

THE
CONNEXIONAL ECONOMY
OF
WESLEYAN METHODISM
IN ITS
Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Aspects.

BY JAMES H. RIGG, D.D.,

AUTHOR OF 'MODERN ANGLICAN THEOLOGY,' 'ESSAYS FOR THE TIMES,'
'THE LIVING WESLEY,' ETC.

London:

PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR, AT THE
WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE,
2, CASTLE-STREET, CITY-ROAD;
AND 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

HAYMAN BROTHERS AND LILLY,
PRINTERS,
HATTON HOUSE, FARRINGDON ROAD,
LONDON, E.C.

GENERAL PREFACE.



THIS volume is mainly a republication. It consists of an essay in exposition and defence of the Connexional principles of Wesleyan Methodism, published nearly thirty years ago, and long out of print, and two minor publications, originally written as part of a series of newspaper articles about fifteen years ago. They are thus collected and republished now to meet a pressing need. Their relation to each other is explained in the new Preface to the first and main publication. I have added what seemed necessary in consequence of such changes in the economy of Methodism as have been made since 1851.

In this year of official engagements I could hardly have revised and republished the contents of this volume, but for the valuable help, in conducting the whole through the press, which I have received from my assistant, the Rev. JOHN TELFORD.

JAMES H. RIGG.

March 4th, 1879.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
GENERAL PREFACE	iii
 I. CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCY AND WESLEYAN CONNEXIONALISM CONTRASTED.	
PREFACE TO THE NEW EDITION	ix
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION	xiii
 I.	
APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY CONNEXIONAL IN PRIN- CIPLE—A SCRIPTURAL ‘CHURCH’	1
 II.	
MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY AND CHURCH-DISCIPLINE	24
 III.	
ADAPTATION TO EVANGELISTIC OR MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE	37
 IV.	
EMPLOYMENT OF LAY-PREACHERS — MINISTERIAL TRAINING	55
 V.	
ITINERANCY—CLASS-LEADERS	71
 VI.	
ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF CONGREGATIONAL INDE- PENDENCY CONSIDERED	87
 VII.	
THE POPULAR ELEMENT	102
 VIII.	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	125

APPENDICES.

A.

PAGE

INDEPENDENCY AND CONNEXIONALISM MUTUALLY INCOMPATIBLE AND EXCLUSIVE	138
--	-----

B.

CHANGES LATELY MADE IN THE ORGANISATION OF METHODISM	149
---	-----

II. *THE METHODIST CLASS-MEETING.*

I.

THE CLASS-MEETING	169
-----------------------------	-----

II.

CLASS-LEADERS	176
-------------------------	-----

III.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP	183
--------------------------------	-----

IV.

THE TEST OF MEMBERSHIP	189
----------------------------------	-----

III. *THE CAUSES OF DECREASE, AND
MEANS OF INCREASE.*

I.

DECREASE, ITS CAUSES AND REMEDY	197
---	-----

II.

THE MEANS OF INCREASE FOR THE CHURCH	209
--	-----

III.

THE GREAT WORK OF THE CHURCH	218
--	-----



CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCY

AND

WESLEYAN CONNEXIONALISM

CONTRASTED.



PREFACE TO THE NEW EDITION.



THE argument now republished was written twenty-nine years ago, was first published twenty-eight years ago. The book has been many years out of print, and I had not intended to reprint it. As a memento of a painful controversy I wished it to die. I expected that some work, not like this small volume, conceived and brought into the world in the midst of strife and rebuke, but matured in peaceful leisure, would have superseded altogether the demand for this book. It is, however, still asked for, and no other has been published containing the same or any equivalent argument. Meantime there are decisive indications that some such publication is at this time greatly needed in Methodism. I therefore feel constrained to re-issue this book notwithstanding its imperfections. I have not, and am not likely to have, any time to re-write

it. I have to some extent revised it. But this could only be done slightly, here and there. It will not be forgotten that it was written when I was a very young man, and in the heat of a struggle for life, so far as Methodism was concerned. Perhaps it may be well for some who have come upon the scene since the cruel and crucial period to which I refer to have an opportunity of gaining, from such a republication, some faint—it can only be a very faint—idea of the troubles through which their fathers passed.

By a few passages placed within brackets, and by an Appendix (B), I have tried to insert such additions, relating to the history and constitution of Methodism, as the lapse of thirty years seemed to render indispensable.

All my life through I have maintained relations of personal friendship with esteemed Congregationalists. I have delighted, whenever opportunity has offered, to do honour to their high character and to the noble works which some of them have written. But I am as convinced now as I was thirty years ago

that the principles of Independency cannot be reconciled with the principles of Wesleyan Methodism.

I have appended to this republication two others, both very brief, but which also seem to have a useful adaptation to the thoughts and needs of the present time, and which are congenial to the general strain and purpose of the argument which precedes them. They appeared originally in the columns of the *Watchman*, in the years 1864 and 1865, and were afterwards separately published. Throughout all these pages I have written primarily as a Methodist for Methodists. In that respect this volume is in contrast with another published nearly at the same time, on the *Churchmanship of John Wesley* and cognate matters, and in which I have written chiefly and directly for the general public, especially Churchmen. The difference in object of the two volumes may explain some diversity in phrase and style.

JAMES H. RIGG.

WESTMINSTER,
February 27th, 1879.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.



THE *occasion* and *object* of the following discussion are sufficiently explained in the first chapter. A few words, however, may here be said as to the *manner*. The writer will perhaps be accused by some of having infused too much acrimony into his polemics. In reply to this, he has only to say that no one imputation upon the character or motives of any individual will be found in this tract; and only in two places, and in reference to one portion of the public press, has he allowed himself to reflect with any degree of severity upon the actual conduct of any *class* of persons. It is indeed to be regretted, in this case, that the conduct of the parties to whom he refers has been such, and so nearly connected with the necessity which has arisen for the present publication, as to render it impossible to avoid alluding to and characterising their spirit and proceedings.

Of the system, however, the pretensions of which it is one object of this tract to lower, he has felt bound to speak in such terms as strict truth and the logical necessities of his argument seemed to require. If he has used plain and strong words, it has not been in the way of declamation, but as a result of demonstration. If his argument is faulty, then his conclusions are false, and his language is unjust. But, if the argument is sound, the words which he has used in reference to the *tendencies* and genius of Congregational Independency, are the only ones which directly and fairly express the truth.

The controversy is not at all with persons, but with a system. And the misrepresentations in reference to Wesleyan Connexionalism which have obtained so much currency, and which the Independent press has laboured so heartily and so perseveringly to accredit and propagate, have compelled such a thorough and discriminative examination and defence of the system gratuitously assailed, in reference especially to the particulars in which

it has been unfavourably contrasted with its antagonist system,—Congregational Independency,—as could not but involve, in return, a direct and articulate attack upon the latter system in reference to those contrasted particulars.

It may be right to say, further, that the leisure of an enforced temporary retirement from the ordinary labours of the ministry seemed to lay upon the writer the duty of undertaking this argument, which the present circumstances of Wesleyan Methodism appeared to demand, and for which former engagements and inquiries had in some degree prepared him. The chapters here, in substance, reprinted, appeared, accordingly, as a series of articles, during the months of the last winter, in the columns of the *Watchman* newspaper. The urgent and unanimous requests of readers of every class—including several of the most distinguished among our Wesleyan laymen and ministers—have rendered it matter, not of option, but of duty, to publish these papers in their present form.

Sensible the author is of defects which time and care might have enabled him, at least in part, to remove; but delay, at present, would be more injurious than any but vital deficiencies. He therefore offers the present small treatise as a contribution to the constitutional science of that system which, the more he studies it, the more profoundly, gratefully, and religiously he admires and loves.

JAMES H. RIGG.

London, May 6th, 1851.

CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCY
AND
WESLEYAN CONNEXIONALISM
CONTRASTED.

CHAPTER I.

APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY CONNEXIONAL IN PRIN-
CIPLE—A SCRIPTURAL ‘CHURCH.’

A SYSTEM which claims for itself *divine right* is, of necessity, an exclusive and polemic system. Making such pretensions, it, of course, challenges and proscribes every other as unauthorised and anti-scriptural. It must, therefore, expect its claims to be scrutinised and its pretensions opposed by the adherents of all other systems.

Now, such a system is that of Independency, as accepted and advocated by the more rigid of its adherents. High Episcopalians themselves are not more resolute than stiff Independents in upholding the claims of their own polity as alone divinely authenticated.

Wesleyans, on the other hand, have ever defended their system in a more modest tone and on less exclusive grounds. They con-

ceive that only general principles, as to the matter of church-government, are fixed authoritatively by Scripture. The particular adaptations of these principles, and the details of church-arrangement, have, as they believe, been left to be moulded according to the varieties of human character and surrounding conditions and influences.

Yet, when it becomes necessary to enter the lists of controversy on behalf of their ecclesiastical polity, Wesleyans find little difficulty in showing that their own system is in at least as close conformity with even the leading *details* of the primitive church-arrangements as any other that may boast, however confidently, of its superior or exclusive purity and scriptural authority. Still, it is not upon this fact that Wesleyans ground their attachment to their peculiar institutions, so much as on the eminent adaptation of these to do the work of the primitive institutions in the present condition of the world, and to diffuse, unadulterated and unimpaired, the energy and influence of the apostolic gospel. And the peculiar excellence of the Wesleyan economy, in their view, is, that it embodies more perfectly, and expresses more directly and fully, than any other, the genius, the spirit and tendencies, of primitive Christianity.

Yet Wesleyans do not deny that there may be conditions and characters in relation to which another church-system than their own may be found both more congenial and more edifying. On this point they are perfectly willing to 'think and let think.'

Circumstances have at length compelled us to rise in earnest in our own defence. Foes within our church have been, in a spirit of the most gratuitous hostility, backed and applauded in their fiercest assaults by foes without, who had been wearing the semblance and using the language of *friends*. Both these parties have united, with common consent, though with a dialectic variety of speech, to attack our institutions and economy, as well as our good name.

We have long borne almost in silence the assaults of the Independent press upon our Wesleyan polity. This we have done, not because we were unable to defend ourselves, nor because we had no adequate retort to throw back on our assailants, but because we have loved peace rather than war.

There are limits, however, beyond which patience becomes pusillanimity, and silence unfaithfulness. A crisis may arrive when we must either speak, or our influence be seriously diminished, and our cause be counted lost.

~~~~~

If we consent at last to contend with those with whom we would fain have dwelt in peace as brethren,—and if, in accepting the challenge so long and so defiantly sounded, we carry our attacks in turn into the territory of those who will be our enemies,—it is only in order that we may gain a position from which to command a lasting peace.

Independents have been accustomed to speak and write as though their system of church-government were immaculate, and ours most indefensibly faulty,—as if all scriptural precedent and principle were with them, and ours a mere human system of expediency and craft.

Not that the most intelligent and reflective of them could really believe this. Let the pages either of Mr. Miall, on the one hand, or of Dr. Davidson, on the other, be consulted, and it will be seen how very little, on the showing of such authorities as these among Independents themselves, the system of modern Independency possesses in common with the principles and provisions which—the same in general outline—characterised the church-arrangements of primitive and apostolical Christianity. But this is, among Independents, esoteric doctrine. Here and there, and now and then, a bold and honest spirit may

---

venture to promulgate it; but it is not for the promiscuous multitude. The exoteric doctrine, which the people are taught or allowed to believe, is what we have described. And even Dr. Campbell, who must have known better, one would think, writing, in his *British Banner*, an account of the meeting of the Congregational Union,\* in which he is obviously haunted throughout by a conviction and feeling of the vital deficiencies of Congregationalism, ventures, notwithstanding, to cast a reflection upon the systems of Methodism, of united Presbyterianism, and of the Scotch Free Church, as being, in comparison with Independency, ‘artificial and less scriptural systems.’ It is high time that the weakness and folly of this style of assumption should be exposed. And, in reluctantly undertaking this office, we are encouraged by the consideration that we are not defending Wesleyan Methodism merely, but the great majority of Protestant organisations, against the bigotry and exclusiveness of one portion of a single sect.

Whilst we make no pretensions, on behalf of Methodism, to absolute identity, or even a very close agreement, in the *details* of its ecclesiastical polity, with the machinery and

\* For 1850.

~~~~~  
arrangements of the apostolic churches,—indeed, we believe no perfect or certainly accurate description of the order and discipline of those churches ever has been or can be given,—yet we feel assured that we hazard nothing in maintaining that our polity much more truly represents the spirit and principles of primitive Christian organisation than that in which the Independents glory.

To our minds nothing appears plainer than that Connexionalism, and not Independency, was the condition of the apostolic churches; not, indeed, a highly-organised and close-knit Connexionalism, such as belongs to modern Methodism,—this could not have been, eighteen hundred years ago, in the infancy of the widely-scattered primitive churches, and under the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed,—but still *Connexionalism in principle*, in germ and general outline.

Indeed, the union in doctrine, in object, in affection, and in commission, of the apostles, necessarily laid the foundation of a connection and intercommunity between the churches founded and regulated by them. The apostolic council, too, at Jerusalem, formed, as to matters of general interest and importance, a common standard of reference and fountain of authority to all the churches. Even Paul,

independent as was his commission, and separate as was, in general, his sphere of action, yet felt it right, by a reference to the central apostolic authority at Jerusalem, to bring himself, and the churches founded by him, into recognised community and co-ordination with the other churches of Christ. On his first visit to Jerusalem, after his conversion, he communicated with Peter and James, and abode with the former fifteen days. Fourteen years after, he went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus, and ‘communicated unto them that gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means he should run, or had run, in vain.’ Very significant is the narrative in Acts xv. and xvi. Paul was an apostle—Barnabas scarcely less; and these, in conjunction with the church at Antioch, might have been sufficient, one would think, to determine any point of doctrine, discipline, or practice, about which there was any controversy or doubt. Assuredly, if the church at Antioch had possessed the spirit or embraced the principles of modern Independency, they would never have thought of referring the questions which troubled them to the decision of a distant central authority at Jerusalem, especially when

they had with them two apostolic men. Yet this is what they actually did. ‘They determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apostles and elders, about this question.’ And the apostles and elders at Jerusalem decided it,—‘laying no greater burden’ on the church at Antioch ‘than these necessary things,’ etc. After which, Paul and Silas, going forth from Antioch to visit the churches of Asia, which Paul had founded among the Gentiles, ‘delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders.’ So, when Paul at a much later period of his history, returning to Jerusalem with alms for his countrymen, gave an account of his labours and successes to the assembly of apostles and elders, we find them not only giving Paul directions as to his behaviour, which he immediately followed, but speaking in language which implies, on their part, the possession of something approaching to œcumenical authority over the churches,—‘As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing,’ etc. (Acts xxi.) It is plain that in all this we have a system outlined and initiated the very reverse of Congregational Independency. Here is a union

and council of ministers,*—‘apostles and elders,’—centralised in one spot, assuming and exercising authority to make ‘decrees’ binding upon all the churches of Christ; those churches being, with a single exception, not even represented in, or before, the council from which the decrees go forth. Even apostles joined in referring and deferring to this general and central authority.

We shall, perhaps, be reminded that apostles presided over the church at Jerusalem. But there was an apostle, also, among the Gentile churches. Paul was a chief apostle. Besides, the elders are distinctly associated with the apostles as authenticating these decrees. And, further, the question is not, what might have been if inspired apostles had not been at the head of the primitive churches, but what was. Was, or was not, the system of polity then dawning into distinctness identical in spirit and principle with Congregational Independency? The evidence already given might warrant a negative answer.

* The whole connection proves that the apostles and elders constituted the only essential authority in this matter. The ‘multitude,’ it is evident, were present only to hear, inquire (if needful), and be instructed,—not to vote or judge. That they were joined as co-ordinate authorities in this case, is, if we look at all the circumstances, and consider well the phraseology used in various places by St. Luke, really incredible.

But there are other things connected with the relations of the primitive churches to each other, and to their common founders, sufficiently indicative of the mutual connection and intercommunity of many of them. Some of these are minor and incidental in themselves; yet their evidence is, on that account, all the more valuable. To bring forward all the evidence of this kind contained in the apostolic writings would occupy a very considerable space. We can only refer to a small portion. Let candid inquirers carefully read only 1 Corinthians xvi. and 2 Corinthians i., viii., ix., and they will both see and feel how entirely opposed was the condition of the earliest churches of Christ to the spirit and principles of modern Congregational Independence. The various churches, it will be seen, are under a common direction, and are referred to each other for regulative precedents and examples for imitation. ‘Concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.’ (1 Corinthians xvi. 1.) ‘I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many,’ etc. (2 Corinthians ix. 2, etc.); with which also compare 2 Corinthians viii. 1, 4.

The ministers accredited by one church were thereby authenticated in all, and some of them (as Timothy and Titus) possessed a common commission as special itinerants among the churches. ‘If Timotheus come, see that he be with you without fear; for he worketh the work of the Lord, even as I.’ (1 Corinthians xvi. 10.) ‘We desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you the same grace also. And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches. . . . Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers of the churches and the glory of Christ. Wherefore show ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf.’ (2 Corinthians viii. 6, 18, 23, 24.) And how distinctly and persuasively is the principle of connexional union and mutual aid—the very principle of Wesleyan Methodism—enunciated in the following words!—‘Not that other men be eased and ye burdened: but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality.’ (2 Corinthians viii. 13, 14.) To these refer-

ences we will only add one more. The apostle Paul himself, when in need, was maintained by the common care of the churches, and his maintenance is implied by himself to have been a common obligation binding upon the churches. 'Ye have well done that ye did communicate with my affliction. Now' (or for) 'ye Philippians know, also, that, in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me, as concerning giving or receiving, but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity. Not because I desire a gift; but I desire fruit that may abound to your account.' (Philippians iv. 14—17)

How little is there in all this to remind us of the tone, temper, or aspect of modern Congregationalism! What we have adduced above, however, are rather symptomatic traces, intimating the spirit and tendency of apostolic Christianity, than distinct and conclusive evidence as to the character and purport of its organisation. The union of the anointed apostles, who had received a common commission from their common Lord,—the deference shown by the great apostle of the Gentiles, and by the Gentile churches, to the central authority of the apostles and elders

presiding over the mother-church at Jerusalem,—the common subjection of the Gentile churches to Paul, and to the ministers deputed and authenticated by him,—the obligation upon each of the churches to cherish and honour any who came as the messengers of their fellow-churches, and to receive them as possessing authority and commission from Christ,—the common care of all the churches for each, and their obligation to afford mutual help in proportion to emergent necessities,—the dependence of the great apostle himself, whilst prosecuting his missionary labours, upon the common love and duty of the churches to which he had ministered :—all this, though it strongly savours of the principle, does not absolutely prove the fact of connexional organisation as characterising the early churches. It would, indeed, be very difficult to reconcile it with the genius and tendency of modern Congregationalism. But we shall be expected to bring more distinct evidence than this, in order to make good the affirmations with which we commenced this argument.

Let us now, then, turn our attention to the actual church-organisation of the apostolic times. On this point we have no complete or minute information; but we have quite enough, notwithstanding, to prove that

the arrangements of a Wesleyan circuit very much more nearly, both in principle and detail, resemble the primitive model than those of Independent churches.

There would seem to be no point connected with primitive church-organisation more evidently certain, than that the apostolic churches usually included not only a plurality of pastors, but of congregations. This fact lies upon the surface, as we think, of nearly every Epistle, and is plainly implied in several passages in the Acts. But it is, and indeed must be, denied by resolute and thorough Congregationalists. And as this point is one of the hinges upon which our controversy turns, we must bestow upon it a sufficient examination.

Strict Independents maintain that, in the apostolic writings, by a particular church we are always to understand so many believers as were accustomed to meet together in one place for mutual edification, and to receive the sacraments in common. And they infer, from this supposed fact, that it is unlawful to unite several distinct companies of communicants under the government of one pastorate.

Our common-sense readers will no doubt think it very strange and unreasonable that the second of these positions should be main-

tained, if even the first were true. It plainly rests upon the assumption that scripture precedent is, as to matters of church-arrangement, no less binding than scripture precept. But why, then, do not our Independent brethren appoint deaconesses, and hold feasts of charity, as the primitive church undeniably did? This question has been often asked; but never has been, and never can be, satisfactorily answered. Let it be shown that a plainly-taught scripture *principle* is involved in any *precedent*, and to the *principle* we will adhere. The precedent, as such, is mere *letter*. We must attain to the *spirit*.

