were not only strangers to them, but also by no means in a condition to supply their spiritual wants. The Committee rather relinquished three German Missionaries than withdraw one English Episcopalian Missionary. So zealous were they of the law, Acts xxi. 20.

Once more consider, I pray you, what you have done by this act to the people of Tinnevely. What must the Christians think of the removal of their Teachers by whom they were brought to the light of the Gospel, and nourished for many years with the pure milk of the divine word, and whom they loved and revered! Suddenly I am torn away from their midst. And when they inquire why? What answer can be given to them? If a charge of immorality or false doctrine could be fixed upon me, then matters would be plain to them. But as this is not the case, what must they think when they understand the true causes, viz., that I published a little book pointing out certain errors in the forms of the Church of England! What must they think of the Church Missionary Society when they learn, that simply on this account they removed their beloved and consistently walking teacher from them? What must they think of this Christian Church in general? How greatly must their confidence, I will not say in Christianity, but in their new Teachers be shaken! The heathen also cannot but be confounded. Knowing my upright and just life among them, they must by this act of yours receive the most unfavourable impression of the Christian Church! How will many of them, who are criminally disposed, exult in the fact, that what their own enmity could not accomplish (viz., getting me away from Tinnevely,) my Christian friends did for them!

* I must here remind the reader that my publication is not an *attack* on the Church of England, as it has often been insinuated, but merely a *defence* of divine truths against the assertions which were made in the book which Mr. Harper sent me, for reviewing assertions which attacked the German Churches as well as the English Dissenting Churches.

But enough. I trust I have shown that your act in removing me from Tinnevely is cruelly unjust towards me and the people, and highly inconsistent with your profession of being desirous only to promote the Glory of God and the Kingdom of Christ according to the Scriptures. This is the second black spot on your characters as a Missionary Society in reference to myself. The first your Madras Committee made, when in 1820 they removed me and Brother Schmid to Tinnevely from Madras, where the Mission was just beginning to flourish under our hands, solely because we had too Catholic a spirit, and desired to embrace all as Christian Brethren who hold the Head.* The Madras Mission has suffered ever since. The second black spot is your present act, and by it you are determined to draw down the blast of God also upon the Tinnevely Mission. I confess you were put to some trial by the publication of my Review, but it was a trial only whether you would continue to walk "after the flesh," after the commandments and doctrines of men, or to choose to walk "after the Spirit." You have chosen the former, and have not therefore stood the trial. "But he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh also reap corruption," Gal. v. 8.

I now bid you farewell! I part from you with deep regret, chiefly because you should have so closely followed the steps of the Madras Champion, to the great injury of your Society and of the Church of England. If I have said any thing in this letter strongly or in language you are not accustomed to hear, do, I beseech you, ascribe it not to any angry feeling against you personally, but the force of Truth which compels me to be faithful to you and to the cause of our adorable Redeemer. Moreover, I entreat you most humbly, on this occasion, if you desire the real prosperity of your labours in the Missionary cause, to get rid of that spirit which could prompt you to act towards Tinnevely as you have done. At the Judgment Day it will clearly appear whether I have sinned by publishing the Review of the Church in defence of divine Truth, or you by forcing me away from Tinnevely on that account. I wish you no evil; on the contrary, I pray that the Lord Jesus Christ our common Master, (whose was your money and my services,) may abundantly prosper you, yet so that all trusting in human ordinances be confounded, and his word alone be glorified. May He be gracious to us all for the sake of his blood and righteousness.

I remain, with Christian regards, still, my dear Brethren,
Your's affectionately in Christ Jesus,

Madras, July 18, 1835.

(Signed) C. R.

* This true cause of my removal from Madras to Tinnevely was never made known to the public. In the Report of the Society for 1821 only secondary inconsiderable reasons are mentioned. [Mr. Strachan has taken advantage of this, to represent Mr. Groves as in error about it.]