But, now, as to the *matter of fact*. Independents, in maintaining their opinion, are compelled also to maintain that there was no church-community, in primitive times, so numerous as to be unable to assemble in such a building as might be at the command of the Christians, before specific sacred edifices were built. They are compelled to maintain this, because it is perfectly evident that the apostles considered all the Christians of each city as constituting one church. The assumption, no doubt, is startling; but to dispute it is not, this moment, our purpose. We wish to point out, what all Independents seem to have lost sight of, that they must be prepared, also, to

~~~~~

maintain that, under the administration of the apostles, if, in any city, say at Jerusalem or Ephesus, the Christian community *had* become too large for accommodation in one place; in such a case, the brethren would have severed themselves clean away, into two independent churches—two separate ‘interests’—mutually exclusive and apart. He must have ill-conceived the spirit of primitive Christianity who can believe this. Would this have accorded with the temper of that religion which, in the church at Jerusalem, made ‘all things,’ in effect, ‘common,’ so that ‘no man counted aught that he had his own’? which led the multitude of the disciples to ‘break their bread from house to house,’ and to continue steadfastly, not only in the ‘apostles’ doctrine,’ but in mutual ‘fellowship’? This would have been to institute rivalry in the place of unity, and to engender selfishness instead of love!

But, again, as to the matter of fact? *Could* each of the primitive churches be contained in one building?

The church at Jerusalem was very numerous. It cannot be supposed to have contained fewer than 10,000 members. (Acts ii. 41, 47; iv. 4; v. 14; vi. 7.) The church at Ephesus, also, can scarcely have been less

numerous. (Acts xix. 17—20.) Now, at that time, in the very earliest infancy of Christianity, the believers could have possessed no large public buildings for divine worship: how then could it be possible for their Church Meetings to be held in one place? A Church Meeting of 10,000 members! and in apostolic times, too!

Rigid Independents are bound to maintain so extraordinary a supposition, or to give up their 'right divine.' But all others are agreed in holding it to be incredible; and even more moderate Independents, Dr. Davidson, for instance, have felt constrained to give it up. The old school, however, as represented by Dr. Wardlaw, still cling to it: though even these appear to be staggered by the difficulty. We need hardly say, that the authority of all standard church-historians, down to the learned and painstaking Gieseler, and the sagacious and impartial Neander,\* is against the Independents on this point.

But Dr. Wardlaw maintains that, however hard of belief it may appear, it is yet affirmed in Scripture that the church at Jerusalem *did* meet in one place. He refers to Acts ii. 44, where it is said that 'all that believed were

\* See especially Neander's *Church History*, vol. i. (Clarke's Edition), pp. 250—253.

together'; but Dr. Wardlaw should know that the form of speech here rendered 'together,' means literally 'at one,' and may apply as properly to those who are joined together in one spirit as to a company gathered together in one place. Does the Doctor believe all the three thousand believers were accustomed to bring their united property, also, into this one place, where they 'were together, and had all things common'? and again, that 'all together,' they not only frequented the temple, but 'broke bread from house to house'? A consistent interpretation will compel him to maintain all this. We are next pointed to Acts vi. 2, and xv. 12, 22, where 'the multitude of the disciples,' and 'the whole church,' are, in our authorised version, spoken of as having been assembled together. But every tyro in Greek knows that the word here rendered 'multitude,' may be used in reference to any number of persons collected together, from a few scores upwards, and that the word translated 'church' means, to use Dr. Wardlaw's own language, 'generically, *an assembly*,' and is, or may be, 'employed indiscriminately,' in this sense; and, further, that, still to quote Dr. Wardlaw, 'in this its generic sense, it is applied, in the New Testament history (Acts xix. 41), to the tumultuous concourse of people

at Ephesus, at the time of the Demetrian riot.' So the word used in the 39th verse of that chapter, to denote 'the lawful *assembly*,' is still the same word, *ecclesia*, which, in Acts xv. 22, is rendered 'church.' Let it, in this latter passage, be translated *meeting* or *assembly*, as it certainly ought to be, since none but Independents can believe that all, or even the greater part of the 10,000 or 15,000 members of the church were present, and then Dr. Wardlaw's objections are annihilated.

We conclude, then, that the churches of Jerusalem and Ephesus, not being able all to meet in one place, embraced several, probably many, separate congregations. These, therefore, constituting all together—as is, on all hands, admitted—but one church, under a common government, must have been *connexionally* united.

But this does not close our case. We read, in various parts of the apostolic writings, of 'churches in houses.' Aquila and Priscilla, whether at Ephesus or Corinth, or (probably) at Rome, had a church in their house. Gaius, too, seems to have had a church in his house at Corinth. And so had Philemon at Colossæ, as well as Nymphas at Laodicea.\* But were

\* See Romans xvi. 3, 5, 23; 1 Corinthians xvi. 19; Colossians iv. 15; Philemon 2.

all these distinct and separate churches, communicating apart, and governed by their peculiar ministers? We believe, in reference to those at Corinth, Colossæ, and Rome, that this is not imagined by any. But if not, then it is clear that the word 'church' is, in Scripture itself, applied to a branch-meeting, tributary to, and connected with, the general church of the place.

On this point, as we have already intimated, the judgment of Dr. Davidson is decidedly with us.\* But perhaps with many Congregationalists the authority of the editor of the *Nonconformist*, professing to represent the 'Dissidence of Dissent, and the Protestantism of the Protestant Religion,' may, in this matter, weigh more than that of Dr. Davidson. In a well-known work this gentleman describes 'all the believers in one city or town,' in primitive times,

'As associated together in spiritual fellowship, meeting stately for prayer, praise, and the breaking of bread, not necessarily in one place, but often in several.' †

Again, Mr. Miall elsewhere writes still more plainly :—

'In apostolic times, there seems reason to conclude

\* See *The Congregational Lecture for 1848*, pp. 111, 120—124.

† Miall's *British Churches in relation to the British People*, 8vo. ed., p. 165.

all the Christian disciples of one city or town were united together in spiritual fellowship, and constituted the one church in that town. No evidence exists that the Christian community in any one city was divided into as many separate organisations, as there were separate places of assembly for public worship. As its members multiplied to such an extent as to render the gathering together of all of them in one place impracticable, they would, without dividing the body, and appointing a separate official machinery, assemble in more than one, and add to their elders and teachers as convenience might prescribe.\*

The same writer shall be allowed to point the contrast to all this, as existing in connection with modern Independency. His words may possibly command attention where prejudice would prevent ours from being heard:—

‘ Meanwhile, it is but too apparent, that the needless multiplication of spiritual organisations in one locality, and the appointment of a single minister over each, but ill succeeds in eliciting either the life or the power of religious association. . From that spot (the pulpit) the devotions of the people are to be led by the same man that preaches the word, every time the church assembles, year after year. The most seraphic piety, combined with the most splendid talents, can hardly, on this plan, prevent both devotion and instruction from becoming invested with an air of formality, deeply injurious to freshness of religious feeling, What is it we see [in Independent churches]. Multiplication,

\* Miall's *British Churches in Relation to the British People*, 8vo. ed., pp. 174, 181.

instead of extension ; conglomeration, in the place of diffusion ; several “ interests,” where there should be one church ; a stronger motive to gather up than to scatter abroad, to concentrate than to diffuse, to entice in than to send forth. Who has not witnessed, with a sigh of anguish, separate spiritual organisations, embodying precisely the same faith and practice, in the same town, sometimes in the same village, contending with each other, as if victory in such contention were gain to the church, scrambling after proselytes instead of seeking converts, and giving to their respective *interests* the zeal, devotion, and labour which ought to have been enlisted in the service of heavenly truths ? Who has not observed, and inwardly groaned while he observed, churches discountenancing all effort which might redistribute their own members ; and, although swelling into proportions too ample for convenient assembling in one place, frowning upon every proposition which might appear to threaten the birth and growth of a rival body ? There are important places in this empire in which single Christian societies, commonly supposed to be in a pre-eminently flourishing state, positively stifle, by their influence, all further enterprise in the same locality ; and instead of enlarging their borders, and making their moral force tell upon greater breadths of society, simply drain all neighbouring religious life into their own reservoir, in process of years to stagnate and become corrupt. These are terrible facts ; but, I ask with fearlessness, Are they not facts ? ’\*

What a censure is this, from the hand of a friend, upon the unscriptural system of modern

\* Miall’s *British Churches in relation to the British People*, 8vo. ed., pp. 175, 181, 182.

---

Independency ! How high a tribute, from one of another denomination, to the principles of Wesleyan Methodism !\*

\* We may possibly be told by some Independents, that Mr. Miall is *not* an authority in these matters. ‘Dr. Morison,’ it will be said, ‘has rebuked and refuted him, and so has Dr. Vaughan.’ We beg to say, that neither Dr. Morison nor Dr. Vaughan has refuted, or even challenged, the above sentiments ; and it is plain that the *truth* of much in Mr. Miall’s work is not less displeasing to his Congregationalist critics than his errors on some points.

## CHAPTER II.

### MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY AND CHURCH-DISCIPLINE.

WE have shown that something like a connexional union subsisted between both the apostles and, as far as practicable, the churches of their founding; that the Gentile churches, especially, deferred to a common central authority; followed the same rules and precedents; recognised and received, as possessing a title to ministerial status and honour, the ministers accredited by each other; and acknowledged a common obligation to help each other's necessities, and 'bear each other's burdens';—and, beyond all this, exemplified, in their actual organisation, a church arrangement essentially connexional, and opposed to the Congregational Independency of modern times.

We proceed to show that, in several other particulars, the churches, which have been accustomed to boast of their conformity to the 'primitive model,' are, in fact, quite at variance with it.

The appointment of pastors among Congregationalists is not regulated in conformity with New Testament principles. The people appoint by direct election, and hence the

---

minister is immediately and absolutely dependent upon them for his official authority. Such was not the plan in primitive times. The apostles, or their substitutes, 'ordained elders in every city.' The direction to Timothy was, 'The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit THOU to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also'; to Titus, that he should 'set in order the things which were wanting, and ordain elders in every city.' The New Testament principle, therefore, is, that the ministry shall appoint their associates or successors, and be made directly responsible for their purity, fidelity, and ability. And this is the principle of Wesleyan Methodism. Whereas, the Independent principle is, that every congregation, however recently gathered, raw, uninformed, or even corrupt it may happen to be, shall be left to choose its own teacher and pastor; a principle which is as opposed to common sense as to scripture teaching. Apply it to the election of teachers or governors in any University or training-institution, and to what absurdities will it conduct us! The direct and entire dependence of the pastors upon the flock, of teachers and guides upon those to be taught and guided, is certainly a strange inversion, and

inconsistent with that fidelity to the truth of Scripture, that plain and honest dealing with all transgressors of Christ's laws, and that strict adherence to Christian discipline, which the Head of the church requires of all His ministers. How can ministers so situated 'watch for souls, as those that must give account' to Christ? And how, except as the language of irony, could they use, in addressing their charge, the apostle's exhortation, 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves'? The Independent theory goes upon the assumption, that the average church-member is competently intelligent, as to questions ecclesiastical and spiritual, as to all important matters of doctrine and discipline, 'a perfect man in Christ Jesus,' who has his 'senses fully exercised to distinguish good from evil,' right from wrong. Little need, comparatively, could such a community have of a teacher or pastor at all. A settled minister, a permanent (nominal) head and ruler is, in fact, an incongruity and superfluity, on the pure Independent hypothesis.

Of course, such being the origin of the minister's authority in an Independent community, it is an easy and obvious corollary from this first principle, that every ministerial act, every pastoral utterance, to be just and valid,

must express and embody the decision of the majority of church-members. The minister is not the servant and humble representative of Christ, bound to teach His truth and enforce His laws, whether the people 'will hear or whether they will forbear'; but he is simply *the organ and the mouth-piece of the people*. How can a minister so circumstanced respond to the prophet's strain of exhortation in Ezekiel xxxiii.? How can he, in this degraded and degrading position, conscientiously, and without fear or favour, discharge his duty to Christ, in 'warning the unruly,' 'rebuking those who are unsound in the faith,' 'rejecting' the factious or immoral? A corrupt Independent church is almost certain to grow more deeply and deadly corrupt; and in one that is tainted with corruption, the leaven of evil is very likely to spread. The republican constitution of those churches calls forth and fosters a turbulent Antinomian spirit; and the factious flatterer of popular vanity, or abettor of popular licence, will almost always, in the end, overcome the passive resistance and quiet influence of the more peaceable, pious, and sober-minded. Just as any form of church-government, departing from what we believe to be the *juste milieu* of Wesleyan church-government, approaches to the Independent or republican model, it becomes liable,

---

as experience has abundantly demonstrated, to the operation of similar evils.

In countless ways must this direct and absolute dependence of the pastor upon his flock for authority and power to act, operate to the detriment of purity and scriptural discipline.

Nor is it merely in relation to the purity and discipline of the flock, that Independency, when pure and unmodified, strongly tends to evil. It affords a very insufficient guarantee for the purity, whether doctrinal or moral, of the ministry. We have seen that, according to the New Testament principle and precedent, the purity and fidelity of the ministry are intrusted to the vigilance and care of the ministers themselves. The charge of Timothy is, ‘The same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach,’ &c., and, ‘Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses’; and again, ‘Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither’ (by connivance at the sins of those in office, whom it was his duty to rebuke) ‘be partaker of other men’s sins.’ These passages imply that Timothy was made responsible for the purity, fidelity, and competency of the elders or bishops within his charge. The whole spirit of the two Epistles to Timothy, and of the one to Titus,

implies this in reference to both those sub-apostolic ministers. The *principle* is that of ministerial oversight; the particular means and method here indicated were such as were suitable to the condition of newly-organised and comparatively ignorant and inexperienced churches, placed in circumstances of great temptation. The same plan of something like episcopal oversight of ministers themselves, is found to be a *desideratum*, even at the present day, in the different provinces of the mission-field; and a similar plan was adopted by John Knox, in the early days of the Reformation in Scotland; his 'superintendent' performed several important parts of the episcopal function. But among the Independents there exists no provision whatever for anything like mutual ministerial oversight. The minister and the flock are all in all to each other. Corruption or indolence or lifelessness in either is likely immediately to react injuriously upon the other. There is no healthy circulation flowing from church to church; no common permeating life; no wide-spread sympathies; no intertwining tendrils of mutual amity and intercourse, or far-reaching arms of common enterprise. Each is independent,—how likely to become selfish! Each settled in its own bed,—how likely to become

stagnant! Minister and people alike thus secluded, and exposed to these temptations to listless, selfish indolence, how probable is it that they will fall asleep in each other's arms, till the Christian life is utterly forgotten and extinct!\* But where there exists a union both of churches and of ministers, the latter being united for common oversight of each other, as well as in common care of the churches, this is much less likely to be the case. A large fire is not so easily extinguished as its scattered embers. A large and highly organised body retains warmth longer than one smaller and less complex, and defies a thousand local lesions which would each have destroyed a minute and simple organism. Ministers, too, in a truly enlightened and Christian community, being unsustained by the secular arm, and directly dependent on voluntary support, are likely to be, on the whole, more wise, spiritual, vigilant against evil, and jealous of ministerial purity, as well as more at leisure and more competent to guard

\* Instances very many in illustration of the foregoing observations might be brought from the Congregational and *isolated* Presbyterian churches, both of the United Kingdom and America. How many of these have become first unfruitful and then corrupt, settling upon their lees either into Antinomianism or Socinianism! Mutual ministerial oversight and responsibility might have done much to prevent this.

---

against evil and corruption, whether in life or doctrine, than the people.

How deeply the serious practical evils in Congregational Independency are felt by the most enlightened among Independent ministers themselves, shall be shown by two quotations. The excellent Mr. James, of Birmingham, expresses himself in reference to the powerless condition of the ministers in many Independent churches, in the following terms. As Wesleyans, we could not have ventured to speak so strongly.

‘It is my decided conviction, that, in many of our churches, the pastor is depressed far below his just level. He is considered merely in the light of a speaking brother. He has no official distinction or authority. He may flatter like a sycophant, he may beg like a servant, he may woo like a lover ; but he is not permitted to enjoin like a ruler. His opinion is received with no deference, his person treated with no respect, and, in the presence of some of his lay-tyrants, if he has anything to say, it must be something similar to the ancient soothsayers ; he is only permitted to peep and mutter from the dust.’\*

The following remarkable passages are taken from the masterly address of the late Mr. Binney, at the opening of the sessions of a meeting of the Congregational Union,† where that gentleman presided,—an address equally

\* *James On Christian Fellowship.* † Autumn of 1850.

creditable to his catholicity of feeling and largeness of intellect.

‘I am not one of those (he says) who are so happy as to think that their own particular communion has got hold of the whole truth on all points, and nothing else ; and that other communions must be necessarily wrong wherever they are so unfortunate as to differ from them. I am disposed to think that there is something right in all Christian communities, and in all ecclesiastical forms ; that each has some portion of truth, some right idea, which the others have not ; and that all have got some errors they would be the better without.

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*

‘If Independency proceeds to the entire insulation of every distinct and separate interest from all others ; if each society, and every individual, insists upon the exercise of their own liberties, unaffected by all connexional relationships ; if, at the same time, the voluntary principle is carried to the extent of all churches and congregations, of all sizes, and in every place, each for itself finding within itself the means of its own support ; men may say what they please about Divine ideas, or primitive models, or anything else ; but the fact is, that while, on such a system, you might have perfect liberty, congregational independence, separation from the state, freedom from the ‘supremacy,’ and so on, you could not have compactness or power as a body, strength from union, defence from scandal, nor ability to provide for the spiritual wants of small and poor patches of population. Independency may, doubtless, be carried so far as that Independents shall not be, properly speaking, a body ; the churches shall not be members of a body, or, if members, only like so many scattered and separate legs and arms.’

---

No one can mistake the import of this. Mr. Binney, in fact, gives up the Divine right of Independency, and admits that, pure and unmodified, it is a cold, selfish, and impotent system. To make it tolerable in the present age of enlarged sympathy, extending effort, and ever-increasing and intensifying activity, it must depart from the purity or strictness of its principles, as Independency, and become, to some considerable extent, connexionalised. More especially, Mr. Binney, in an after-part of his address, intimates the weakness of Congregationalism as to the point of ministerial purity and discipline, to which we have just been referring. This, as all readers of the public news are aware, is one of the sore places, as well as weak points, in modern Independency. ‘We see,’ says Mr. Binney, ‘in our own case, *the scandal produced by some cases of flagrant immorality*, WHERE WE HAVE NOT THE POWER TO IMPOSE SILENCE.’ Ministers are corrupt; but the ministry at large, having lost their scriptural right of mutual oversight, have no power to purge out the corruption; while ‘the people love to have it so.’

Before we close this chapter, we must guard against being misunderstood on one point. We are no advocates for unlimited arbitrary power on the part of the ministry.

---

Let there be whatever checks are needful to secure the people from the abuse of power on the part of ministers. Such checks are supplied in Methodism. Besides which, a free public opinion, and the dependence of the ministry, as a whole, upon the body of the people for their support, must ever preserve our societies, as a whole, from the fear of oppressive laws, of an unjust or tyrannical system of administration, or of any abetting of tyranny or injustice on the part of the Conference. Partial disapprobation and local prejudices within their borders, and the fretting of sectarian jealousies without, can well be borne by the rulers of a truly Christian and well-regulated church community, so long as their conduct is founded upon reason and right, because this will ever secure, from the members at large, general approval and support. But no voluntary community, established among a free and enlightened people, can long prosper, or even subsist, after its laws have been mixed with injustice, or its administration has become partial or oppressive.

Let whatever checks are needful to secure the just exercise of ministerial prerogative be imposed. What we maintain is only that a system which, not content with establishing guards against the abuse of ministerial power,

---

annihilates that power altogether, and despoils the pastoral office of those prerogatives of government and discipline so clearly assigned to it in the New Testament, is, to this extent, certainly anti-scriptural. And that it does this, is our charge against Congregational Independency.

By such a system the most precious rights of the people, no less than of the ministry, are, in fact, sacrificed. These are purity of doctrine and fidelity of discipline. How often, in an Independent church, are these, the just rights of the many, withheld through the undue power of a few! The minister and a few favoured or powerful ones are in league. ‘To the junction of a lay oligarchy and a ministerial oligarchy,’ says Mr. Welch,—and these are wise and weighty words,—‘may be attributed every persecution and tyranny that has yet afflicted the church of Christ.’ In how many Independent churches may the truth of this be seen exemplified on a small scale! The ‘power of the purse’ and ‘the power of the keys’ have coalesced; the ministerial function becomes the slave, that the minister may hold the favour and support, of the money-power. A resident lay-patron is a more common, and more continually operative, cause of evil in Independent churches than in

---

the Episcopal establishment. ‘Mr. So-and-So, or his lady, manages all in such and such a church.’ How often do we hear this said of Independent churches ! What, then, becomes of the rights of the people ? What redress can the flock obtain against the minister and his rich friends ? What a blessing would mutual ministerial oversight and responsibility be in such a case !

It is plain, then, that, to secure independence and purity among ministers ; to preserve truth, discipline, and piety among the people ; to rescue the Christian and right-hearted, whether of ministers or people, from the un-Christian tyranny of a majority, or the influence of a powerful, but corrupt or selfish, minority ; Independency is impotent ; and reason, no less than Scripture, requires mutual ministerial oversight and connexional union.

## CHAPTER III.

### ADAPTATION TO EVANGELISTIC OR MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE.

THE temper and tendency of Congregational Independency are in striking contrast with the spirit of primitive Christianity. Independency is solitary, self-sufficing, self-centred\* ; primitive Christianity was social, helpful, loving. The one tends to distintegration or stagnation, the other tended to diffusion and unity. Not less opposed is the actual church-system of Independency to the church organisation of apostolic times. Independency isolates her congregations and her pastors ; apostolic Christianity associated several congregations and several, sometimes many, pastors. Here is a fundamental and irreconcilable difference ; and taking our stand on this we might well maintain the unscriptural character of the Independent model. The essential doctrine of Independency is the right of every church-member directly to concur in every disciplinary act or regulation connected with the church ; and a secondary, but no less essential, principle is the right of

\* See the note on p. 124.

~~~~~

every congregation completely, and without any foreign sanction or concurrence, to control its own affairs. Every individual member is to have an equal voice and vote in all decisions, and each Congregational church is to be complete in itself and alone. But the second of these principles is directly contradicted in the organisation of the apostolic churches; whilst, in such churches, to act upon the first would have been plainly impossible. Here, then, with this firm ground beneath us, we might rest content, assured that all verbal criticism which, despite of such a fact as the connexional character of the apostolic churches, would attempt to gain from Scripture a sanction to the principles of Independency, must be futile.

But our argument does not stay here. We have found evident proof, from the apostolic writings, that the pastors or elders of the churches were appointed, not by the people, though they may have been accepted or approved by them, but by the ministers of Christ, whether apostles, evangelists, or co-presbyters; and that they were amenable for error, in life or doctrine, to their co-presbyters, or to their superiors in ministerial authority, and not to the people, whom they were appointed to teach and govern. We have seen, too, that the opposite

arrangements to these—such as are the rule in Independent churches,—are plainly and necessarily incompatible with that direct relation and responsibility of the minister to Christ, as his supreme Master and Lawgiver, which is so clearly taught in Scripture; and with that faithful, fearless, and impartial discharge of his duties to his flock, in teaching, reproof, warning, and governing them, which is so strongly and repeatedly enjoined by the sacred writers. The system of Independency is alike unfriendly to the piety and fidelity of pastor and of flock; the action and reaction are both bad, and bad in many ways: and if the effects are in many instances happily less injurious than might have been expected, it is because in these cases the much-vaunted *theory of Independency is a dead letter*. In some Congregational churches, the minister possesses and exercises, in direct opposition to the democratic theory of the denomination, far more absolute and universal control than is ever, or ever can be, exercised by a Wesleyan minister. And by means of Congregational Unions and Home and Foreign Missionary Societies, the peculiar tendencies of the system are, to a considerable extent, counteracted. But this, again, is in opposition to the theory, as we now proceed to show.

Our position is, that the tendency of Congregationalism is unfavourable to an expansive missionary spirit, whilst its fundamental principles render it powerless for evangelical effort beyond already existing fields of labour.

As to the first of these points, we shall not say much ourselves. Who but must see that a system which almost compels each church to look upon its neighbour-church as a rival or antagonist interest, necessarily tends to produce a narrow, selfish spirit? Can such a condition of things be favourable to expansiveness of heart or catholicity of affection? We dare not venture ourselves to speak the whole truth on this matter. We should be stigmatised as slanderous and bigoted. But we may be permitted to quote from Independents. The testimony of Mr. Miall, already cited in reference to the point of primitive organisation, applies also here.

‘ Conglomeration, in the place of diffusion,—several “*interests*,” where there should be one church; a stronger motive to gather up than to scatter abroad, to concentrate than to diffuse, to entice in than to send forth; churches discountenancing all effort which might redistribute their own members, and although swelling into proportions too ample for convenient assembling in one place, frowning upon every proposition which might appear to threaten the birth and growth of a rival body; positively stifling, by their influence, all further enterprise in the same locality, and, instead of enlarging their

borders, and making their moral force tell upon greater breadths of society, simply draining all neighbouring religious life into their own reservoir, in process of years to stagnate and become corrupt.*

This is Mr. Miall's picture of Independency. And is not the likeness in the main correct? But if any should question the authority of the editor of the *Nonconformist*, we are content to abide by the judgment of the late Dr. Payne, who, in his *Lectures on Christian Theology* (vol. ii., pp. 487, 488) expresses himself in the following terms:—

‘If a congregation expends all its zeal upon itself; if it displays little interest in the prosperity of neighbouring ones; if it puts forth no helping hand to assist them; and especially if it views their success with the cankered feelings of envy and jealousy; there can be no doubt that its members are grossly deceiving themselves, if they imagine they have any pure, unadulterated regard to the glory of God, and the extension of His kingdom.

‘Bear with me if I enlarge a little upon this point, as there are few things in the Dissenterism of the present day more offensive to me than the prevalence of this evil, against which I would guard you. To an individual who is deeply concerned for the honour and prosperity of our denomination, scarcely anything can be more humbling and affecting than the sad lack of public spirit amongst us. How little disposed are our churches to regard themselves as constituting one army, and to feel that the success of one is the success of the whole! How feeble and lifeless the sympathy which pervades

* Miall, p. 181, 182.

the body! How inconsiderable, in the case of any one society, is the joy which the prosperity of sister-churches produces! How little regret does their want of success awaken! Nay; does not truth compel us to acknowledge, that when the localities of churches are contiguous, they are apt to mourn over each other's growth and enlargement, and only to rejoice in each other's downfall? "Tell it not in Gath." *Proh pudor*. Even Heathenism itself would be disgraced by such conduct. I know not, however, that Heathenism bears upon it so foul a blot.'

What a melancholy description is this! How strictly does it accord with the censures of Mr. Miall! And how conclusively does it establish our assertions as to the *tendencies* of Independency! Even a small amount of Christian principle and feeling, unfettered and uncounteracted, is sufficient to produce some degree of real and disinterested brotherliness and catholicity of spirit. And, no doubt, in the churches to which the remarks of Mr. Miall and Dr. Payne apply, there is a considerable proportion of true Christianity. How happens it, then, that the actual temper of these churches towards those who should be their most cherished friends, as they are their nearest neighbours of the same denomination, is so jealous and anti-Christian? How happens it that this is said by such authorities to be *commonly* the case among Independents, so that the contrary is really the exception and

not the rule? How happens it, we ask again, that Congregationalists possess an unhappy singularity in this respect; that among other denominations this is not the case; nay, that even 'Heathenism itself scarcely bears upon it so foul a blot'? We are driven to the conclusion that it is the *system* of Independency which engenders such evils; and that not even the diffusive charity of true religion is able effectually to counteract the tendencies to selfishness inherent in the system.

We conclude, then, that a system, the necessary tendency of which is to counteract the energies, to limit the scope, to chill the heart, to pinion the arm, of Christian charity, to self-centre all thought and care, to transform every neighbour-church, though called by the same name, and serving the same Master, into a rival, whose success is a source of sorrow, and whose failure is a cause of satisfaction; to cut off communion, and suppress sympathy;—that such a system cannot be the chosen instrument of the God of love, and the Saviour of the world, for the accomplishment of the purposes of His grace, and for the diffusion of His glory.

A system *adapted* to the spirit of Christianity; and, therefore, expansive, aggressive, missionary, in the tendencies and capabilities

of its organisation; must be the system of which the Author of Christianity approves.

But not only is the spirit and tendency of Congregationalism opposed to the diffusive charity of true religion; its organisation, also, is such as absolutely to forbid all effective evangelising operations beyond already existing spheres of labour. This seems to be admitted by Mr. Binney. 'If each society, and every individual, insists upon the exercise of their own liberties, unaffected by connexional relationships; if the voluntary principle is carried to the extent of all churches and congregations, of every size and in every place, each for itself, finding within itself the means of its own support; then,' says Mr. Binney, 'men may say what they please about divine ideas, or primitive models, but the fact is, that while, on such a system, you might have perfect liberty, Congregational Independency, and so forth; you could not have compactness or power as a body, strength from union, *nor ability to provide for the spiritual wants of small and poor patches of population.*' That is, *Independency as such, Independency thoroughly carried out, cannot evangelise, whether at home or abroad.* No minister has a right to exercise pastoral functions, except as chosen by the people to whom he ministers. But where

there is no church to choose him, but a flock is to be gathered altogether from the world, what is he to do? Is he to collect one or two, and then ask them to choose him as their pastor, before he ventures to act as such? And is he thenceforward to perform no church-act without their sanction and concurrence? What *bizarre* work would this make upon mission stations!

It is self-evident, indeed, that an Independent minister, when he sets himself to the proper work of an evangelist, to missionary work, whether at home or abroad, must violate and reverse his own theory of church order and government. He forms the church by his labours, where before there was none. He discharges his ministerial duties to the people who listen to him, not in consequence of their choice, but as sent by Christ. He must, for a considerable time, centre in his own person all spiritual authority, and be the fountain of church power and subordination. He may righteously—and will, one would hope, discreetly and firmly—impose upon those whom he receives into Christian association with himself, and to the benefits of his ministerial labours and oversight, whatever conditions he may think most conducive to the security and purity of their spiritual life. And he will be

guided, as to the share and influence which he shall concede to them in the management of church affairs, by their 'growth in grace, and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ.'

But we may be told, that the case of missionary churches is an exceptional case. It certainly ought not to be so. Every religious community ought to be, by its very organisation, missionary. The ministers should all have scope to be evangelists; and the principle of mutual help—the principle of missionary enterprise—should unite all the churches. If, in Independency, such is not the case, this only proves the system to be essentially and vitally defective.

The case of infant and inexperienced churches an exceptional case in a Christian community! This is much as if children were called an exception in families. The church *should be* a mother; and the churches the children of that mother, united in fraternal concord and affection, and eager to render mutual help. And the infants of this family should ever be a numerous and thriving company, cared for, guided, and sustained by the common love of the community, and especially by the aids of their nearest sister churches. The propagation of the faith, the planting and nurturing of churches, is as plainly and cer-

tainly the duty of the church of Christ, and the very purpose of its existence, as the multiplication and right training of children is the principal end of the family institute.

Independency, then, is essentially defective as an ecclesiastical system, not only because it makes no provision for the propagation of the Gospel in 'the regions beyond,' or even in neglected patches hard by, but because *it is impossible to supply the needs of destitute portions of the great field of humanity, whether nearer or more remote, without violating the fundamental principles of Congregational Independency.*

The primitive church was accustomed to utter her voice from shore to shore, to send forth her messengers from city to city, from realm to realm. Commissioned by the Lord Jesus, they 'went everywhere preaching the Word.' And wherever they went they gathered converts, and founded churches. They 'ruled' from the first, and organised according to the Spirit of wisdom which was in them. The apostles or evangelists 'ordained elders in every city,' when fit men had been discovered and trained for the office; the elders 'took the oversight of the flock,' and were 'obeyed' by them, as having received authority to 'rule,' and as 'those that must give account' to

Christ for the 'flock over which they were appointed overseers.'

But where, in all this, is the resemblance to modern Independency? Or how, under that system, could the Word of God have so mightily and wonderfully grown and prevailed? Far different from this is the natural and normal growth of Congregational Independency. The old physical axiom, that 'a thing cannot act where it is not,' applies with a singular propriety to Independent churches. They can project to a distance no influence, or only as a faint and evanescent gleam; they can, consistently, initiate no enterprise abroad. They may spread slowly, church after church, from place to place: but that is all. Their deposition is like that of crystals from a chemical solution. Let the electrical conductor be introduced into the solution at a particular point, and crystallisation will there commence. And therefrom and around that first formation as a centre, may crystal after crystal be deposited, till the operation is complete. So, yet not so surely or perfectly, might a system of Independent churches extend themselves among mankind. But, at this rate, when would the world be evangelised? Was anything like this contemplated by our Lord, when He said to His disciples, 'Go ye into all

the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature'?

The unsuitableness of the Independent system for the work of *spreading* Christianity, seems to be admitted by Dr. Wardlaw. Not only is there the absence, in his volume on Congregational Independency, of any attempt to evince the adaptation of the system for the propagation of the faith in unevangelised regions, whether at home or abroad, but he makes the following admission:—‘That churches constituted on Independent principles do require a larger amount than others of the operation of certain Christian graces, in order to their prosperity’:—‘that the churches formed upon its principles *cannot possibly prosper, can hardly continue to exist*, without the prevailing and dominant influence of humility, and love, and self-denial, and meekness, and forbearance.’ To our mind, this settles the question. Such a system as this, it is plain, could never be adapted to the condition of churches where the majority of the members were immature in knowledge, experience, and Christian attainments. No such church as that of Corinth, the members of which were ‘rather carnal than spiritual, and only babes in Christ’ (1 Corinthians iii. 1); no church composed mainly of such ordinary types

of everyday Christianity as those Hebrews, who, so far from being mature Christians, 'though for the time they ought to have been teachers, had need to be taught again what were the first elements of the oracles of God, and needed, as babes, to be fed with milk, and not with meat' (Hebrews v. 12—14);—no such churches as these 'could have possibly prospered, hardly could they have existed,' under such a system of government as that of the Independents. And yet this is the system for which, to the exclusion of every other, Divine right and primitive usage are pleaded. It is plain that, by such a system, churches could never be nursed into maturity. Surely it is most preposterous to claim universal acceptance for a system which supposes Christian maturity in all or the majority of its members, as the necessary condition of its working well. Such a system, utterly unfitted as it is for gathering churches among the unevangelised, whether Heathens or nominal Christians, or for nurturing and training their inexperienced and weakling infancy, cannot be that by means of which God designs to evangelise the world. Is it, then, the Divine purpose, by means of one system and agency, to 'break up the fallow ground'; and then, by another, to complete

the edification of the churches? Surely so disjointed and ill-fitting a plan cannot be attributed to the all-wise Head of the church. Doubtless the system which is the most efficient in evangelising the altogether untaught,—in planting churches, and tending and rearing their infancy,—must also be that which, rightly administered and wisely adapted, will best promote the edification and full maturity of believers. God never intended to disjoin these two great branches of evangelistic duty,—to give one to one church, and another to another. On the contrary, to be directly connected with the work of evangelising the untaught, of spreading the gospel, to be a missionary church, is one main contributive to the edification of the church in love. Nor can that church have sufficient scope for activity, sufficient exercise for its spiritual graces and faculties, which is not directly, and by its very organisation, missionary. A self-centred and self-contained church is ever tending to become selfish, languid, and feeble.

To us it appears strange that Dr. Wardlaw should make, with such complacency, the admission we have quoted. He even accounts what we have been viewing as a defect, to be a positive merit. This is much as if we should praise a system of education, because, to pre-

vent it from failing, it required a certain amount of mental qualification and previous knowledge not required by other systems. If Dr. Wardlaw could prove that the system of Independency usually developed and produced an order of piety never or but seldom attained to under any other system, this might help him a little. But this he cannot prove; nor is this his matter of congratulation. No; it is that Independent churches 'cannot thrive, cannot be held together, without' very superior Christian attainments. We believe this as strongly as he; but (so differently do we look at things) we urge this as an argument against his system. There are some methods of rearing children which only the hardiest constitutions can survive; there are some bleak and exposed regions where the feeble or sickly plant will infallibly perish; and similarly we think that there are tendencies and influences, in a pure and consistently carried out Independency, so unfriendly to Church unity, so uncongenial to evangelical enterprise, so unfavourable to the spirit of humility and brotherly love, that, without a much more than ordinary degree of these and kindred Christian graces, it is impossible Independent churches should 'thrive'; and, if they are held together, it will be by anything but

that ‘charity which is the bond of perfectness.’

That Dr. Wardlaw and those of his school should claim for such a system—one confessedly unfit for the work of rearing from their infancy, and evidently impotent to send abroad and plant, Christian churches—the praise of conformity to the primitive model, when the apostles and evangelists were ever planting, and their churches were all infant, seems to us to be one of those sheer extravagances into which the spirit of party has sometimes impelled even wise and able men.

We are quite prepared to be pointed, in reply to these strictures, to Congregational Unions and missionary institutions. But these afford no reply; they only prove that Independents are compelled, by love to Christ and souls, to violate their principles, to Connexionalise (after a fashion) their Independency, and to give their evangelists rights incompatible with the theory which derives all church-power from the sanction and authorisation of the people. How inconsistent the proceedings of Congregational Unions are with the true principles of Congregational Independency, whether as to the choice of pastors, or even, on some occasions, as to matters of internal arrangement or management, is very well

known to all who have paid any attention to their proceedings, or conversed with their members.*

* The late excellent Mr. Ely, in one of his published sermons, preached before the members of the Congregational Union, in the year 1846, and dealing with the subject of Congregational Independency, lays down the principle, that a church dependent upon another for its support, may *perhaps* have a *veto* upon the appointment of its minister, but certainly cannot claim more than this. This principle is acted upon in Congregational Unions. Indeed, the *veto* cannot be really said to be conceded in many instances. But who does not see that such a principle, however equitable and natural, is fundamentally opposed to the theory of Independency? Let this but be granted to us, and we have the $\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\omega$, the *locus standi*, upon which we can easily construct the whole fabric of Wesleyan Connexionalism. But Mr. Ely grants even more than this. He justifies, in the case of dependent churches, an amount of 'authoritative interference' on the part of the community which gives them aid substantially equivalent to the Connexional authority possessed by the Wesleyan Conference. The extract which follows will bear out these assertions:—

'Nor can I omit to remark, that a false notion of the rights of Independency seems to me often to interfere with missionary operations. A community of churches, by missionary zeal, plant a village church; that church depends on their funds: as long as they yield support, they have right of supervision and interference. It is with them to appoint the agent or the minister, to demand a statement of operation, to exercise authoritative interference. A *veto* is the utmost that the church can ask; and, in the election of a minister, this, perhaps, ought to be conceded.' (Ely's *Remains*, pp. 95, 96.)

This sermon, preached by such a man, on such an occasion, doubtless expresses authoritatively the views of the leading spirits in the Congregational Union. It follows, that they have abandoned at the same time the Divine-right theory, and the distinctive principles, of Congregational Independency.

CHAPTER IV

EMPLOYMENT OF LAY-PREACHERS—MINISTERIAL TRAINING.

I N our last chapter, we examined the position of Independency in reference to that great purpose of church-organisation,—evangelistic or missionary enterprise. We saw that each Independent church must exist in a condition of isolated antagonism, or, at the least, rivalry, with all surrounding churches; and that, being thus self-poised, self-contained, and exclusive, they must be, so far as the influence of their *Independency* goes, ever disposed rather to seclusion and selfishness, than to that self-sacrifice and diffusive charity which form the spring and strength of all successful and continued missionary enterprise. We saw, moreover, that not only the temper, but the theory, of Independency is opposed to diffusion or effort beyond already existing spheres of labour; that it is impossible for an evangelist to found and organise a church, without giving up and reversing the fundamental principles of Independency.

The next particular that will claim our attention, is the question of auxiliary lay-agency

in the work of evangelising. We refer especially to lay-preaching. No one will deny that in apostolic Christianity many, besides the appointed pastors of the churches, were accustomed to exercise a 'gift of teaching,' or of 'exhortation.' Nor can it be doubted that an auxiliary agency of this kind is essential to the completeness and success of every aggressive and missionary church. Methodism, from the first, has been distinguished by the successful employment of this great arm of missionary enterprise. Independency, on the other hand, except in rare and peculiar cases (and then only in happy *inconsistency* with its character and principles), has systematically dispensed with the labours of lay-preachers. On this point, no reasonable exception can be taken to the statements of Mr. Miall. The truth of his testimony will scarcely be called into question by any. The following extracts, as from the pen of a writer so able, so intimately acquainted both with the theory and working of Independency, and naturally so biassed in its favour, are entitled to serious attention.

'The writings of the New Testament do not authorise the conclusion that it is the prerogative, or the peculiar and *exclusive* duty, of any class in the church of Christ to communicate to others the Gospel of God. Under the regulating moral power of the church's embodied

authority, all the aptitudes, gifts, powers, and influences of each member are to be freely exercised, in accordance with the beautiful exhortation of the apostle, "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given us; whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness."

* * * * *

'It is but too apparent, that the needless multiplication of spiritual organisations in one locality, and *the appointment of a single minister over each*, but ill succeeds in eliciting either the life or the power of religious association. Our very mechanical arrangements, modelled, of course, in conformity with our ecclesiastical ideas, put a needless distance between teacher and taught, and exert a repressive influence upon the sympathies which should connect the one with the other. In each place of worship there stands the pulpit,—a visible symbol of *the monopoly of teaching*—a fixed memento to the church that it is to *one* individual they have to look for *all* those declarations, illustrations, and enforcements of the word of God, by which their minds are to be informed, their consciences stirred or comforted, or their hearts impressed and improved. The most seraphic piety, combined with the most splendid talents, can hardly, on this plan, prevent both devotion and instruction from becoming invested with an air of formality deeply injurious to freshness of religious feeling.

* * * * *

'Can any one doubt that there lies, at this moment, hidden in the bosom of religious society, and dormant

for want of all fitting scope for exercise, an immense amount and variety of talent, which might have been elicited and trained under happier auspices, and triumphantly employed in the prosecution of Christian objects?

Now and then, strength of mind, associated with irrepressible religious zeal, makes its way through every disadvantage, and reads the church in connection with which it works an impressive lesson on what may be done for Christ by unprofessional instrumentality. Such instances, however, are not numerous—are never likely to be under any system. *More, many times multiplied, are they whose energies wither for want of scope and exercise; many more in which the germs of useful talent, always environed by a COLD ATMOSPHERE OF ROUTINE, and stimulated by no external process of culture, never unfold themselves, and pass away from their appointed scene of opportunity, without having so much as disclosed their presence.*

* * * * *

‘Certainly, no mistake could well be more fatal than that of removing, from the instrumentality employed by the churches, that large admixture of spontaneous but duly regulated effort, which would have communicated to the whole the unimpeachable character of disinterestedness. At present, *with one remarkable exception, the success of which ought to have elicited more serious investigation,—I REFER TO THE WESLEYAN BODIES,* and leaving out of sight recent attempts to employ what is called lay-agency,—*the viva voce exhibition of Christ’s Gospel to men, whether for purposes of edification or conversion, is, by common consent, made the peculiar function of a class set apart and supported for that express purpose. And this has thrown around the proclamation of the glad tidings an atmosphere of worldliness, which places the best, the holiest, the most self-denying,*

*and heroically-disinterested men under a fearful disadvantage.**

We deem these to be most important TRUTHS. In our opinion, this neglect or suppression of lay-agency is a serious item among the many vital errors or defects of modern Independency. It is plainly anti-scriptural, and as plainly it is a grievous wrong to an intelligent and pious laity, and a serious loss to the universal Church. Great aids and advantages are foregone, noble spiritual powers, beneficent and happy energies, are left to wither in the germ, for want of opportunity and scope. How different is it in Wesleyan Methodism!

There we see, in perfect accordance with the primitive and apostolic precedents, opportunity afforded for the exercise of every gift of teaching possessed by the lay-members of the church, from that of the plain countryman, who occasionally delivers an 'exhortation' in a neighbouring village, to that of the accomplished and meditative Christian gentleman, who, though not given up to the work of the ministry, is yet well able, by his public discourses, to edify his fellow-Christians. In this way, Wesleyans do honour to the endowments and promptings of that Spirit, whose

* Miall, pp. 160, 161, 175, 186, 187, 191, 192.

‘manifestations are given to every man to profit withal,’ whose ‘diversities of operations’ in different members are all intended to co-operate for the common good of the whole spiritual body, which is thus ‘fitly joined together and compacted by *that which every joint supplieth.*’ In this way, a wholesome stimulus and exercise are given to the laity in general, tending to promote, directly or indirectly, mental and spiritual cultivation, and diligent inquiry into theological truth; the ministry itself is made to feel the benefit, being compelled, in order to maintain its relative position in the church, to elevate its own standard of theological attainment in proportion to the general intelligence and attainments of the community; an auxiliary force of vast reach and most various capabilities, adapted to every kind of work, and every order of society, is brought into association with the regular pastorate, and employed in manifold and most effective aggression upon the kingdom of darkness; and an impressive demonstration is exhibited to the world of disinterested and self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of truth and the salvation of men.

Look at Wesleyan Methodism as thus presented to our view! How massive in its unity, how mighty in its energy, how mani-

fold in its agencies! How poor, how feeble, in comparison, the isolated atoms of Independency, where one church and one pastor make up the total of each church organism!

But we may be told that the absence of lay-agency, such as we have been describing, is not necessarily characteristic of Independency; that this is rather an accident, than an essential, of the system. This is an apology, however, which we cannot admit. How happens it, that, except in rare and exceptional cases, lay-preaching has never been familiar in Independent churches? The truth of the matter is, that where there is but one church, and one congregation, and this church and congregation are stately ministered to by a fixed and separated pastor, there is plainly no scope or work for lay-preachers. There is nothing for them to do at home; the pastor does all here: nothing abroad; for this is an isolated, an independent church. There is one church, and one pastor; one congregation, and one chapel. What can a body of lay-preachers find to do in connection with such an organisation as this? *

* The function of the 'leaders' in the Wesleyan body constitutes another and very important branch of lay teaching and agency; and their peculiar relation to our itinerancy and Connexionalism will be considered in another chapter.

Yet this is represented as a primitive and scriptural—as the primitive and the exclusively scriptural—church-system.

The next point of contrast between the two systems whose respective merits we are discussing, is that of ministerial training. As to this point, again, we shall borrow Mr. Miall's description of the plan which universally prevails in the Independent denomination. And whilst, as to the whole system of Independency, he must be a very competent witness, as to this point he is likely, from the circumstances of his history, to be especially competent. The following are his remarks :—

'I mention, first, ministerial education.—The modern process, which terminates in giving to a vacant church a minister of spiritual things, and which qualifies the subject of it for taking the oversight of a Christian community, is usually after this sort. A youth, generally from fifteen to two or three and twenty years of age, is happily, and through the mercy of God, brought into a state of sympathy with the Gospel, receives the life-giving message, and rejoices in its salvation. He turns to consecrate his life to God, and experience has not yet instructed him that he may do so in *any* honourable calling. He seeks and obtains an introduction into a theological seminary, where, in company with others like-minded, he travels through a routine of study,—classical, mathematical, philosophical, exegetical, and theological,—exercising himself occasionally in delivering discourses from neighbouring pulpits, and

shielded, more or less carefully, by the regulations of the place, from the numerous temptations with which society abounds. At the close of his course, extending over three, four, or five years, an invitation commonly awaits him from a destitute church, which, having approved of his aptness to teach, calls him to 'oversight,' and receives him as an 'elder.' It is to be observed, that, by our present method, the most important steps which can influence the character, or affect the efficiency, of the future teachers of Divine truth, are taken before the religious principle can have proved its genuineness, and before intellectual aptitude and qualifications can be determined. The common views which prevail respecting the ministry, present it with no ordinary attraction to young and aspiring minds, as a sphere of active service. Our academies, founded upon an eleemosynary basis, and offering *an easy ingress* to an honourable and useful occupation, naturally increase those attractions, and tend to insure, if anything can do, a large admixture of inferior influences in motives which should be kept unusually pure; *and from a career so likely to be entered upon without calm calculation, with an incorrect estimate of their own powers, and, occasionally, with a delusive view of their own religious character, our sentiments have cut off the practicability of any but a difficult retreat.* An education, in a great measure technical, having consumed exactly that portion of life within which a choice of calling is feasible, leaves a young man, at the end of his preparatory course, even when he has discovered his original mistake, nearly precluded from altering his destination.'

Besides which,—

'If, after having received ordination, any should see fit to withdraw from the ministerial profession, they are

regarded as, in some sense, desecrating what is sacred.

*I think it would be possible for the churches to wait the unfolding and ripening of spiritual character in their members, before giving practical aid to those contemplating the episcopal office, and to impress upon all who might aspire to fill that honourable sphere of labour, the importance of informing and disciplining the mind to as great an extent as possible, that if hereafter called to office, they might be prepared to discharge its duties with efficiency. Surely, if things were well ordered, and the spirit of the Gospel were sincerely cherished, those desires which young men feel in the early days of their religious life for employment in the ministry, might be fostered as desires possible to be realised at some future period; and, pursuing their several worldly callings, and devoting such leisure as they could get to intellectual improvement, exercising, too, as opportunity offered, their "gifts," they might leave to the churches, in whose bosom they have their home, to determine for them whether, and when, they should enter office, as teachers in Christ's kingdom.**

Here Mr. Miall, while censuring the system of Independency, and sketching the general outline of a better and unexceptionable system, has, unconsciously to himself, delineated with singular accuracy Wesleyan Methodism, so far as its principles and provisions relate to ministerial training. Amongst Wesleyans all is already done which the remarks of Mr. Miall suggest as right to be done. The censures which apply with such emphasis to Independency, have no applicability to Wes-

* Miall, pp. 168—172.

leyan Methodism. The guards and practical tests and training which he shows to be so needful, are already supplied. There is no 'easy ingress' into our ministry or colleges; none can be accepted for the latter whose gifts and calling have not been proved in reference to the former; a candidate must have made good his vocation to the ministry before his ministerial education in our Institutions can commence. And the various tests and challenges which must be passed before a candidate for the holy office can be finally accepted, are of the most thorough and searching character. There must have been, in the first place, examination, acceptance, and employment as an assistant lay-preacher, the ministry and laity coinciding in approval of the candidate; then a public nomination by the pastorate, and acceptance and recommendation on the part of the Circuit-Meeting, as preliminary to his separation to the Gospel of God; then a sifting examination before the assembled District-Meeting, as to doctrine, morals, and gifts; then a still more complete and particular examination as to all points before the London Board of Scrutiny; then a revision of the whole case in full Conference; then (unless the candidate is sent at once into the actual circuit work) there comes a two or

three years' residence at one of our Theological Institutions or Colleges; even after the introduction into the regular work of the ministry, there is still a yearly scrutiny, not only of character, but of reading, general diligence, and faithfulness, until the four years of probation are expired; and, finally, at the termination of the period of probation, the candidates undergo an examination before the Conference, and are publicly received, after a statement of their experience and call, before the great congregation.

Now, Independency *cannot* do all this; nor can it materially amend its present system. We have seen that, under ordinary circumstances, and in its pure and natural condition, Independency does not admit of a subsidiary lay-agency, employed in the work of public teaching and exhortation. Consequently, it possesses *no nursery for the ministry*, no introductory or preparatory grade of office, out of which suitable persons might be taken as candidates for the separated ministry; no preliminary condition in which capacity and fitness for the ministry may be discovered, tested, and trained. This is a *vital* want in a Christian community. In consequence of it, a youth, inexperienced, untested, untrained, must choose at once, and finally, whether he

will devote himself to the sacred office or not. When comparatively 'a babe,' he must make an irrevocable decision, affecting most intimately his own eternal happiness, and that of many more through him. And he must do this without the possibility of that experience and probation, without which it must be, in almost all instances, impossible for either himself, or the members of the church with which he is connected, to be satisfied of the wisdom of his decision. Not such was the practice of the primitive Church. Among them, none were committed to the work of the ministry, to the office of the episcopate, who had not, by frequent exercise of the 'gift of teaching,' *given proof* that they were 'apt to teach,' 'holding fast the faithful word as they had been taught, that they might be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers,' whilst their moral character also was approved and confirmed as 'vigilant, sober, and of good behaviour.' It was expressly ordered by St. Paul, that 'no novice' (or neophyte) should be appointed to the ministerial office, 'lest, being lifted up with pride, he should fall into the condemnation of the devil.'

Further, as there is no preliminary grade or school adapted for calling forth and testing

the gifts suitable for the pastoral office, so neither, in Independency, is there any, or more than a very slight, inducement for 'the church' to care for the discovery and training of persons suitable for that office. Each church has its own wants provided for the present, and for an indefinite period to come: it feels little or no anxiety as to the possibility of supplying its needs in the remote future, and is less likely to look to its own bosom than to a foreign source for the supply of those needs, whenever they shall happen to arise. It is an *independent* church, having no direct or organic relation to any other church, or to any church-community, and therefore feels little or no interest in providing for general wants, with which its own concern is so very remote and so little practical. How can we expect that a church thus isolated and independent should feel a very lively concern in providing for the general good, for the good of others merely, a seed of faithful and efficient ministers? The strong selfish and exclusive tendencies of Independency naturally oppose such a disinterested and far-sighted feeling. Besides, in Independent churches there is no organisation to secure this. Not only, as we have seen, is there no organic grade or seminary from which the

new succession of ministers might naturally rise into notice,—compelling attention and attracting kindly interest and care,—but there is no provision made for the due cherishing, guidance, and authorisation of those who may from whatever motives or under whatever circumstances, have decided for themselves that the ministry is to be their future sphere of usefulness. Whatever is done in their case, is done incidentally, and, in a sense, irregularly. It is the mere voluntary and extra-ecclesiastical act of the church or of individuals. It is no proper and necessary church-function, or regular part of ministerial duty, to watch for, welcome, test, educate, and recommend suitable persons as candidates for the ministry. Here, as in other parts of Independency, ultra-voluntaryism becomes a vital and organic defect.

How different is it, again we say, in Wesleyan Methodism! Here all circuits feel their dependence upon the pastorate at large, for a supply, not only of senior, but of junior, ministers; hence all take a very lively interest in providing for the continued prosperity of the whole community, with which that of their own particular churches is so directly identified, in discovering, fostering, and training a continual succession of able and faithful men

for the ministry. The ministers, for obvious reasons, feel a yet deeper interest in this matter than the people, while it is their special office to suggest, initiate, and guard whatever is done in this direction. And the class of local preachers furnishes an ever-green and springing nursery, from which the most hopeful and suitable persons may be transplanted into the ministerial body. At every stage, too, in the progress of the candidate, from first to last, the approval of both ministers and people is required to concur; so that as in the provision and training of suitable persons for the ministry ministers and people have a common interest, there is correspondently imposed upon them a common responsibility.

CHAPTER V

ITINERANCY—CLASS-LEADERS.

THE system which isolates the churches, of necessity also fixes the pastors, since it is impossible to conceive of a circulating community of pastors, unless there is an intercommunity of churches. Itinerancy, therefore, cannot be fitted to Independency. It is equally plain that, in a perfectly connexional, and at the same time purely voluntary, church, it will greatly conduce to that community of feeling and care which should correspond to the actual community of interest and responsibility, for the ministers who are directly and vitally related to the entire church, to circulate, as circumstances may suggest and admit, through the whole. Thus, and thus only, will each member of the body thoroughly realise its relation to the united pastorate, and each minister his relation to the whole church.

So that Itinerancy in some form would seem to be a necessary part of a thoroughly organised, consistent, and self-sustaining Connexionalism. And to whatever extent any minister becomes permanently and peculiarly

identified with a particular locality, it will be easily seen that there is a danger lest local interests and peculiarities should so operate as to infringe upon Connexional rights and principles. The ministers, in each locality, are the guardians of Connexional interests and rights, and the expounders and administrators of Connexional law. It is therefore needful, in order to secure their vigilance and impartiality, as acting in this character, that they should not be bound and trammelled by local interests and attachments. Otherwise, the guardian and representative of Connexional principles and rights might become himself the centre and bond of local prejudice and selfishness; and, instead of the diffusion and unity which the Connexional plan is intended to embody and perpetuate, local interests would, to a pre-dominant extent, absorb and fix local cares and energies. Thus would the separate circuits become what Mr. Miall, in writing of Independent churches, very felicitously terms 'ecclesiastical nodules,' interrupting and obstructing the flow and pervasion of Connexional life and influence.

It is possible that some may think the Presbyterian churches furnish a conclusive example in opposition to the foregoing reasoning. But if we look at the case closely, we

shall find that the opposition is only apparent. The Presbyterian churches have been established and endowed by the State; all their principles and regulations have been accurately and minutely defined in written codes; and these codes have been recognised, not only as the statutes of the church, but as the law of the land. The State which endowed the church, adopted its disciplinary enactments, homologated them, as a Scotchman would say, as part and parcel of the statute law of the country, and, as such, *enforced* uniformity in their observance by the strong arm. The strongest reasons for Wesleyan Itinerancy are the common dependence of the ministry on the united churches, and the necessity of securing for every circuit the presence of administrators of Connexional law, and expounders of Connexional principles, unbiassed by local prejudice or interest. But in church communities whose ministers are endowed, and whose laws are enforced by the State, these reasons cannot exist. Ours is a Connexion which, from the first, has been entirely dependent upon voluntary support, and each of whose funds and institutions is dependent upon the common support of the whole. In such a Connexion itinerancy is a necessity.

We may be reminded that there are free Dissenting Presbyterian communities, also dependent principally upon voluntary support. But the dependence in these cases is by no means so complete as in Wesleyan Methodism, nor the 'Connexionalism' so perfect or efficient. And, moreover, all these have come in for an inheritance of that originally enforced uniformity, which had been established in the church from which they separated, and from which, as to matters of ecclesiastical order and discipline, they have only slightly, if at all, dissented.

Further, there can be no doubt that even the Presbyterianism of Scotland would have been more uniformly and perfectly carried out, than it has been,—for several parts of the *Books of Discipline* have never been more than a dead letter,—if the principle of Itinerancy, which was partially adopted, and, therefore, to that extent, sanctioned, by John Knox, had been more extensively acted upon, and had been permanently embodied in the kirk polity. We venture indeed to urge upon our friends of the Scotch Free Churches the desirableness of introducing into their polity, systematically and permanently, some form or modification of Itinerancy: not such an amount or form of it, as is found in our own church,

but so much, and in such a form, as may be best adapted to their peculiar circumstances, and to Scotch character and feelings.

The substance of the foregoing remarks is just this,—that Itinerancy, in some form, and to some considerable extent, is necessary to a perfect and consistent Connexionalism. It may be compared to the great circulatory system in the animal frame, by which life, energy, and unity are made to pervade the whole system, and which cannot be arrested or obstructed without disorder and injury, both at the point of obstruction, and, more or less, through the whole body.

But, further, an Itinerant ministry may be advocated on independent grounds; and so the advantages it is adapted to secure, will form a separate and, as we think, a very powerful argument in favour of Connexionalism.

In the first place, then, the Itinerant plan is adapted to secure superior life, power, and variety in the pulpit-addresses of the ministers. The fixture of a minister in one charge, year after year, is certainly not, of itself, calculated to promote the variety or liveliness of his ministrations. The same scenes, the same hearers, the same routine of duty, a continual demand upon resources which there is comparatively little in the uniformity of experi-

ence and circumstances to replenish or invigorate :—these are not conditions favourable in themselves to freshness of feeling, novelty of illustration, or vivacity of address. Monotony and formality are much more likely to be the result. ‘The most seraphic piety, combined with the most splendid talents, says Mr. Miall, ‘can scarcely avail to prevent this.’

‘Be the preachers’ talents ever so great (says Mr. Wesley), they will, ere long, grow dead themselves, and so will most of those that hear them. I know, were I myself to preach one whole year in one place, I should preach both myself and most of my congregation asleep. Nor can I believe that it was ever the will of our Lord that any congregation should have one teacher only. We have found, by long and constant experience, that a frequent change of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent; that another. No one whom I ever yet knew has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation.’*

This remarkable quotation suggests that there will be a want of variety and compass in the ministrations of a fixed pastor, not only as a consequence of the circumstances in which he is placed, but of the limitation of his own mind. How rare and wonderful a mental organ must that be, which is furnished with all the pipes and stops, the moods and tones, the sympathies and capabilities, which

* Wesley’s *Works*, 8vo., vol. xiii., p. 189.

are needful to answer to the various characters and conditions of a whole congregation for even one year, much more for many years together! Exceedingly well has the Rev George Turner written on this point:—

‘That the ministry of some individuals is far more richly varied than that of others, is granted; but a man possessing “all the talents which are requisite for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation,” is yet, and to the end of time will probably remain, a *desideratum*. Fully to meet a case like this, must ever require the utmost energies of a *united* ministry, and, *cæteris paribus*, that is most likely to succeed which combines the fairest proportion of that diversity of talent which God has graciously bestowed upon the church at large: the son of consolation, and the son of thunder; the profound theologian, the calm and lucid reasoner; the judicious expositor, and the impassioned preacher; the fire of youth, the vigour of manhood, the wisdom and the gravity of age; the sternness and severity of John the Baptist; the grandeur of Paul, the eloquence of Apollos; the vehemency of Cephas, and the simplicity and unction of the beloved disciple.’*

The system of Itinerancy also secures a better *average* supply of talent for inferior circuits, than would be otherwise likely to be obtained. If the principle of locating permanently the pastors in different circuits were

* Quoted from the Rev. George Turner’s very masterly and valuable *Essay on the Constitution of Wesleyan Methodism*, pp. 109, 110.

once adopted, it is evident that the men of intelligence and energy would become fixed in congenial spheres of labour, while inferior men would alone be left to supply the wants of inferior places, as is now the case, very generally, in Independent churches. As it is, in Wesleyan Methodism, the special needs of the circuits can be consulted and met. It not unfrequently happens that ministers of superior talents are sent, contrary to their natural inclination, to places of very inferior quality and attractions; and sometimes even to spheres of labour where, though they are much needed, they are little wanted. In this way something may be done to enlighten long-continued darkness, to remove old prejudices, and to rectify and organise disturbed or disorderly circuits.

Again, on this plan a habit of ready utterance, and of homely, forcible expression, is acquired, such as is by no means so easy to be attained, and is, in fact, seldom attained, by the fixed pastor of one congregation. Preaching ordinarily from four to six sermons a week, and many of these among country people, in houses or village chapels, the Wesleyan itinerant necessarily learns to 'talk to' his audience, in a homely and familiar style. There may be instances, and some situations, in

which Wesleyan ministers are in danger of falling into the formal, essayic style of deliverance, the sleek, well-combed propriety of phrase and manner, of which Mr. Miall so strongly and justly complains, and which too frequently prevail in Congregational pulpits. But this is not yet the general characteristic of Wesleyan preaching; and we have good hope that, ere long, idiomatic and conversational simplicity of style and illustration will become the standard and aim of all our ministers in all their pulpit addresses. Village preaching is an admirable training for the minister, and he who has learnt to gain and hold the attention, to inform the understandings, and to reach the hearts, of a village audience, has acquired the art of preaching. Such a man will be able, with a little study and experience, to adapt himself to any class of persons with which he is acquainted; and if he has thoroughly mastered his subject, will always be able to bring it home to the minds and hearts of his hearers. Hence, the immense and universally-admitted superiority, on the whole, of Wesleyan ministers to those of other denominations, in the power of speaking, appropriately and powerfully, on the suggestion of the present subject, and on the shortest notice.

The Itinerant plan, also, by securing attachment, on the principle we have before explained, to the body of pastors *as a whole* and *to the system* as such, and apart from its individual administrators, tends to promote width of view, largeness of purpose, a disinterested regard for the general good, and an habitual reference to principle. These we deem to be elements of power and greatness, as embodied in the character and proceedings of any community. The love of Wesleyan Methodists is eminently to Wesleyan Methodism, as the most influential and successful embodiment of the spirit of Christianity; and they are accustomed to look above and beyond all individuals, and all individual interests, to the general prosperity and success. Such a condition of things necessarily tends to enlargement of soul, and operates as a counteractive to the natural selfishness and narrowness of the human heart. It seems strange that this very characteristic has been sometimes alleged as a *defect* in Methodism. Rightly considered, it is surely an *excellence*. It is true that ministers, in consequence, lose the opportunity of gaining, by their personal excellence and exertions, that local influence and respect which a long residence might have enabled them to acquire. But still it must be remem-

bered that, wherever they come, they are welcomed by the societies as their own ministers, with that cordiality which is peculiar to Methodism, and which every arrangement in the system is calculated to promote. They have a ready-made influence, to which they succeed wherever they go. And, further, it ought not to be forgotten that, if the permanent residence and influence of one man cannot, among us, effect much good, by means of purely personal qualities and relations, as is sometimes done among Congregationalists; so neither can the continued incapacity, imprudence, or indolence of a fixed minister, ruin Methodism in any place, as Independent 'interests' are not unfrequently ruined.

On the Itinerant plan, too, difficulties can be overcome which would be insuperable if the minister were fixed. A minister—to such an extent independent of any locality, that, even though rejected or unpopular there, he can still, if faithful to Methodism and Christ, always be sure, at the ensuing Conference, of having an appointment somewhere else—can dare to do right, in spite of local factions or corruptions; whilst, in similar circumstances, an Independent fixed pastor would probably be compelled to yield to what is wrong.

Nor is Itinerancy less favourable to the

rights and convenience of the people than to the true independence of ministers. No minister can be, on the system of Wesleyan Itinerancy, permanently and immovably fixed in the oversight of an unwilling people. Among the Independents, a pastor, once chosen by a church, claims the pulpit as his freehold, in the possession of which he is maintained by the law of the land. He may become indolent, wayward, or even inconsistent and un-Christian in his behaviour; still the church has, in most cases, no power whatever to remove him. They may, indeed, 'starve him out,' as it is technically called, if he has no private resources; but that is all they can do. Sometimes they endeavour to 'buy him out.' But, in such cases, the retiring pastor will generally ask a round sum for the favour of his retirement. Is it right, is it according to the principles of Christianity, that a pastor should be thus permanently, unconditionally, irrevocably fixed in a charge, however unsuitable a lengthened experience may prove him to be for the position he holds, or however he may degenerate from his original piety and zeal? Is not this a 'heavy bondage, and grievous to be borne'? Is this the *liberty* which our Independent friends invite us to share? Of course, the alternative to this

would be, that the minister, although once chosen, should be at any time removable at the pleasure of his flock. This would be plainly even a greater injustice and injury than the other arrangement; and the law of the land is never likely to permit it. Between the two alternatives, Independency permits of no medium. There can be no third way of escape, precisely because each Independent church, as such, necessarily rejects all external right of interference. There is no general court or community to whom, or their representative authorities, any matter of difference between pastor and flock might be referred for arbitration. The pastor would be absolutely at the mercy of his flock but for his legal tenure of the pulpit; whilst this, again, puts the flock, in some instances, and in regard to some matters, absolutely and most injuriously in the power of the pastor. In Wesleyan Methodism, on the contrary, though the Conference has, and obviously must both of right and of necessity have, the power of appointing for one year any accredited minister to any circuit; yet this minister can hardly be imposed a second year, and certainly not a third, contrary to the will of the circuit. So that, in reference to the appointment of ministers, Wesleyan Methodism far more equably and surely

provides for justice to the people than is or can be done on the system of Independency.

Of course, Itinerancy has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. What finite plan has not? What is this but saying, that sunlight brings with it shadow? The tie is scarcely formed between a circuit and its ministers, before it is again broken; and in each new circuit the task of becoming acquainted with the members, which, in the previous circuit, had just been mastered, has to be recommenced. But it is wonderful how soon a Wesleyan minister comes to know, and be at home with, all his people, and they with him. Mutual trust is the bond of the system; and Methodist hearts quickly warm to each other.

Besides, to supplement the pastoral labours of the separated ministry; to afford that minute and constant attention to the spiritual wants of the people which it is out of the ministers' power to give; to form a permanent tie between the members and the pastorate, though the pastors themselves be ever changing; the office of 'leader' and the institution of 'classes' have been provided in the Wesleyan economy. The people are divided into small companies, called 'classes'; and over each of these is appointed an established

Christian, called a 'leader,' to take the constant oversight of the members of his class, inquiring into their spiritual condition, watching over their Christian deportment, taking the conduct of their weekly meetings and giving such advices to each of the members, both at the class-meeting, and, if needful, in private, as their several cases may require. These leaders are, or should be, if possible, themselves met weekly by the ministers, whose council they form as to all the affairs of the society, and to whom it is their duty to report all special cases in their classes which may require the advice or personal visitation of the ministers; and once a quarter, at the 'quarterly visitation,' as it is called, all the classes are met by the ministers themselves, at which time, in the proper exercise of their pastoral office, they examine into the spiritual condition of every member of their charge, and give or renew to them their 'ticket' of membership.

It will be at once seen how beautifully this plan supplements the Itinerancy of Wesleyan Methodism. Without it, the connection between the ever-changing ministers and the people would, of necessity, be extremely loose; pastoral oversight would scarcely exist even in name; and, although many sinners might be awakened and converted, there would be

no effectual provision for the spiritual edification of the churches. But, on the Wesleyan plan, the aggressive energies and adaptations of Itinerancy are united with the conservative efficiency of a permanent pastoral provision. The leaders form a spiritual *diaconate*, representative and supplementary of the pastoral office; and, while the ministers change, the leaders, who form their council and supply their lack of service, are, generally speaking, fixed.

Whether or not, in the case of *superintendents*, especially in the large towns, and after they have fulfilled a respectable term of service, it might be well for them, if wished by the people, to continue for a longer period than three years in the same circuit, is a point upon which we are not called to pronounce an opinion. Our argument is general. We advocate Itinerancy as opposed to a fixed ministry; and we are convinced that the latter, when weighed in the balances, must be found wanting.

CHAPTER VI.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCY CONSIDERED.

IN our former chapters the system of Independency has been shown to be opposed to the spirit and principles of the New Testament, and to be wanting in almost every provision requisite either for the secure edification in the pure faith and in true holiness of the churches of Christ, or for the effectual extension of the kingdom of Christ in the world. Upon what pleas or apparent arguments, then, we shall be asked, can such a system as this be founded? How comes it, if the reasons against it are so many and powerful, that it has, notwithstanding, obtained so many adherents?

The reason we take to be in the main this, that Independency, though it does not accord with Scripture, agrees well with certain principles of political democracy, and with certain likings of human nature. A subordinate reason may be that the High Church theory and practice of successive generations to which Independency is the antithesis, has by its leaden intolerance and its arrogant spiritual

despotism produced a powerful re-action in favour of opposite principles.

But it is only due to Independency that we should examine particularly the arguments which have been or may be adduced in its favour.

The grounds upon which Independency rests are these :—

1. A true principle misunderstood. 2. A false principle foolishly applied. 3. Two or three places of Scripture misinterpreted.

1. *A true principle misunderstood.*

Under the new dispensation, it is said, all believers are equal. The priesthood is universal. All are sacred persons; and therefore the distinction of order—as between priests and people, the ministers of God in holy things, and those who only wait in His courts—no longer exists. This, we are told, was a part of the bondage of Judaism, from which Christians are set free. To all this the reply is plain enough. There is no *such* distinction as existed under the Mosaic institute; but there is a distinction. All Christians are undoubtedly priests unto God; but theirs is a spiritual priesthood; they are called ‘to offer,’ each within the temple of the renewed spirit, and on the altar of his own heart, ‘spiritual sacrifices.’ So also all Christians are ‘kings’;

‘kings and priests unto God, even the Father.’ But, notwithstanding this, all are not elders or bishops. And the Scripture no more teaches or implies the ecclesiastical, than the civil, equality of all believers. The same Scripture which enjoins that, notwithstanding there is no longer ‘bond nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus,’ still children should dutifully obey their parents, wives duly reverence their husbands, and servants obey ‘in all things their masters according to the flesh’; enjoins also, and with equal explicitness, that the members of a Christian church should ‘obey them that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, seeing that they watch for their souls, as those that must give account.’ The doctrine of the universal priesthood, and of the equality in Christ, of all true Christians, does not at all interfere with the principle of the official superiority and authority in the churches of the separated ministers of Christ. Misunderstood, however, this doctrine has not only disposed many to accept the principles of Congregational democracy, but has legitimately developed itself in such forms as Quakerism and Plymouthism. And if it is sound and true, it must, in all consistency, be pressed to such results as these.

2. *A false principle foolishly applied.*

It is, first, assumed that the economy of Christ's spiritual kingdom upon earth is, or should be, analogous to the civil and political economy of the commonwealths of this world; and, then, that those commonwealths ought to be grounded, arranged, and conducted on the republican theory. Hence, as, according to the republican theory of government, all power is virtually, and ought to be professedly and formally, derived from the people, it is concluded that all church-power should be considered as originally belonging to, and vested in, the people, and that all church-offices should be derived from popular suffrage.

It is clear that, if either of the assumptions upon which this conclusion rests is incorrect, the deduction founded upon both must fall to the ground. Wesleyan Methodists, for the most part, will deny them both. They will neither allow that the people are the only, or the only proper, fountain of authority; nor that voluntary Christian communities are to be regulated according to analogies drawn from the necessarily compulsory governments of this present mixed and evil world. The power of civil governments must indeed be based upon the people, and maintained by at

least their passive consent; but it is a mere fiction to affirm that such power is, of necessity, originally derived from the people. The captaincy of a nation has much more frequently grown from patriarchal precedence and authority, than been conferred by popular suffrage; and the strong who give protection, or deliver from wrong, have some claim, in their own right, as well as from the consent of the weaker multitude, to enforce, up to a certain point, obedience and tribute. But, even if the extreme republican or democratic theory of civil and political rights and government were better founded than it is, it would never be allowable to transfer that theory to the government of that kingdom which is not of this world. The governmental power and polity of all religious communities should be founded on the commission and laws of Christ. A minister derives his authority from Christ, to whom he must give account. He must, indeed, be accepted by a Christian community as their minister, before he has any right to exercise ministerial authority and privilege among them. But, then, they ought to receive him as the minister of Christ, not as their hireling; as set over them by Christ, not as simply doing their work for their pay. If they should be dissatisfied with his conduct, they

and he may or must separate; but so long as he remains among them as a minister, he must exercise ministerial authority. He is not at liberty to teach or rule according to their pleasure or dictation; for Christ has prescribed the doctrine which he shall teach, and the laws which he shall enforce. If they object to hear doctrines which he believes the Spirit of Christ to have laid down in holy Scripture, they must submit to him, or he must leave them. He is not at liberty to adulterate, to their taste, the doctrine of truth, and purity, and salvation. So, again, he cannot lower, abrogate, or modify the laws of Christ, to meet their approval. He is 'Christ's minister,' made by Him a 'steward of His mysteries,' put into this office because 'accounted faithful,' appointed, on behalf of the 'Chief Shepherd,' to 'watch for souls, as one that must give account,' and required, as such, by impartial '*manifestation of the truth, to commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God,*' to 'preach the word,' to 'reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all fidelity,' to 'reject' the factious or immoral; and this he must do, not according to the humour of a congregation or church, but as *the Book* tells him, on peril of his soul's salvation, if he be partial or unfaithful. He is to expound,

maintain, and enforce, not the *decrees* of the *community*, but the truth and laws of Christ, 'whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.'

This last consideration is sufficient to invalidate, fundamentally, the analogy so often implied as subsisting, or having a right to subsist, between the constitution of civil communities, and of the churches of Christ. Civil communities have a right to make and unmake their own laws; but the churches of Christ have no right to repeal or modify the laws which He has ordained, and His ministers are bound to enforce.

The principle, then, is false; namely, that all civil and political power is, or ought to be, derived from the people; and, if it were true, it would be very foolish to apply it to the matter of ministerial authority and church-government.

3. *Two or three places of Scripture misinterpreted.*

Dr. Wardlaw was probably the ablest modern advocate of Independency, and, in his work on Congregational Independency, brings forward just two arguments from Scripture, and these only inferential, in support of his system. The first is founded upon Matthew xviii.

15—17 : ‘If thy brother shall trespass against thee,’ &c. ; and the second, upon the passages in the Epistles to the Corinthians, relating to the incestuous person. (1 Corinthians v. 11—13 ; vi. 1, 2 ; 2 Corinthians ii. 6.)

We shall not need to be detained long by a consideration of these passages.

Matthew xviii. 15—17, refers not at all to questions of church-discipline or authority, but only to private differences between man and man ; was originally a direction, not at all for Christian churches, but for Jewish synagogues ; and embodies a *principle* which, from the first, has been acted upon among Wesleyan Methodists. It seems strange, indeed, how any simple-minded person, or perhaps we should say in another sense, how any *but* a *very* simple-minded person, could suppose that this passage has any bearing upon the question, either of popular rights, the rights of private members, or of ministerial precedence and authority. And it seems still more strange that any intelligent Independent should imagine that the Jewish synagogue could furnish any precedent for the practice of an Independent church. It would be as feasible to deduce rules for American democracy from the practice of Rome in the palmiest days of patrician power and exclusiveness. It

is plain that, so far as authority and executive power went, the elders and rulers of the synagogue constituted 'the church.'*

Nor will the other argument, upon which Dr. Wardlaw relies, better endure analysis or pressure than this. If our readers will refer to 1 Corinthians v. 11, and vi. 1, 2, they will perceive that all they teach is, that Christian people should so far discern and judge respecting their brethren, as to shun the company of the immoral, and be separated from them; and that, for fear of scandal among the Heathen, they should settle their matters of dispute, not by a resort to the ordinary courts of law, but by arbitration among themselves. Here is not a word going to imply that Christian ministers are to be put on a level, as to authority, with the people, or that the latter have all a right to exercise formal and solemn judicial and disciplinary functions.

But the former of these passages suggests, in fact, an argument of the greatest force *against* the Independent principles of popular power. It was penned with a not very remote reference to the incestuous person whom St. Paul, without a trial,—for his guilt was palpable and not denied,—and *against* the partiality and will of almost the whole Corinthian church

* See Neander's *Church History*, vol. i., pp. 250—253.

which was in favour of his continuing in communion with them, sentenced to be cut off from the church. It matters not to say that St. Paul was infallible, and an apostle; that only proves that he *did right, in enforcing Christ's law, because it was Christ's law, contrary to the popular will*; and, therefore, that the popular will is *not* to be the final authority in matters of church discipline, but the law of Christ, as administered by the minister of Christ. St. Paul's fiat could not annihilate a popular *right*, if that were just in itself, and scriptural. If the Independent theory of necessary and divine popular right, in matters of church discipline, is correct, then Paul was wrong.

Paul's reasoning, reproof, and authoritative sentence, however, convinced the understanding and turned the hearts of the major part of the Corinthian church, who, therefore, carried into effect his sentence against the offender. Hence (in 2 Corinthians ii. 6, the remaining passage to which our Independent brethren refer on this subject) his punishment is said to have been inflicted of many, τῶν πλειόνων, the major part. But it was Paul who, by his sole authority, issued the sentence, and insisted on the infliction.

It is further to be noticed, that there

seems to be little doubt that the Corinthian church, at this time, was in a rudimentary and embryotic state, destitute of a regular government and pastorate.

No one can attentively study the Epistles to the Corinthian church without feeling how difficult it is to reconcile the condition of that church, as disclosed in those Epistles, with the idea of a regularly-settled church, conducted and controlled in an orderly manner by a council of elders or bishops. Nor is there an allusion, from first to last, which implies the existence of any regular church-officers or systematic church-organisation. It appears much more probable that, at this time, the Corinthian church subsisted under a merely temporary and introductory arrangement, in which, though there were supernatural 'gifts' of 'teaching,' 'helps,' and 'governments,' there were no formally-appointed and permanent elders or deacons. Such must have been the first condition of every church, since it is certain fit persons for the office of elder could not all at once be found. There must have been training and testing, or, as St. Paul says, *proving*, before ordination could take place. Let the directions to Timothy and Titus be considered, and it will be at once perceived that not supernatural gifts, but a trained and

developed spiritual intelligence and character, fitted a Christian for permanent pastoral office in the church of Christ. Hence we find that it was only on a second or subsequent visit that the apostles or their substitutes ordained elders in the various cities where they had founded churches. The first stage in the spiritual history of each apostolic church must, therefore, have been one in which extraordinary gifts in the various members, and the supernatural insight and absolute authority of the apostles, supplied the place of a regular organisation and government. Taking the light of this principle to guide us, we shall find no difficulty in understanding the two following passages from the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Romans, which have given much trouble to commentators.

‘Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.’ (Romans xii. 5—8.)

‘And God hath set some in the church,

first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.' (1 Corinthians xii. 28.)

And we shall easily understand, also, how it happened that, in the Corinthian church, the execution of judgment upon the offenders was given in charge, not to the elders, but to the whole church. There was, in fact, at this time no regularly-appointed and permanent executive in the church.

It will be seen, too, that, if this matter is as we say, it is foolish, indeed, to refer to primitive and apostolic *precedent* as to matters of church-order. The precedent of the first years of Paul's ministry differed from that of the last years. Church-organisation, even in apostolic times, *developed*. *At first*, even where elders were appointed, it is probable that some were ordained to *rule* who were little competent to *teach*, formally or extensively. (1 Timothy v. 17; Romans xii. 6, 7) Instructed, experienced, competent persons, qualified both to teach and rule, were not so numerous at the time of the first ordination of elders as they afterwards became. Just so much we are inclined to concede to the Presbyterians, in reference to the matter of the 'ruling elder,' as distinguished from those

who both ruled and taught. But, that this distinction was not intended to be permanently embodied in the polity of the churches of Christ, is sufficiently plain from the requirement of the apostle in the Epistles to Timothy, that elders or bishops, as such, should be 'apt to teach.' (1 Timothy iii. 2; 2 Timothy ii. 24.) The later date of these Epistles, as compared with the period of the formation of the principal apostolic churches, explains this direction, which, it will be seen, is absolute and repeated.*

We feel inclined to insist a little on this fact of the *development* of church-polity even in apostolic times, because it will be seen that it entirely upsets the dogma of divine right, as claimed by any *church-model*, whether Independent, Presbyterian, or Episcopal. A very few general principles may be discovered in Scripture, which *every* system of church-polity ought to embody, and in consistency with which the whole system ought to be framed. The chief of these have been specified in the foregoing chapters. But, these principles being made sure of, the form of church-polity may, in other respects, and as to points

* See, in confirmation of these views, Neander's *Church History*, vol. i., pp. 255, 256, 260 (Clark's edition); and his *Planting of the Churches*, vol. i., pp. 174—178.

of detail, be adapted to the various situations and exigencies of this various and changeful world. Our charge against Independency is, that, whilst pretending to a strict conformity to the apostolic model, and wasting an inordinate amount of affection upon certain points, which are, at most, but obscurely intimated in Scripture, and which none but Independents believe to be contained in Scripture at all, it has quite lost sight of several of those great principles which should give spirit and character to every Christian church. And our claim on behalf of Wesleyan Methodism is, that, though doubtless imperfect in some of its details, and possibly incorrect in some of its adjustments, it nevertheless to the present age represents, as no other church does, in power, and unity, and manifold application, the cardinal principles of apostolic church-organisation.

CHAPTER VII.

THE POPULAR ELEMENT.

WE have already indicated, with sufficient clearness, the position which we maintain as to this point. But as it is the characteristic boast of Independency that the popular element receives its full and fair development among them, and as it is often objected to Wesleyan Methodism that in this respect, at least, it is wanting, we propose to devote a separate chapter to the examination of the subject.

There are two grounds upon which the question of popular claims in church matters may be discussed,—the ground of explicit Scripture authority, and of Christian propriety and expediency.

The question of Scripture authority on this point has already been discussed, especially in the second and last chapters; and it has appeared that while in the New Testament the rights and duties of *ministers* are very often explicitly stated, and more often still plainly implied, not only is the relation of *the people* to church discipline nowhere defined or explicitly indicated, but there exists no pre-

cedent from which anything can be certainly inferred in reference to the position which they were intended to hold in the conduct of the spiritual commonwealth.

The utmost that Scripture will yield to an unbiassed and considerate expositor, is the general principle that the people shall, as far as possible, be taken along with the ministers in all decisions affecting the general interest. We are willing to concede that as much as this is taught us by the narrative in Acts xv. We are quite prepared to adopt, in reference to the people's share in this transaction, the words of a distinguished expositor and defender of Congregationalist principles. 'They are not treated,' says Dr. Wardlaw, 'with unceremonious exclusion, or supercilious oblivion. They are present to hear; they acquiesce in the decision; they are united with the apostles and elders in the communication of the result, to the Gentile churches.' Here, however, the decision, affecting, as it did, important points of Christian practice, and touching also upon some questions of evangelical doctrine, was not submitted in any way to the judgment of the people. It was sanctioned and made authoritative by the fiat of the apostles and elders. Its reasons were expounded to 'the multitude,' and their acquiescence was an-

nounced, but that was all. On this particular we are at one with Dr. Wardlaw.

In Acts vi., however, we have the narrative of a very different transaction, in connection with which deacons were first appointed. Here the matter in debate was merely temporal and financial; it was, as much as any church-matter may be, quite a people's affair. The funds to be distributed were from the people, and the parties to be relieved were the church's poor. Here, accordingly, we find the 'multitude of the disciples' taking direct action and exercising real functions. A change was to be proposed in the method of distributing their offerings, and an altogether new class of officers was to be appointed; it was reasonable that the people should be called together to consider these things. And as there were, at this time, no people's officers or representatives, as, in fact, the church at Jerusalem was not yet organised, it is plain that, without such an assemblage of the church, the apostles could scarcely with justice or prudence have changed the manner of distributing the public charities, and certainly could not conveniently or to the general satisfaction have instituted a new office, and appointed persons to fill it. The church then is called together; the affair is laid before them, and the best

course to be taken is indicated, by the apostles. In compliance with their recommendation, the multitude choose and propose for the new office seven men, who are brought to the apostles for their sanction and formal appointment; so that, while the people selected and proposed in this case, the final ratification and appointment, with the power of *veto*, remained with the apostles.* This, be it remembered, was a purely temporal affair, and related directly only to the people's interest; and the principle involved in the proceeding is, that, in such matters, the ministry and the people ought to have a mutual check; and that temporal or financial officers, placed in charge of the people's interests, should be appointed in such a way as to secure the concurrence and confidence both of the people whose property is in their charge, and of the ministerial executive in connection with whom they must act.

The precedent which Independents have endeavoured to deduce from the case of the Corinthian church, was examined in our last chapter, and shown to be worthless. This case can furnish no precedent whatever for the general conduct of church affairs, as it was itself anomalous and exceptional. But, even if we were to admit its authority, we

have proved that, fairly interpreted, the utmost it could teach would be that the people may be taken into union with the ministry in the pronouncement of church censures. The *authority* of the church, in this case, was plainly nothing. They were constrained to obey the behest, and to declare and enforce the decision, of the apostle.

As to the appointment of ministers in the church, all the information which the Scripture affords is that this was done by the apostles, or their itinerant representatives. (Acts xiv. 23; 2 Timothy ii. 2; Titus i. 5.) It is *probable*, also, that the already existing ministry joined in sanctioning and authenticating the appointment. (1 Timothy iv. 14.) How far, or in what way, the church in general concurred in such appointments, is neither declared nor in any way intimated.

So in reference to church discipline in general, all we are taught is, that the elders or bishops were mildly to 'rule,' and the people cheerfully and lovingly to 'obey'; but what limits should be set to ministerial authority, or what rights should be conceded to the people, are matters as to which Scripture gives not even a hint.

We think, however, that the narratives in Acts xv. and Acts vi. sanction the general

principle which we have stated, that, as far as possible, the people ought to be taken along with the ministerial executive in all decisions affecting the general interest. They are not to be left in the dark as to public questions, and the reasons of public measures. On such matters they should receive full information, and their concurrence and approval should, as far as possible, be secured. And, in the appointment of officers for the church, it is plainly desirable, that the persons chosen should be such as possess the respect and confidence of the people, as well as the approval of the ministers. Especially would this be desirable and right when the office in question related directly only to the temporal affairs of the church and the interests of the laity. Though, even in this case, the approbation of the ministers, the ‘rulers’ of the churches, should be a *sine quâ non*.

Such appears to be the sum of what may be learnt from Scripture on this point.

We add the judgment of the sagacious Neander respecting this matter, which, it will be seen, quite coincides with our own deduction :—

‘As regards the election to these church-offices, we are in want of sufficient information to enable us to decide how it was managed in the early apostolic times.

It may have been the general practice for the presbyters themselves, in case of a vacancy, to propose another to the community in place of the person deceased, and leave it to the whole body either to approve or decline their selection for reasons assigned. Where asking for the assent of the community had not yet become a mere formality, this mode of filling church-offices had the salutary effect of causing the votes of the majority to be guided by those capable of judging, and of suppressing divisions; while, at the same time, no one was obtruded on the community who would not be welcome to their hearts.*

We stay, for a moment, in passing, to remark how precisely all this agrees with the spirit and practice of Wesleyan Methodism in every department, and how utterly at variance it is with the principles of Independency. Alike in the election and appointment of *leaders* and *stewards* (the Wesleyan *diaconate*) and of lay (or local) preachers or evangelists, in the accrediting of candidates for the ministry, and in cases of church-discipline, Wesleyan Methodism carries out the primitive principles.

If, leaving Scripture, we ask, ‘What would be the teaching of an enlightened and Christian expediency on this point?’ we shall receive the same reply,—that, as far as possible, in all matters of church regulation and discipline, the people shall be taken along with the ministry. The voice of brotherly love

* *Church History*, vol. i., pp. 257, 258.

persuades to this, Christian equity requires it, sound and provident policy prescribes it.

But the question immediately occurs, How far *is* it possible to do this? If all is not to be conceded to the people, and the ruling authority and prerogative of the ministry are not to be annihilated,—which would be a plain violation of Scripture principle and precept,—then we must somewhere fix limits to concession. What are those limits? Are they like the statutes of morality, fixed and immutable, or are they various and movable, according to the various circumstances and relations of the church, and the varying development of Christian intelligence and character?

We believe that there is a certain point, beyond which concession must in no case pass; that there are certain ministerial prerogatives which are sacred, and without the preservation of which, untouched, no minister can fully and aright meet his responsibilities, and discharge his duty to Christ; but that, up to this point, the amount of concession to popular influence must vary according to varying circumstances.

For example, it will be admitted by all that it would be simply absurd to give to a newly-gathered church of South-African troglodytes, or Ceylonese tree-lodgers, or Aus-

tralian savâges, the same powers and functions which have been exercised by the church of a Jay or a James in England. It would be an un-Christian farce to do this. Such untutored children of the wild must be informed and trained before they can be prepared to take any part whatever in church discipline, or possess any share of ecclesiastical authority. Now, these extreme cases prove the principle. And scarcely less sunk in brutal ignorance than the African negro, or less savage than New-Zealanders, were some of the converts gathered into church association by John Wesley a hundred years ago.

But, in proportion as the laity of a church advance in intelligence, and the discipline of Christian culture, it is fit and right that they should be taken into closer and more frequent association with the ministry in church counsels and decisions. Many men in many churches are eminently fitted to tender advice, and to add authority in questions and decisions connected with ecclesiastical regulation and administration. And it is the duty of the church to use, and to find scope for, every faculty possessed by its members. Still, if the ministry has imposed upon it a *peculiar responsibility* and *special duties*, in relation to the laity at large, it is clear that there must

~~~~~  
ever be reserved to it a *peculiar authority*, and *special prerogatives*.

Now, according to the theory of Independence, the minister is deprived of all peculiar and official authority; he is merely, as Angell James said, a 'speaking brother'; or, at most, he is, beyond this, nothing more than chairman of the church meeting, with a casting vote, bound, *on all points*, to submit to the decision of the majority. He has burden, but not power; office, without prerogative; and responsibility, without authority. He is a ruler only in name; in reality, he is the hired servant and organ of the people. And yet he would be esteemed the minister of Christ, overseer and pastor of the flock of Christ, and, as such, appointed by, and responsible to, the Great Shepherd,—'ruler over the Master's household, to give them meat in due season.' As if there could be two supremes,—the people, and the Lord; and as if the same person could derive ultimate authority from both! Or, as if, while finally responsible to Christ for fidelity to His truth and commandments, he could, at the same time, be unconditionally and invariably amenable to the will of the people!

The Independent theory, then, we cannot accept. It virtually denies the Headship of

Christ, and reduces His church to the level of a merely human institution.

In reference to Wesleyan Methodism, the question to be asked is, whether the ministerial authority is injuriously predominant in the system; or whether, if it has not in all departments been reduced to a *minimum*, it is not at any rate quite as little and as low as, under present circumstances, is compatible with ministerial fidelity, and the effective working of the system.

During the life of Wesley, Methodism was undoubtedly, in technical language, a pure ministerial despotism. Not only was Mr. Wesley's authority universal and absolute when he chose to exert it, but in the government of the various societies and circuits the laity had no voice or share whatever, much less had they any part, direct or indirect, in general legislation.\* The leaders themselves had no more power or prerogative in the government of the societies than, to use Mr. Wesley's own word, 'the doorkeeper.' The leaders and stewards were appointed by the sole authority of the preachers, without

\* The Conference had no existence till 1784. Mr. Wesley shared his power with it, so far as he thought good, while he lived, and at his death it inherited so much of his power as the Deed Poll or as the consent of the Societies placed within its hands.

any conjunction of the laity. In fine, all things were ruled absolutely by Mr. Wesley and his 'assistants,' without the least popular interference or concurrence. Even temporal and financial concerns were, to a great extent, absorbed into the all-embracing scope and management of the ministerial body.

Yet we must ever remember, that this pure despotism was entirely dependent upon voluntary support. No secular arm or legal endowment sustained it. Of these it was as destitute as it was of every quality likely to secure popular favour. It was a system which, with John Baptist-like fidelity and vehemence, stood up to oppose and to denounce every vain fashion and every criminal pleasure of the world. In its morality it was austere and self-denying. The zeal it required was such as forbade all soft and slothful indulgence. What, then, could sustain such a despotism as this in growing vigour and ever-extending dominion through half a century? Nothing, assuredly, but the virtue of its instruments and the visible blessing of heaven upon their labours. We can scarcely conceive of a sublimer fact than such a pure, spiritual despotism as this, commanding, by the self-denial, virtue, and energy of its administrators, the voluntary adhesion and support of an ever-increasing multitude of

persons diffused throughout the three kingdoms, and extorting, ultimately, the homage and admiration of almost the whole nation.

So lofty a dominion was that of Wesley, and so supported!

Before John Wesley's death, however, his Societies had come to include a considerable proportion of intelligent and respectable adherents, well qualified to advise with Mr. Wesley's 'assistants' in church affairs. Hence, although the rules of the societies remained unaltered, usage began to give the officers of the Society a consideration which at first they could not claim. It became usual, especially in certain societies, for the ministers to consult the meeting of stewards and leaders as to important matters. Further than this the growth of popular influence does not seem to have advanced; and, as to this point, though usage might sanction and prudence prescribe the concession of so much to the society-officers, yet no law required it.

Within a few years after the death of the founder of Methodism, however, important rights and functions began to be legally conceded and guaranteed to the lay-officers of Methodism. The Regulations of 1794, 1795, and 1797, completed the outline of our constitution. But many details remained to be

filled in according as circumstances might suggest, and time fit. During the present century much has been done, and our organisation is now approaching to completeness.

Since the death of Mr. Wesley, every change in Methodism, affecting the position and functions of the laity, has been a concession to popular influence. The introduction of laymen into the District-Meetings, to take a principal share in the discussion and determination of all matters not purely spiritual and ministerial, was a most important recognition of lay-rights. This feature of modern Methodism grew up without legislation, and has been in operation from an early period in the present century.

The Committee System, again, introduced a new element into Methodism, by means of which some of the advantages, without the jars or evils, of a 'lower house' are secured. These afforded a fair, virtual representation of the lay-intelligence and influence of Wesleyan Methodism, which was thus brought into advantageous and happy combination with the ministerial executive. And the Conference was, by this plan, relieved, as to mixed and financial matters, of all functions, except those of a Court of Review. Yet all this was done without infringing in any way upon the

original principles of Wesleyan Methodism, or marring any of its characteristic features.\*

In addition to which must be specially mentioned the legislation of 1835, by which further checks were placed around the authority of the ministerial executive, and a constitutional way of access to the Conference, in reference to any change deemed desirable in the laws of the Connexion, opened and secured, as it had not previously been, to the circuits of Methodism.

† [The year 1852 was memorable for its wise and liberal legislation in respect to the circuits and the laity of Wesleyan Methodism. In that year the Quarterly-Meeting of the circuit was, for the first time, distinctly defined. It was constituted, in the widest sense, the representative circuit assembly. All the leaders of the circuit, all the stewards, the trustees, the local preachers, were recognised as members of the Meeting, which thus became the aggregate diet of the circuit, including all the Leaders'-Meetings of the Societies, the trustees of the chapels, and the members of the Local-Preachers' Meeting. A

\* This Committee System is now (1879) superseded by the recent organisation of the Conference in its Representative Session. (See *Minutes of Conference* for 1877 and 1878.)

† The two paragraphs following have been added to the present edition.

---

circuit of one thousand members may be expected, on an average, to have a Quarterly-Meeting of not less than one hundred and twenty members. These powerful bodies invite the ministers, determine and raise their allowances, review all the interests of the circuit, and send petitions or memorials to the District-Meeting or the Conference. They have also the right to appoint a circuit jury of appeal from the verdict and findings of a Leaders'-Meeting in certain cases of discipline.

Since 1852 legislation has still proceeded in the direction of recognising and enlarging the functions and rights of the laity. In 1861 the right was given to each District-Meeting to send a lay representative to attend the Committees of Review in preparation for the Conference. And in 1877 and 1878 the final and natural consummation of the whole course of advance since 1791 was effected in the constitution of the united Conference of Methodism, including both ministers and laymen, according to the plan which is given in the Appendix.\*]

At present the laity hold a most influential position in Wesleyan Methodism.

Any circuit has the right of suspending, for a year, the operation of any new regula-

\* See Appendix B.

tion adopted by the Conference. It is plain that this must compel the revision and alteration at the ensuing Conference of any law rejected by a majority of circuits. The circuits have thus collectively a *veto* upon Conference legislation. At the same time it is open to them to suggest whatever alterations they judge necessary in the laws of the body.

The circuit officers and the District lay treasurers and Committee men in the District-Meetings have the right of memorialising Conference as to any Connexional regulations.

All the society and circuit officers are, according to the practice of the early church, nominated by the ministers, but elected by the members of the meeting into which they are to be introduced. \*

The management of society affairs, as to all general business and bye-regulations, is vested in the Leaders'-Meeting; and of the temporal affairs and general business of the circuit, in the Quarterly-Meeting of the lay-officers of the circuit. The ministers preside over these Meetings, but the vote of the majority decides.

In the administration of ecclesiastical discipline the minister is bound to act upon the verdict of the Leaders'-Meeting; and although the power of censure, suspension, or excision

\* See Note, p. 122.

~~~~~  
finally rests with him, it is surrounded by such checks and guards, that he is in little danger of acting harshly or rashly in any instance. *The danger now is undoubtedly in the other direction, lest he should find himself too feeble and dependent to exercise necessary discipline in the church.* It is, no doubt, possible that he may, in some instances, fall into the opposite fault of haste or tyranny. But this is much less likely than that an irresponsible majority of lay-officers should do so. And if the minister does wrong, he is not only personally and alone responsible to public opinion, and dependent upon that opinion, to a considerable extent, for his comfort and respectability, but he is directly responsible to the superior Connexional courts, the impartiality and resolute justice of which have been repeatedly evinced.

[And in regard to all matters except such as the Connexion at large, under the lead of its most distinguished laymen, has agreed and resolved, with one accord, to recognise as bound up with the proper and common pastoral responsibilities of the united pastorate of the body, the laity are joined on equal terms with the ministry in the supreme representative body of the Connexion; that is, in the Conference.]*

* This paragraph is now added (1879).

It is not, however, our purpose here either to describe or to vindicate the details of our Connexional system. Our space will not allow this; and, besides, it has been done elsewhere.*

A general outline we thought it needful to give, in order to show how, in a Connexional system, the popular element may have fair play; and the principle—the only principle bearing upon this point taught in Scripture—of the mutual support and the concurrence of the ministry and the laity, be carried into every department.

Wesleyan Methodism, like the British Constitution, is a system of checks and compromises. Though, in many particulars, it very closely resembles Presbyterianism, yet, strictly speaking, it is neither Episcopal, Presbyterian, nor Congregational, but blends the characteristics of all three models. More popular than the two first, it is less democratic than the third. Yet, though less democratic, it is more pervasively and practically popular than Congregationalism. At the same time its superintendents, its chairmen of districts, and its presidents, give to it some of the spirit and characteristics of primitive Episcopacy.

* See the Author's *Principles of Methodism*, part ii., chaps. ii., iv.; also Dr. Beecham's excellent essay, and the Rev. George Turner's comprehensive and masterly treatise, *On the Constitution of Wesleyan Methodism*.

The Episcopacy of the Anglican establishment, like that of Popery, ignores the people in the conduct of church affairs; Independency ignores the ministers, as such. In the first, the clergy are the church; in the second, they cease to be even a class. In neither is there any constitutional check to the abuse of power. In Wesleyan Methodism, the Scriptural prerogatives of the ministry, and the legitimate influence of the people, are made beautifully to limit and direct each other.

That all in Wesleyan Methodism is perfect, we are far from supposing. *On the contrary, we are convinced that some matters of importance require to be re-adjusted, and some doubtful points defined. Some things now only intimated need to be made explicit. And the system of lay co-operation must, as time advances, become more completely articulated, and be more fully carried out.**

But there are two points which we are equally convinced can *never* be altered. The constitution of the Conference is fixed by law; and the system is so adjusted in all departments to this leading fact, that it could not be altered, even if the law would permit,

* This is left as it was written and emphasised in 1851. What is here anticipated, however, has since been carried out (1879).

without bringing confusion and discord and feebleness into the whole working of the system. And the ministerial prerogative in the government of the societies has been reduced to the *minimum* compatible with fidelity to Christ and His law. The supremacy of the Conference is, of course, a primary postulate in a *Connexional* system like ours.

[NOTE to p. 118.]—Some inquiries lately addressed to me, lead me to add, in this note, a *caveat* against its being supposed that a Superintendent has any prerogative of *nomination* in a Trustees' meeting. There he is the chairman of a business meeting, possessing all such powers as the Deed assigns him, and as every chairman of a business meeting necessarily possesses, but none besides these. (1879)]

CHAPTER VIII.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

WE propose in this chapter to exhibit, in a simple but comprehensive summary, the results of the comparison which we have prosecuted in our former chapters.

There are several distinct conditions which should be fulfilled by every system of church polity. Though distinct, they are not incompatible. On the contrary, under a right arrangement, the fulfilment of each of these conditions will contribute to the fulfilment of the rest; and the utmost perfection of the system in reference to *each*, will only be attained by giving the fullest satisfaction to them *all*.

A perfect church-system will at the same time accord with Scripture, be directly and pre-eminently adapted to disseminate Gospel-truth through the world, be amply supplied and fitted with provisions, means, and capabilities for the spiritual edification of its own members, and be adapted to call forth and elevate all the faculties and endowments, intellectual and spiritual, of all its members. And in proportion as all these conditions are harmoniously fulfilled and satisfied by means

of any church system, does that system approach perfection. Let these four tests, then, be applied to Independency and Wesleyan Connexionalism respectively, as their peculiar characteristics have been unfolded in the preceding articles.

1. *Accordance with Scripture.*

The arguments by which Independents endeavour to deduce their principles from Scripture, are founded only upon two or three passages, and are merely inferential. Even as such, too, it has been shown that they are worthless; and that the passages themselves, upon which it is attempted to found them, yield, in reality, evidence on the other side. The very witnesses brought into court in favour of Independency, upon cross-examination, are found fatal to its pretensions, while the Scripture-evidence against the main principles of Independency, and in favour of the contrasted principles of Wesleyan Connexionalism, is explicit and abundant,—not to mention the multitude of passages which incidentally, and by implication, support them.

2. *Adaptation for efficient external action, in the dissemination of the Gospel at home and abroad.*

The principles of Independency are such as to render it almost impotent in this respect.

At least, it cannot become missionary, without violating and reversing its fundamental and distinctive principles. Its churches may spread gradually, step by step, church after church, each new church being the surplus from its neighbour church or churches; but it can send forth no missionaries, near or far, to gather sinners from the waste, and form them into infant churches. All that is done in this way, in connection with Independency, by Congregational Unions, and Home and Missionary Societies,—however much we may rejoice that it is done,—is still only done by the sacrifice of all that is distinctive in the principles of Independency.

The spirit engendered and nourished by Independency, also, is essentially opposed to the missionary spirit. This is the emphatic testimony of some of the most eminent among Independents themselves. Sectarian narrowness, and low-thoughted selfishness,—not catholic and expansive charity,—are the natural fruits of the system of Independency.*

* To the testimonies of Independents on this head already given we here add that of Professor Davidson, formerly of the Lancashire Independent College. ‘The churches of Congregational Independents,’ existing ‘in modern towns,’ he tells us, ‘in their independent individuality, are PATCHES AND SHREDS, OFTEN INCAPABLE OF A RIGHT SELF-GOVERNMENT.’ ‘Their views,’ he further says, ‘have become narrowed. Every man, thinking and moving in the midst of his little

Whereas Wesleyan Connexionalism, our enemies themselves being judges, is pre-eminently missionary in its genius, its principles, and all its arrangements.

3. *Provisions for internal efficiency in the spiritual edification of the churches.*

A system which so entirely holds its adherents aloof from all foreign action as Congregational Independency, should, at least, be well arranged and provided for internal efficiency. But even in this respect, Independency will not bear scrutiny. Much good has been done in connection with it; but the system itself cannot justly be called good.

There are three requisites for the edification of a church,—*doctrine, discipline, and practice.*

(1.) AS TO DOCTRINAL *purity*, Independency makes no provision for its preservation. Its principles do not admit of the ministers and churches exercising mutual oversight. A corrupt minister or a lax majority may utterly ruin any church.

And as to *efficiency of DOCTRINAL inculca-* society, becomes contracted in his ideas of men and things. *It is very difficult for him to avoid being sectarian, selfish, unsocial in spirit; because his sphere is so narrow. Comprehensive and liberal views of Christianity are not readily nurtured in the small canton which the preacher looks upon as peculiarly his own.*—*Congregationalist Lecture, 1848, p. 123.*

tion. Many have been, and are, the eminently holy and the successful ministers among Independents. Still, it cannot be doubted that, in a large number of instances, the ministry of Independent pastors is tame, cold, monotonous, and unsuccessful. And from a system which fetters and fixes its ministers in isolated uniformity, what else can be expected?

(2.) Again, as to DISCIPLINE. On this point, Independency is eminently defective. The church is, in almost every instance, either under the control of that most headstrong and unreflective of all masters, an irresponsible majority, or of a clique which, though the minority in numbers, is the majority in property and influence, and which itself governs irresponsibly under the name of the majority. How few are the Independent churches which are not thus governed, either by a low majority of equals, or, practically, by a few members more wealthy and influential than the rest, to whom ministers and people alike *must* bow, and between whom and the minister there is ordinarily a tacit compact! But it is plain that in either of these cases,—and the first is the *normal* case of Independency,—it is impossible for a vigilant, dignified, and impartial discipline to be maintained. Some few Independent churches, whose ministers are men

of commanding character and influence, are in a different condition. But in these cases, the principles of Independency are put in abeyance ; and the minister exercises *more than* the full authority of a primitive pastor.

(3.) And, as to PRACTICE. The characteristic temptations and tendencies of Independency are, confessedly, very unfavourable to the exercise of the peculiarly Christian virtues. And the isolation of the churches withdraws them from the opportunities of sympathy and the calls of brotherhood and charity

Contrast with this condition of things that of the Wesleyan church, the vigilance and success with which purity of doctrine is guarded, the variety and the general interest and efficiency of Wesleyan preaching, the impartiality and the comparative vigour of our discipline, and the zeal and warmth of affection which distinguish our people ; and it must be admitted that, although many are our defects, yet, compared with Independency, our condition is matter for thankfulness.

(4.) The remaining test of true and right efficiency in a church-system, is its *adaptation to call forth and elevate all the faculties and endowments, spiritual and intellectual, of its subjects.* We account this to be a point of great importance in any Christian church.

The Head of the church intended, by means of His Gospel, to elevate and energise *the whole man*, and by means of the church, to give impulse and inspiration, both moral and intellectual, to the whole world. Every Christian ought to be an abler man, a better and more energetic citizen, more elevated and refined in thought and feeling,—to be in every way, and at all times, a man of purer, higher and more powerful spirit,—because of his Christianity. And Christianity, as such, is directly and beautifully adapted to produce these results. But its pure and free spirit may be clogged and fettered by being forced into a feeble, defective, or diseased body. The church-system may be such as to impede and derange the natural operations of Christianity. While the one is naturally cheerful, boon, and free, the other may be cold and cramping; while the Christian spirit should, and would, animate the whole body, a false and unnatural theory may reduce the limbs to paralytic helplessness, or sink the system in sluggish feebleness.

Such comparisons would, perhaps, be too strong, if intended to indicate the actual results of Independency. But they illustrate a principle. We have partly shown upon what grounds, and in what respects, we believe that

Independency is not in accord with the spirit of Christianity ; and that the direct tendency of its distinctive peculiarities is to dam up the flow and diffusion of Christian charities, to narrow the range of intelligence and sympathy, and to repress the energies of the renewed spirit. Especially it has been shown that Independency does not, and cannot, afford scope or stimulus for the varied talents and attainments of the members of its churches. Spiritual gifts have been as freely bestowed by the Father of Lights on the members of Independent churches as on those of the Wesleyan church ; but they are lost for want of opportunity to use and train them. The plants of grace begin to bud, and strive to blossom ; but so cold is the soil, and so chill and unmoved the atmosphere in which they exist, that the fair blossom is seldom seen to unfold, and the fruit is still more seldom found. There is, in fact, no inducement or use for any exercise of spiritual insight, or Gospel knowledge, on the part of the church members. It is not among Independents as in the primitive church, where the whole church was edified by ‘that which every joint supplied.’ Whilst the pastor has no power as a ‘ruler’ in the church, he has, ordinarily, an absolute monopoly of all those functions by which the

church is to be directly taught and edified. And his monopoly in the latter case is not less unscriptural than his impotence in the former. All that is exercised by the members of Independent churches is that for which few among them can be qualified,—the function of ruling; and this belongs to *all*: whilst that for which, in due place and proportion, many might be, or might become, well qualified,—the office of teaching,—is withheld from all. What wonder, then, that those who, without faculty or true vocation, exercise the functions of legislator and judge,—whilst they have scarcely any opportunity or motive to use spiritual knowledge for the edification of their fellows,—should sometimes be more distinguished for cavilling and wilfulness than for Christian activity and scriptural knowledge? What wonder that torpor and formalism should, in such cases, benumb the spiritual sensibilities and faculties?

Undoubtedly the zeal of Wesleyans often outstrips their knowledge, and this is much to be lamented; but even this is not so bad as for Christians to be destitute of both zeal and knowledge. On the other hand, again, there can be no doubt that there are some Independent churches in which some of the members are deservedly distinguished for the combina-

tion of zeal and knowledge; but in these particular cases the bad tendencies of the system have been counteracted by the energy and piety of the pastors, whose authority here is supreme. And even in these cases, notwithstanding the commanding talents, and distinguished piety, and systematic energy of the eminent men who, *spite of their independent theory, govern* their churches, the want of adequate scope and motive for calling into full play the energies of the church members is continually felt to be a great evil; whilst in the great majority of Independent church republics the condition of affairs is such as we have indicated in the last paragraph.

In the churches of Wesleyan Methodism we see a very different spectacle. There the ministers are surrounded, and at the same time both checked and assisted, by a multitude of lay-officers of various kinds. These not only take, as we saw in our last chapter, their full share of the government of the churches, but also exercise, in many cases, most important spiritual functions. We have not only our trustees, but also our local, or lay, preachers, and our leaders. We find a place for everybody, though we may not be always able to keep everybody in his place. There is no gift or energy, no variety of talent, for which

Wesleyan Methodism does not afford scope and opportunity. Not only spiritual gifts, but business talents of every kind, find employment among Wesleyans. All endowments are quickened and made fruitful. Though a supreme responsibility rests with the pastor in reference to the supply of all church needs, and the performance of all church functions; yet nothing is exclusively his, but the sentence of excision from the church, and the administration of the sacraments—the necessary and peculiar functions of the *pastoral* office. Preaching the word, watching over their fellow-Christians in the Lord, visiting the sick, are functions which all Christians are called, in some form and degree, to perform; and for their regular and official performance by duly qualified laymen, Wesleyan Methodism makes systematic provision. At the same time these officers, besides others specially appointed to fulfil the office of steward and of trustee, have the management of the ordinary business of the churches. And here how free is their speech, how independent are their opinions, and, generally speaking, how intelligent and Christian are their views! No narrow church bed confines them,—they regulate not one church apart, but a circuit, a community of churches,—and they are identified with

~~~~~  
a Connexion which extends through the world.

And all these offices—besides a large number of minor ones, connected with the numerous branch-institutions of Wesleyan Methodism—are accessible to all, and will be surely reached by those who, by zeal, liberality, and appropriate talent, have proved their fitness.

There are dangers, undoubtedly, in such a system. It offers temptations to ambition. It stimulates activity more than it favours reflectiveness. There is danger lest the man of quiet worth should be overlooked, and the pushing talker be promoted. The leaven of democracy is apt to work too powerfully, and too much scope is afforded for the arts and violence of demagoguism.

But these are faults which, to some extent, are inevitable in a system through which intelligence and sympathy circulate so freely, and where office and influence are accessible to all. And it is far better that these should be endured, than that either the people should be in bondage, or spiritual functions a monopoly, or a connexion be broken up into 'interests.' In a good degree, however, they admit of being neutralised or removed by a more careful education of the people, a more jealous scrutiny of candidates for office, and

a more vigilant piety and deeper spirituality among the ministers. Whereas the faults of Independency are unmitigable—except at the expense of consistency, being the normal and legitimate result and expression of its first and fundamental principles—and are vital, because they affect the whole system of government and teaching in the churches. The different parts of Wesleyan Methodism admit of being so fitted, and balanced, and cushioned, that the friction and jarring can ultimately be reduced to an almost inappreciably small quantity; but Independency, merging, so far as government is concerned, the minister among the people, annihilating all individual responsibility, and consecrating, as a divine right, the absolute and universal authority of the majority, embodies a mere *brutum fulmen*, deifies blind force, and, whatever be its wrong, can admit of no compromise or check.

We cannot better close this argument than by the following extract from Mr. Miall's work, so often quoted by us, in which, whilst drawing his conception of an efficient church, he, unawares, depicts and eloquently eulogises our Wesleyan Connexionalism.

Speaking of church '*association*,' as it ought to work, he says:—

'Besides the additional strength which it contributes

to a common spirit, character, and purpose, the fervour which it nourishes, and the general elevation of all the moral qualities affecting the determination of the will which it secures, upon which we have already remarked, it is attended by other advantages of a high order. *It concentrates wisdom, and it distributes power. It collects from as wide a surface of knowledge, talent, and experience, as possible, for counsel; and by systematic apportionment of labour, it economises action, and makes it tell to the fullest extent. Union in all that pertains to the direction of enterprise is strength, subdivision in all that pertains to the prosecution of it is tributary to success. A common stock into which each may cast his mite is likely to result in the best plans; a separate sphere in which each may employ his powers is equally conducive to perfect efficiency in exertion. Mutual trust is necessary to the one, cheerful subordination to the other. In the first case individuality merges into what is common to all; in the last, the common purpose of all distributes itself among separate individualities. The arrangement, indeed, is beautifully illustrative of what we often meet with elsewhere,—the law of mutual action and reaction. The church as a whole, and every member of it as a component part of it, receives to give, and in giving receives. It is blessed that it may be a blessing; and when most abundant in dispensing good, it realises most profit and joy in the fruit of it. Each has a portion of its life and efficiency in all, and all in each. Christ, the image of the invisible God, is the Head; and from Him ‘the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love.’\**

Assuredly, a Connexion only can realise this beautiful description.

\* Miall, 8vo. ed., pp. 68, 69.

---

Our task is now at an end. We undertook it reluctantly. The misrepresentation and hostility of the Independent press forced us to it. We have spoken plainly, and argued strongly; but we trust that we have caught none of their bitterness of spirit. We have numbered, and number still, Independents and Independent ministers among our personal friends; with some we have had literary association; but the Congregationalist system, we are solemnly convinced, has as little title to claim Scriptural authority for its principles as any form of church government in Protestant Christendom. The maimed episcopacy of the Church of England altogether ignores the people, and, even among its communicants, makes no provision for separating the believers from sinners, sacred from profane. It cannot, therefore, with strict propriety, be called a church system at all. But an evangelical episcopacy, even though diocesan, efficiently organised, freed from secular control, and gathering its people into churches, would be a much superior system to that of Independency.

## APPENDIX A.



THE following argument originally appeared as a leading article in the columns of the *Watchman and Wesleyan Advertiser*. It is appended here as a fit supplement to the foregoing series.

### INDEPENDENCY AND CONNEXIONALISM MUTUALLY INCOMPATIBLE AND EX- CLUSIVE.

THE theory of Independency supposes that no church act is regular and legitimate, which has not the direct concurrence of all the members of the church. It is conceived to be a matter not of prudence or expediency, but of *right*, that each member should thus participate directly and equally in all the regulative or disciplinary decisions of the church to which he belongs.

In like manner, of late, Wesleyan 'Reformers' have been taught to claim a direct participation in certain administrative and disciplinary acts and functions connected with the Wesleyan societies. This claim is not advanced on the ground of obvious advantage in the promotion of religion, and the better working of the system of Wesleyanism, but of positive and indefeasible right—the right, as it is alleged, of all the members of a Christian church directly to assist and concur in all church acts. The former ground would be too low, and far too disputable and precarious, for our positive and *doctrinaire* Reformers. If the question were argued simply as one of Christian prudence and expediency, it would be impossible to get up a fierce, fanatic agitation in reference to it. But by representing what they de-

---

mand as their absolute, scriptural right, wrongfully and irreligiously withheld from the people of Christ by their ministers, they secure a theme admitting of unlimited declamation, and suggestive of endless and most diversified vituperation.

It is our purpose, then, in the present article, to show that, in respect to a very large proportion of church-acts and arrangements, it is simply *impossible*, in our Connexion, that all the members should directly concur in them. If no church-act can be valid without such direct concurrence, then the greater number of our church-acts *must* be invalid, and our Wesleyanism is hopelessly and incurably in fault. So that either our Connexionalism must be given up, or this theory of popular rights must be relinquished, and any concessions which are asked must be pleaded for on the ground of Christian prudence and expediency, not of Divine right.

Let it be observed, that the theory is not, nor ever has been, that the people have a Divine, necessary, indefeasible right to join in this or the other particular church-act or decision in order to its validity,—but that they must be direct parties to *every* act or arrangement affecting the church at large, or that such act or arrangement cannot be regularly valid. The ‘Reformers’ must not be content to forego five of the rights claimed by Independents, because they see that to demand them would be in our Connexion utterly absurd and impracticable, and then concentrate all their passion and energy in demanding the sixth, as their absolute ‘Christian right,’ because they would very much like it, and think that possibly, by agitation, they might get it. They must reason consistently, and either adopt the Independent theory throughout, or give it up altogether.

We write now for those who have embraced Connexionalism, and who, however they may have been misled to suspect their ministers, or demand particular changes

---

in the Wesleyan system, still prefer that system to all others for its social warmth; for its various capabilities and its mighty power; for its aggressive and missionary means and tendencies; for the at once intenser and more diffusive zeal and charity which it promotes. To such Wesleyans as these we wish to prove, if they are not clearly convinced of it already, that Independency and Connexionalism are mutually incompatible and exclusive. No compromise can be made between them. And he that is enamoured of the one, must entirely forego the fellowship of the other.

Simple truism as this may seem to those who have thought closely or clearly on these matters, yet by some, we fear, it is not at all apprehended. Otherwise we should never hear those who profess to love the essentials and the corporate unity of Methodism, asking for privileges or rights, as they conceive them to be, which might consistently enough be required by Independents, but which could not be granted to Wesleyans without contradicting and stultifying our Connexional conditions and principles, and introducing into the working of our system such confusion and conflict as must eventually end in disruption. That some Independent partisans should urge Wesleyans to make such demands, is, alas! no matter of surprise; especially if they foresee what the consequence would be, should these demands be granted. But it is strange that there can be found honest-meaning Wesleyans blind enough to make them. Beware, simple Wesleyans, lest you be made the tools of those who are jealous of the efficiency of your Connexional system, and would rejoice in its rending and ruin; or who, in the spirit of a blind sectarianism, oppose and decry principles and provisions of which, in their mutual relations and working, they know absolutely nothing, except that they differ altogether from those which they have themselves been led to embrace.

According to the theory of Independency, every member of each particular church has a voice, and an equal vote, in all matters connected with the government, discipline, and religious services of the church. In each church-republic, universal suffrage is the law : and this is supposed to be according to Divine appointment and requirement ; so that it is held to be not only the privilege, but the duty, of every member to take his direct share in the management of all matters connected with the church. It is conceived to be as unlawful to delegate to a representative one's interest and influence in relation to the government of the church, as it would be impossible to hold by a representative one's interest in Christ. Personal and direct action in the one case is, we are told, as bounden upon every Christian, as personal and direct faith and appropriation in the other.

Holding such views, the Independent consistently urges the Wesleyan to demand and exercise a personal and immediate share in all matters connected with church government and discipline. He constantly reiterates the cry, that this is not less his duty than his privilege as a Christian. He represents this as a part of the inheritance purchased for him by Christ, a part of the dignity accruing to him with his adoption by the Father.

And some Wesleyans have listened to these appeals, and been persuaded by them. As most of us, by nature, love influence and power,—as it is pleasant for the young and inexperienced convert to be told that his voice, in the government of the church, is and ought to be equal to that of the wise and hoary-headed saint,—it is no wonder that this republican theory finds some admirers. It would be very wonderful if it did not ; and, on the whole, it is really matter of surprise that more are not led away by it than are. But we fancy nearly all who

~~~~~  
have been captivated by it forget, or have never observed, that it is a theory essentially and altogether inconsistent with Connexionalism, and one to which it is utterly impossible that the authorities of the Connexion should ever accede or defer.

An Independent church is complete in itself. Connected with one pastorate is one place of worship, one congregation, and one 'church.' Here, then, the whole church *can* be called together to consider each matter belonging to the church interests, and their decision may rightly and finally determine the case. Each member of the church is simply and directly related to the whole, and can immediately be brought into connexion and correspondence with all the other members. And when all are gathered together, not only every component member, but every constitutional interest, and every essential relation of the whole church, is there, not simply represented, but embodied. There are no external relations or obligations which need to be considered or represented. Each church is entire, independent, alone. The jurisdiction of each is complete and supreme as to all matters, whether of external action and intercourse, or of internal relations and regulations. Each Independent church is a *monad*, self-contained and complete. When most closely associated with each other, they are still but an aggregation of crystals, each distinctly entire, shaped and consolidated by its own internal forces, existing independently by the affinities and cohesions of its own constituent atoms.

In an Independent church, then, each member *can* be present and vote on all questions connected with the discipline and government of the church; and, each church-meeting representing, in fact, the whole church in all its parts, interests, and relations, the decisions of such meetings may rightly determine everything. But how different is the case in the Wesleyan Connexion!

Here no society can regulate its own affairs independently, because it is only a part, and may be a very small and dependent part, of the circuit to which it belongs. The ministers have the charge, not of each society individually and independently, but of all conjunctively; and the interests of the part must, of course, with them, be subordinate to those of the whole. In accordance with this, they are supported and sustained, not by each part severally, nor by one or two exclusively, but by all conjointly. And so, in the general regulation of the circuit, they must be informed and assisted by a committee or council representing all the various societies and interests of the circuit; and whose determinations must be binding upon each particular society, and superior to the regulations and decisions of the meetings representative of the different societies individually considered. It is plain, too, that this general meeting for the circuit could not possibly be attended by all the members constituting the various societies included in the circuit, even supposing that this would not be, on other accounts, a thing very undesirable and inconvenient. A representative arrangement for the various societies which make up the number of church-members united under one pastorate in the circuit, is, therefore, a matter of necessity; and it is equally so, that the affairs of each society shall only be so far regulated by that society, as they have not already been determined by the general regulations of the circuit. It is plain that, in such a condition as this, there is no room for the application of the theory of Independency. The various societies of the circuit are all mutually dependent, and all their interests are interwoven. The pastorate stands related not to each society independently, but to all conjointly. The church-members committed to the charge of the pastorate are not connected with one place of worship, and accustomed to assemble in one

place of meeting, but consist of bands attached to many different chapels, and separated by wide distances.

But this is by no means all the distinction between Independency and Wesleyan Connexionalism. As each society is but a subordinate and dependent part of the circuit, so each circuit is only a subordinate and dependent part of the Connexion at large. As each society is under the care of pastors maintained not by itself alone, but by the circuit at large, and for the benefit of the whole circuit, so each circuit is placed primarily and supremely under the care of the united and common pastorate of the whole Connexion, receiving from their number whomsoever they may, in common council, agree to appoint, from year to year, and, at most, for a very limited period of years, to that particular temporary charge. Each circuit, therefore, stands related, permanently and ultimately, not to any particular pastor or pastors, but only to the common and circulating pastorate of our whole Connexion. And, further, the ministers are no more maintained, even during the brief period of their residence in any circuit, exclusively by that circuit, than by any particular society in it. Some very important items of that maintenance are derived from common funds supported by the whole Connexion. And, in addition to this, very many circuits are dependent upon the special charity of the Connexion at large for aid towards the maintenance of their ministers. Indeed, there are comparatively few of the now independent circuits (so called) which were not formerly, in this sense, directly and specially dependent.* And, of

* Very many, too, have been relieved from crushing difficulty or impending ruin, by the help of the Chapel Relief-Fund. We have been lately brought into special acquaintance with the case of a small circuit connected with a cathedral city in the midland district. The principal chapel in this circuit has long been embarrassed. It has received

course, viewing the career of each minister from first to last, it will be seen that his relation and obligation to any particular circuit can be but temporary and, in a sense, accidental; his essential and permanent obligation can only be to the Connexion at large. Finally, as the decisions relative to each society in a circuit must be subordinated to the general regulations and the general welfare of that circuit, so the determinations of the general circuit-meeting itself must be limited and conditioned by the regulations and decisions of the supreme Connexional authority. These must be absolute and final in regard to each constituent circuit, and each particular society.

This, of course, is the strongest and completest contrast to Independency possible. It results from this state of affairs, that no circuit has a right to decide upon matters independently, much less any society. Even the most important circuit is but comparatively a minute member of that corporate whole, from which its Christian life and privileges are derived. The whole is of more importance than any part. The well-being of the whole must be regarded before the will of any part, however considerable. The regulations adopted for the good of the whole must be held inviolate, at whatever sacrifice of predilection, prejudice, or temporary convenience to any of the parts. No circuit meeting can be permitted to contravene, or interfere with, these. They are the postulates of its existence, and must be

from the Chapel-Fund *two final* grants of considerable amount, and has been promised a *third* on certain reasonable conditions. It also receives aids from the Contingent or Home Mission-Fund, and is hoping to have that aid increased. Yet several of the chief officers and most responsible parties in that circuit talk of the right of their circuit and of themselves to independency and self-control; nay, even withhold their contributions from the fund to which they fly for help.

sacredly respected in every transaction or subordinate regulation. And the meetings for the societies in the different localities must be doubly limited by the common laws of the whole Connexion, and by the special regulations of the circuits to which they belong. Most of the affairs to be determined by an Independent church-meeting are thus, of necessity, taken out of the hands of the particular societies. The business to be transacted in connection with them, except in rare cases, is simply of a routine or economical character, in reference to which it would be the merest folly and superfluity to call together more than the officers particularly charged with its responsibility.

There is one other grand distinction between Independency and Wesleyan Connexionalism, which we must not omit to name. It is this. In Independency, the church exists before the minister; the minister holds his pastoral office directly from the people. The latter have therefore a right (legally speaking), if they see fit, to join themselves to the minister in every regulative decision and disciplinary act. The people confer the office on the pastor of their own election, and, so far as they do not conceive the matter to have been taken out of their hands by the plain decision of Scripture, they can make their own conditions with the pastor, as to his discharge of the functions of his office. But in the Wesleyan Connexion it is quite otherwise. There the connection of circuits depends, and has ever depended, on the prior union of ministers; and the existence and maintenance of each circuit, on the prior existence of the Connexion. 'The Conference, from the first, has been to Methodism the central and vitalising body, possessing a collective pastoral authority and oversight over the whole.' 'Upon them, as the united pastorate, the whole Connexion has been dependent, as its origin and centre; by them, as such, energy, direc-

tion, and extension have been, and are still, given to the whole corporate entity of Methodism.* As, then, the members of an Independent church, in electing a pastor to serve them, have a right,—Scripture teaching being respected,—to make what conditions they deem fit, with the minister who derives from them his particular authority as pastor ; so, it must be admitted, that the Wesleyan Conference, in receiving into connection with itself any circuit, has a right—plain Scripture-teaching again being respected—to impose whatever conditions may be deemed necessary or conducive to the general peace, prosperity, and efficiency of the Connexion placed under its care. And that these conditions imposed for the general well-working of a Connexion, should be identical with the rights reserved to themselves by the members of an isolated Independent church, is surely, when the manifold and extreme diversity of circumstances is taken into account, a thing the least of all to be expected.

Yet are there some people to be found foolish enough to apply to Connexionalism the rule of Independency, and to claim for Wesleyans, in addition to the numerous peculiar rights and privileges which they now possess, the alien and incompatible functions exercised by the members of Independent churches.

The question is easily narrowed to a point. On what ground are certain rights claimed for Wesleyans? Is it of Scripture authority, or of expediency? If the latter, let the tone of demand be lowered, and the question fairly and modestly argued. Let what has been urged on the side of existing arrangements be carefully read, and candidly weighed. And let it be *answered*, if possible. Hitherto we have seen nothing of this kind attempted. But if these 'rights' are claimed on the

* *Principles of Methodism*, p. 96.

ground of Scripture, our reply is, 'The theory which makes these your due, is the theory, not of Connexionalism, but of Independency. On no other hypothesis can Scripture be made even to seem to favour your views. But that theory we do not accept; nor can you do so, as Connexionalists. If the Independents are right, exclusively and divinely, we are all wrong from first to last. The principles of the two systems are opposed at every turn and point. It is necessary that you should choose the one or the other. You cannot amalgamate or harmonise both. And if you are not prepared to abandon Connexionalism, with all its warmth and breadth, its energy and diffusion, its wide and manifold activity of love, then assault its arrangements no more on Independent principles.'

APPENDIX B.



CHANGES LATELY MADE IN THE ORGANISATION OF METHODISM.

THE constitutional ground on which the arrangements of the Wesleyan Conference stand, the continuity of law and tendency in the developments of Wesleyan organisation, and the identity of principle between the Methodism of to-day, as defined by the Conferential arrangements and settlement of 1877, and that of the period preceding, will be illustrated by the following quotations.

First I venture to place a passage from my *Essay on the Principles of Wesleyan Methodism*, first published in 1850. A second edition of this *Essay* was called for in the same year; and the views here laid down have met with general, so far as I know, with universal acceptance in Methodism. The passage quoted is evidence, therefore, to show what was the theory of Methodism in 1850.

‘The Conference consists exclusively of ministers. The reason is obvious. The Connexion, as we have seen, is a union of many societies and congregations, under a united pastorate. In order to the orderly and concordant discharge of their pastoral duties, and to preserve unity among themselves, it is absolutely needful that there should be periodical *réunions* of as many as possible of the pastors. And when they thus come together, it is impossible that they should be deprived, in their collective capacity, of those prerogatives which belong to them individually as Christian pastors. As to summaries of doctrine, the manner of the administration

of discipline, the proprieties of divine service, plans and regulations for the more efficient discharge of their pastoral duties, it is clear that they have a right—a perfect right, as pastors and as freemen—to come to such an agreement, to adopt such conclusions, as they think fit, provided they are careful not to violate explicitly or implicitly any of the conditions of the connexional union, or infringe upon any of the rights possessed by the people. It is also evident, that they have a right, this being conceded to all by each, to exercise mutual discipline, to submit to mutual examination. The examination of candidates for the ministry, also, as to their religious attainments, doctrinal belief, and pastoral gifts, is by common consent a ministerial office, and one which would scarcely be discharged either more efficiently or appropriately by the association of laymen with the ministers. To prepare a pastoral address, also, to their common charge, is clearly and exclusively their function; and not less so, to receive and reply to other addresses sent to them as the pastorate of the Wesleyan body.

‘Now these are what I may call the *natural* rights of the Wesleyan Conference, as the united pastorate of the body, and comprise, in fact, very nearly the total sum of the duties performed exclusively by the Conference. What they have done of late years beyond this, is scarcely more than, aided by the instructions of the local circuit authorities, to station the ministers, and to receive reports from connexional mixed committees.

‘The fact that the Conference is a united pastorate, *bound* to meet periodically, because of their common responsibilities, and in order to community of understanding, feeling, and aim, is often forgotten. Being thus *bound to meet periodically, and eminently fitted to represent and advise* the whole community, it was natural that the Conference should take oversight of whatever matters were required to be periodically regulated for the good of the community at large; and it was needful, or at any rate proper, that any laws affecting the whole community should, before they could be executed or adopted, receive the approval of that community of pastors who were to be charged with their execution, and who, by

the law of Christ, and the consent of the people, were to be the rulers in the churches.

‘Accordingly, to the *Conference*, Mr. Wesley, from the first, taught his people to submit, as possessing a collective pastoral authority and oversight over the whole community,—upon them, as the united pastorate, the whole Connexion has been dependent, as its origin and centre,—by them, as such, energy, direction, and extension have been, and are still, given to the whole corporate entity of Methodism.

‘In fact, the Conference, from the first, has been, in regard to Methodism, the central and vitalising body, and the property of the Connexion is, and has been from the first, bestowed and devised for their use, and placed under their guardianship; yet, subject to such conditions and guarantees, that it is impossible they should abuse it. ‘The only power which they possess over it, is to take care that neither any of themselves, nor any tumult of the people, shall have power to divert it from its original purpose and legal use. Of this power, which has come to them by inheritance, which is theirs by legal tenure, they dare not, they cannot divest themselves. It is a precious charge, a sacred deposit, received from their fathers, held on behalf of the people at large, and for which they are responsible, not only to man, but to God.

‘The Conference, then, cannot disincorporate themselves; nor can they part with that sacred charge of ecclesiastical property which has been entrusted to their care. Nor can they consent to any alteration in their legal constitution, which would endanger the purity of those doctrines, or the efficiency of that discipline, or the security of that property, of which they have been constituted the guardians. An alteration in the constitution of the Conference is not a matter merely affecting ministerial exclusiveness; it is a change which would affect the tenure of immense property, and the right government and the well-being of a vast community. It must be clearly shown that such a change will be practically beneficial, or it cannot, in good conscience, be promoted. Nothing doubtful, nothing merely theoretical, can be looked on with favour.

‘It is granted, that it is proper the assistance of the laity

should be afforded to the ministers in the discussion and settlement of all temporal matters. And this is provided for. The temporal management of every circuit is complete in itself, and is conducted by lay officers, appointed as before described. No change in the limits, or temporal liabilities of any particular circuit can be made without the consent of that circuit; the two stewards, of every circuit, attend and vote at the District-Meetings, while the general financial business of the circuits is transacted and discussed; no new regulations, as to the payments due to ministers or their families, can be made without the consent previously obtained of the May District-Meetings, the stewards being then present; memorials relative to the management and disbursement of the general connexional funds may be sent up, at these times, from the District-Meetings to the general Conference committees and the Conference. The annual review, and, when possible, the conduct, throughout the year, of all financial and mixed affairs of administration, is entrusted by the Conference to mixed committees, composed of an equal number of ministers and laymen. These committees are virtually more justly representative of the liberality, good sense, and piety of those who support the respective funds, than any elective system of representation possibly could be, and, taken as a whole, do most fully represent the property, intelligence, and piety of the Connexion. Several of these committees are to a large extent expressly representative,—I mean, contain lay representatives, elected from certain circuits and districts,—and the Missionary Committee of Review, the supreme committee, is freely open to all the treasurers and secretaries from all circuits in the Connexion.

‘Now these committees relieve the Conference of all directly financial business. Nothing is done there, except receive reports, and adopt them. Recommendations coming from the committees are received with the greatest deference, and always embraced, as far as the general interests of the whole Connexion, of which the Conference is most adequate to judge, will permit.’

The quotation which next follows is the President’s

address delivered at the opening of the Representative Session of the last Conference (1878) at Bradford, that being the first such Session held, being the inauguration in practice of the new arrangements adopted by the Conference of 1877. I take the report of my address on that occasion from the *Watchman* newspaper for Wednesday, August 7th, 1878.

‘The President said: My dear Brethren,—It is a part of the business prescribed to be done this morning that, after the calling of the roll, the President shall deliver an address. That was prescribed, I believe, because it was felt to be due to the importance of the occasion, and I confess that I feel that importance very greatly. What I feel at the same time is, how exceedingly difficult it must be—for me, at least—to say precisely what ought to be said on an occasion of such entire novelty as the present. Of course the strongest feeling in my mind is that this is an honour as great as it is serious and solemn and difficult. It adds to the honour of the presidency, but it adds to the burden of the presidency, to have such a duty to perform at this moment. I have, perhaps, one qualification for speaking now—viz., that I am in entire sympathy with that great development which has gathered you together here to-day. For many years past the conception now realised has been continually before my mind. It is now many years since I first sketched it in a committee of the Conference. In the year 1851-2 I had the satisfaction of having that conception endorsed by at least one eminent Ex-President—my friend Mr. Arthur—and, I think, by two. No one could have attended the Committees of Review without feeling that there were inconveniences attached to the mode of working, and that the total effect and representation was inadequate to the spirit and to the purpose of Methodism; and the thought that we should have a collective assembly of ministers and of laymen before whom—not melting, not changing like dissolving views, but maintained in continuity—the business which appertains to this Conference should come in successive stages and accord-

ing to the various subjects, and that such a great assembly should be distinctly representative of all the districts of Methodism,—that, I say, is a conception, a desire which has dwelt in the minds of some of us for many years. I expected that it would have been realised by an arrangement for a gathering antecedent to the Conference. Providence has ruled it otherwise; and it seems to me that the present arrangement—though doubtless there would have been very little virtual difference between the one and the other; for in my judgment finality would have been given to the one as well as to the other, at least in a qualified sense, for we do not here assume to do and determine off-hand anything absolutely; we refer all matters of new legislation to the consideration of the Connexion for twelve months before coming to a final decision upon them—I say, then, that virtually one arrangement would have been much the same as the other; but there is a majesty, a unity, a satisfaction in the present arrangement which I think must come home to all our hearts, and, coupled as it has been with a magnanimous covenant adopted by the representative laity of Methodism with regard to the respective spheres and functions of the two branches of this Conference, I think it amounts to a settlement not only of the utmost possible importance, but of the best possible omen—full of wisdom, I trust, and full of the grace which belongs to our Christian faith and Christian religion. I do not know whether all will agree with me, but I regard that which I see this day as being in perfect harmony with the law of growth as seen in the development of Methodism from the beginning. I do not myself recognise that in old Methodism there was a principle of despotic government or of necessary separation between ministers and laymen in authority and counsel. Doubtless, John Wesley's Methodism was a despotism, but it was a sublime personal despotism; it was not a caste despotism according to his conception or intention; it was a sublime, personal despotism, with which he was invested by the manner in which Providence put work and opportunities and the hearts of the people into his hands. It is never to be supposed for a moment that he expected either that that personal despotism or any equivalent to it should be maintained

in permanence, if his churches were maintained in permanence from generation to generation. He himself governed Methodism solely and absolutely by his power and responsibility; and yet from the beginning he meant to devolve his power upon the Conference,—upon the Conference in the first place. He says in more than one place in his writings that he was deliberately training the ministers and societies to that end; and as for the Conference, on which he meant to devolve his power, that was not in his conception a properly ministerial body, but a body of preachers and administrators upon whom Providence had placed certain responsibilities, but so that there might be a continual extension of partnership as opportunities arose, and from one epoch to another. That is, according to my thinking, what has taken place. What we recognise here is this, that we are all to work together as one: that we are each to exercise gifts, functions, &c., according as opportunities open before our view, and we cannot look back upon the history of Methodism without seeing that upon this principle Methodism has been shaping and extending itself from the beginning. The years 1793-6 witnessed a distinct development and the declaration of a charter of rights upon that basis. From that root there has been a growth, an expansion and extension, from that day to this. I think it is now nearly seventy years ago that laymen were first connected with the Committee of Privileges; then there was the union of ministers and laymen in the Missionary Committee; soon after that there was the union of ministers and laymen in home missionary work and in connection with the important Chapel Department of Methodism. If I am not mistaken, it was out of the Annual Home Missionary Committee that the whole system of Committees of Review naturally grew and developed. It is now about sixteen years ago since the principle of direct representation was introduced into the Committees of Review. There are some present here who remember the discussions in Conference and in committee by which that principle was introduced and established. When that principle was established in 1861-2 no one who looked forward could doubt that it would lead to a larger and still larger development in the same direction. An old preacher, very much respected in his

day—a man of great sagacity, the late Peter Duncan—rose in the Conference, and said that this arrangement was “an important step in the right direction, and would prevent such periodical Connexional disputes and eruptions as there had been in the past.” He recognised in that arrangement the greatest possible safeguard for all that belonged to the prosperity of Methodism. Now we see what the result has been. We recognise the consummation of that growth, and of those principles in the fact that we, ministers and laymen, meet here as partners, as brothers, knowing no distinction whatever, save in certain pastoral functions which, by common consent, belong to the ministers alone, to unite in common council for the extension of that branch of the kingdom of Christ to which we belong. I wish to be allowed the indulgence of reading a few sentences from a letter which appeared in the *Watchman* newspaper a great many years ago, which for one reason at least may be worthy of notice. The letter was signed, “A Conference Man, who is also a Reformer.” That letter was submitted to Dr. Bunting, and his advice was asked in reference to its publication. He advised that it should be printed in the *Watchman*. Now, the sentences which I should like to read are these—(and I think you will see how pertinent they are to our position to-day)—viz., “There are two things which Wesleyan Methodism can never yield. 1. That there be in our churches a separate order of men dedicated to the work and office of the ministry, upon whom Christ is believed to have devolved a special and singular responsibility in relation to souls, and who must therefore possess a special and singular authority in that relation. 2. That the Conference and its representative courts or committees must have power to maintain unity, equity, and harmony in the body by correcting and overruling when necessary the decision of the local courts. It is well for the matter to be thus reduced to what is essential. As in Christianity all who agree in essentials can hail each other as brethren in Christ, so in Methodism—all, whatever may be their views on minor points, who are with us in these two, are of our brotherhood, are true and essential Wesleyans; and I confess that, whatever modifications of Wesleyan

Methodism may be proposed which do not really infringe upon these two cardinal principles, are, as it seems to me, matters that may be entertained; nor have I any fear from the freest consideration and discussion of all such minor points, being fully persuaded that there is wisdom and liberality enough in the body of ministers, and wisdom and loyalty enough in my lay brethren at large to prevent the final rejection of any modification which may contribute to the more secure and effective working of Wesleyan Methodism, or the final adoption of anything which may tend to impair the just influence of the ministry or imperil the safe working of Methodism." These sentences appeared so long ago as the year 1851, and from that day to this the anonymous character of that letter has been preserved, though it excited much speculation at the moment. I may venture to say now that those are *my* sentiments, and that I hold them now as I held them in 1851. And now, brethren, I venture to welcome you here in the name of my ministerial brethren. I welcome you as being one with us—brethren in all respects, equals in all respects—for the consideration of the affairs of Christ's Church and kingdom in connection with our particular branch. There are very important matters to be considered. It so happens that this Conference—important, critical as it is by reason of its very constitution and character—has also to consider some matters of the gravest possible importance. With a view to the development of our system some very grave difficulties will have to be looked at. In the first place (I do not speak of this as a grave difficulty), there is partly a digest and partly a reform so far as our home missionary arrangements are concerned, which will be submitted to you this day. Nothing can be more important than that document. It has occupied some years, more or less, of labour; more than one year of express and close committee work; and I cannot doubt that, after your counsels and revision have been added to it, it will prove a great blessing to our Connexion. There is our great chapel department: of that I need not speak; the very name and fame will be sufficient to attract and hold the attention of all. Then there are the various branches of our educational business. There is first

the education of the candidates for the ministry; there is the question on which the Conference last week passed a resolution, which will be brought in due course under the attention of the Conference this week, in regard to the means for providing the requisite training for the candidates for the ministry. There is the question of the Sunday-school Union, and in no place more fitly than in Bradford could that subject attract the attention, the earnest regard of such a Conference as this, for Bradford has distinguished itself by its zeal and its enterprise in connection with that Sunday-school Union. And then there are the important matters connected with the maintenance and extension of our day-schools in this hour of need. I must mention also the Kingswood and Woodhouse Grove Schools Department, the relations between the Schools' Fund and the Children's Fund, and the accumulated debt which at this moment threatens very seriously our peace and our prosperity and efficiency in this department; and last, but not least, there are the affairs of our Foreign Missionary Society, gathering into themselves extraordinary interest; and permit me to say that there is a stone to be rolled away, that the debt needs to be dealt with in order that Christ's glory may shine forth by our Missionary Society to the ends of the earth. There are matters enough, then, brethren, to make this a memorable Conference, to call for close, continuous, business-like attention day after day. There will be no time for play. It will have to be hard business—short hours of relaxation and long hours of work—if the work is to be rightly done. I trust that the reproach which has come upon the lay members of some other bodies will not come upon you; viz., that by the irregular attendance of the laymen business is impeded, and the power ultimately gravitates solely into the hands of the ministers. I hope that no such calamity will be found in connection with this Conference. I am much obliged to you for your kind attention.'

After reading the foregoing quotations, the student of Methodist history and church-principles will be better able to appreciate the meaning and spirit of the

document now to follow, viz., the Conference Minute and Enactment in regard to the constitution and functions of the Conference, as now revised and settled.

‘LAW REPRESENTATION IN THE CONFERENCE.

‘The Conference, having carefully considered the Report of the Mixed Committee appointed last year, to which certain recommendations of the Mixed Committee of the previous year were referred, now adopts the following Scheme of Lay Representation, and directs that it be brought into operation at the Conference of 1878 :—

‘I. The Conference, when considering such matters as are hereinafter declared to be within the province of Ministers and Laymen acting conjointly, shall consist of the President of the Conference, and of 240 Ministers and 240 Laymen.

‘(i.) The Ministerial Members of the Conference when the Lay Representatives are present shall be, in addition to the President and all other Members of the Legal Conference for the time being who shall have declared at the May Meeting of the District Committee their intention to attend the Conference :—

‘(a) Any Assistant Secretary of the Conference not being a member of the Legal Conference.

‘(b) All Chairmen of Districts in Great Britain, not being members of the Legal Conference.

‘(c) Six Ministers in Full Connexion, stationed in Foreign Districts, who may be in England at the time of the sitting of the Conference. The Conference when consisting of Ministers only shall determine in what manner such Ministers shall be chosen ; or if there be not six such Ministers in England at the time of the sittings of the Conference, in what manner their places shall be supplied.

‘(d) If, in any year, any Department would not, in the judgment of the Conference, be adequately represented by Members of the Legal Conference, provision shall be made for the Ministerial Representation of such

Department by the preceding Conference when consisting of Ministers only.

- ‘(e) The remaining Ministerial Members of the Conference, when composed of Ministers and Laymen, shall be elected at the Annual Meetings in May of the District Committees in Great Britain, as follows:—The Ministerial Members of each District Committee shall elect from their own number so many Ministers as, by the allocation of the Conference preceding, are entitled to attend the ensuing Conference. From the Ministers so elected, the Ministerial Members of each District Committee shall elect by vote, taken by ballot after nomination, so many Ministers as were allocated by the preceding Conference to represent such District in the Conference when composed of Ministers and Laymen.
- ‘N.B.—The newly-elected members of the Legal Conference in each year shall be members of the Conference when composed of Ministers and Laymen.
- ‘(ii.) No Layman shall be eligible as a Representative, whether elected annually by the Conference or by the May Meeting of the District Committee, unless he be a Member of Society of five years’ continuous standing, and, at the time of his election by the Conference or nomination in the District Committee, a holder of office as a Trustee of Connexional Property, a member of a Circuit Quarterly Meeting, or a member of a District Committee. Any Layman nominated in a District Committee must be a Member of Society in some Circuit within that District.
- ‘(a) One-eighth of the Lay Representatives shall be elected annually by the Conference when composed of Ministers and Laymen; but in the case of the first Conference to be held after the adoption of this Scheme, by the preceding Conference. This number shall in all cases include the Lay Treasurers of the following General Connexional Funds—namely, the Foreign Missions Fund, the Schools’ Fund, the Chapel Fund, the Metropolitan Chapel Building Fund, the Children’s

Fund, the Home Mission and Contingent Fund, the Auxiliary Fund, the Theological Institution Fund, the Education Fund, and the Fund for the Extension of Methodism in Great Britain, for the time being. One-third of the remaining number elected in the first instance by the Conference shall retire at the end of the first year ; one-third at the end of the second year ; and one-third at the end of the third year. This arrangement for retirement in rotation shall be continued from year to year, and the Lay Representatives so retiring shall not be immediately eligible for re-election by the Conference.

‘(b) For the present, the election of the remaining Lay Representatives to the Conference shall be by the separate vote of the Laymen, taken by ballot after nomination, in the May Meetings of the District Committees ; such nomination to be by the Lay Members only. The Circuit Stewards of each Circuit shall be called upon at the March Quarterly Meeting to declare their ability and willingness to attend the ensuing Annual Meeting of the District Committee in May, or the contrary. If they, or either of them, shall declare inability or unwillingness to attend the said District Committee, the Quarterly Meeting shall have the right of electing by and from its own members, and by open vote, a Representative or Representatives to supply the vacancy or vacancies so created.

‘(c) The number of Laymen to be elected in each District shall be determined by each preceding Conference, when consisting of Ministers and Laymen ; but, in the case of the first Conference to be held after the adoption of this Scheme, by the preceding Conference.

‘II. The business to be transacted by the Conference when consisting of Ministers only shall be completed before that which is to be transacted by Ministers and Laymen conjointly is entered upon.

‘III. The deliberations of the Conference, when consisting of Ministers and Laymen, shall be confined to the duly-appointed members of that Conference ; but any Minister

permitted by the District Committee to attend the Conference when composed of Ministers only, may be present during the Sessions of the Conference when composed of Ministers and Laymen ; and the Lay Members of Connexional Committees may be present during the proceedings of the Conference when composed of Ministers and Laymen. Seats for the purpose shall be reserved for Ministers and Laymen.

‘The admission of any other persons shall be determined and arranged according to circumstances, at the discretion of the Conference.

‘IV. The following subjects shall remain within the exclusive province of the Conference when consisting of Ministers only, viz. :—

- ‘(i.) The formal constitution of the Conference : Filling up of vacancies in the Legal Conference : Election of the President and Secretary : And the appointment of other Officers of the Conference.
- ‘(ii.) Ministerial Lists : Admission and Continuance of Preachers on Trial ; Arrangements for the Examination of Candidates and of Preachers on Trial Admission into full Connexion, and Ordination.
- ‘(iii.) All Questions affecting Ministerial Character and Ability, and of Discipline arising thereupon, or in any wise relating thereto.
- ‘(iv.) All Final Appeals in matters of Discipline relating either to Ministers or Members.
- ‘(v.) Ministers becoming Supernumeraries : Supernumeraries returning to the work.
- ‘(vi.) Obituaries.
- ‘(vii.) Stations : and all Appointments of Ministers.
- ‘(viii.) Pastoral consideration of the number and state of the Societies, and Pastoral Address.
- ‘(ix.) Pastoral Reports : Kingswood and Woodhouse-Grove School, Clapton and Southport Schools, Sheffield and Taunton Colleges, the Leys School, Cambridge and any similar Institution.
- ‘(x.) Supervision of Connexional Literature.
- ‘(xi.) Reception of Addresses, and Preparation and Adoption of Replies.

-
- ' (xii.) Official Appointments, Deputations, and Delegations.
 - ' (xiii.) Conduct of Public Worship, in accordance with the rules and usages of the Connexion.
 - ' (xiv.) Time and Place of holding the next Conference, and the Order of its Business.
 - ' (xv.) And all Ministerial and Pastoral subjects of like nature with any of those specified in this Resolution, or affecting the Ministerial or Pastoral Supervision of the Connexion.

' N.B.—It is understood that the Management of the Book-Room remains as at present.

' V. The following subjects shall come within the province of the Conference when consisting of Ministers and Lay Representatives, viz. :—The business now classed in the printed *Minutes of the Conference*, under the several heads of—

- ' (i.) Committees of Privileges and Exigency.
- ' (ii.) Missions (Foreign).
- ' (iii.) Schools : Kingswood and Woodhouse-Grove, Clapton, Southport.
- ' (iv.) Chapel Affairs : (a) General Fund ; (b) South Wales District Chapel-Fund ; (c) North Wales District Chapel-Fund ; (d) The Relief and Extension Fund for Methodism in Scotland ; and (e) The Metropolitan Chapel-Building Fund.
- ' (v.) The Children's Fund.
- ' (vi.) The Home Mission and Contingent Fund : (a) General Committee ; (b) Army and Navy Committee ; (c) Thames Mission ; (d) Metropolitan Methodist Lay Mission ; (e) Manchester and Salford, and any similar Mission.
- ' (vii.) The Worn-out Ministers' and Ministers' Widows' Auxiliary Fund.
- ' (viii.) The Wesleyan Theological Institution.
- ' (ix.) Education : The (a) General Committee ; (b) Connexional Sunday-school Union ; (c) Children's Home.
- ' (x.) Higher Education.
- ' (xi.) Religious Observance of the Lord's Day.
- ' (xii.) Extension of Methodism in Great Britain.

‘(xiii.) Temperance.

And also all questions relating to—

‘(xiv.) District Sustentation Funds.

‘(xv.) Proposed alterations and Divisions of Circuits or Districts against which there is any Appeal.

N.B.—The Conference when consisting of Ministers only shall have power to consider and decide all questions as to alterations and divisions of Circuits or Districts on which the Quarterly Meetings and District Committees shall be agreed, and against which there is no appeal ; and also all propositions for the calling out of additional Ministers which shall have received the sanction of the Home-Mission Committee.

‘(xvi.) And all financial and general subjects of like nature, with any of those specified in this Resolution, or affecting the financial or general affairs of the Connexion.

‘ But all matters connected with, or arising out of, the consideration or decision of the subjects specified in this Resolution, which in the foregoing Resolution are stated to be within the province of the Conference when consisting of Ministers only, shall be considered and decided accordingly.

‘ VI. The consideration and determination of all questions raised by any Resolutions of District Committees, or by Memorials from Circuit Quarterly Meetings, or otherwise shall come within the province of the Conference when exclusively Ministerial, or when the Lay Representatives shall be present, according to the subject-matter thereof respectively. In all cases in which there may be any doubt as to the province to which a matter belongs, the President shall decide.

‘ VII. No new law on any subject within the province of the Conference when composed of Ministers only, proposed during any Conference, shall come into force until it shall have been submitted to the District Committees, when Ministers only are present, and until their reports, if any, shall have been considered, and such law shall have been confirmed by the next Conference when so composed ; and no new law

on any subject within the province of the Conference when composed both of Ministers and Lay Representatives, proposed during any Conference, shall come into force until it shall have been submitted to the District Committees when Laymen are present, and until their reports, if any, shall have been considered, and such law shall have been confirmed by the next Conference when so composed.

‘N.B.—Nothing in this Resolution shall be so construed as to interfere with the rights of the Circuit Quarterly Meetings as set forth in the *Minutes of Conference* 1797, vol. i., New Edition, p. 393, and 1852, vol. xii., p. 117.’



THE
METHODIST CLASS-MEETING.



THE
METHODIST CLASS-MEETING.



CHAPTER I.

THE CLASS-MEETING.

THE Class-Meeting is the inmost institution of Methodism,—the germ-cell, to borrow an illustration from vegetable physiology, out of which the whole tissue and texture of Methodism is perpetually reproduced and developed. The Methodist Church is a web of Class-Meetings; unloose them, and the whole is unravelled. The Class-Meeting is the matrix within which every element characteristic of Methodism is nurtured. In these small, fervent, confidential meetings, the power of simple, homely, and ready speech, in regard to spiritual truths and experience, is acquired. Here the gift of social prayer is called forth. Here the future preacher first gives token of his powers, and receives his earliest training. Here the future ‘leader’ gives proof of his character and qualifications.

It is to its Class-Meetings that Methodism owes the fluency and fervour so characteristic of those who lead its assemblies in prayer or who habitually address its congregations. It is to the same institution, not less, that the brotherly freemasonry is owing which makes the Methodists one people all the world over, which makes the Methodist stranger who brings with him his 'note of removal' feel himself to be at once 'at home' in a Methodist 'Class-Meeting,' and as a 'member of the Society,' either in Lancashire or in Sussex, in Yorkshire or in Australia, nay, even in London or in Inverness. Very foolish indeed therefore are the suggestions of those who urge that, to meet the views of the present enlightened age, Methodism should multiply and adorn its sanctuaries, should thoroughly educate and polish its ministers, and should abolish or 'modify,' should at least abate, its Class-Meetings. This would be to garnish the sepulchres of Methodism; to sap the springs from which all its life has flowed. Its supply of preachers would presently run dry; the power of its preaching would die out. The sinews of its strength would be unbound; its vital energy would decay to nothing; its heart would collapse; its 'leaders' would be no more; its army of lay preachers, never re-

plenished, would moulder away; Methodism, in fact, as such, would be at an end.

And yet we hear complaints, again and again, that the Class-Meeting is not so popular an institution as formerly. It would appear that some shrink from it, that others complain that it is an uninteresting and unprofitable ordinance, that, for one reason or other, not so large a proportion of the hearers in Methodist chapels now become 'members' as formerly. It is whispered to us even that some ministers have been heard to talk now and then disparagingly of Class-Meetings; and we have reason to believe that some people who are presumed to be somewhat superior to many of their neighbours in taste make it a practice to express their distaste for these meetings. At the same time we are happy to know that the leading minds among our ministers, the most thorough thinkers and the ablest men in counsel, adhere with the most firm and intelligent conviction to the institution of Class-Meetings, and that those of the laity who occupy undeniably the highest position in Methodism are among those who most highly prize the privilege of these meetings.

It is no matter of surprise that the Class-Meeting should have become the subject of

discussion and criticism. We are now in the second century of Methodistic history. The stage of almost unconscious zeal and energy is past, and the age of self-consciousness has arrived. The merely formative forces of Methodism are in part expended; the enthusiasm of its early youth has passed; unreasoning veneration no longer enshrines everything which bears the image and superscription of Wesley; critical thought surveys and examines all that belongs to the history and institutions of the Body. The tendencies of the age are all in this direction. Nothing is too sacred to have its claims questioned, and its merits examined. It would be foolish, then, to expect for the institutions of Methodism an immunity in this respect, and it would be weak indeed to deprecate scrutiny and criticism.

Moreover, the Class-Meeting is a great leveller, as great as the law of Christian fellowship. It brings rich and poor, high and low, the vulgar, or those who are so esteemed, and the refined, or those who expect to pass for such, into the same spiritual brotherhood. In these days, when the continual prevalence of a political democracy, and the continual encroachments in social position of mere wealth on hereditary culture, or mere power

of skilled labour on the defectively-educated tradesman class, tend to the continually increasing subdivision of society into castes, whose ramifications streak and seam all classes, the lower not less than the higher, so levelling a social institution as the Methodist Class-Meeting must wake up against itself many and rooted prejudices, just in proportion as it fulfils the scriptural ideal of equal brotherhood and fellowship.

Notwithstanding all this, we believe that the Methodist Class-Meeting will retain its hold upon the Methodist people, if it is only well administered and worked, that it is capable of being turned to much better account than it ever has been yet, and that all that is needed to bring out more fully than ever its power and properties for Christian guidance, quickening, and instruction, and its capability of adaptation to all characters and classes, is the provision and multiplication of thoroughly competent and devoted Class-Leaders. We believe that a lively, interesting, and instructive Class will never fail for want of members; and that, if there were an adequate supply of such Classes, the objections against Class-Meetings would cease to make themselves heard.

A Class-Leader must be thoroughly in

earnest, must be lively in prayer, ready in speech, affectionate in manner. Time was, when these qualifications were of themselves almost sufficient. In the infancy of Methodism, few joined the Society who were not zealous at least. The novelty of Methodism, the monopoly which it possessed of spiritual fervour and activity, the stimulant of persecution, the sense of the as yet undeveloped energies of the system, and the anticipation of a glorious future which lay before it, kept alive the zeal and enthusiasm of the members. They all brought life, vigour, excitability, into the Class-Meeting. The Leader had sometimes little to do except to regulate their expressions of feeling and displays of energy. If he himself were but lively and ready, it was enough. The Class kept itself up. It could not but be attractive and popular.

But now-a-days something more is needed in a Class-Leader than liveliness. The novelty of Methodism has passed away; its reproach has greatly abated, and what persecution remains is too petty, and withal too partial, to fan the flame of zeal or enthusiasm. Methodism, moreover, no longer stands absolutely *alone* as the evangelical institute and propaganda of England, and almost of the world. The members breathe a less bracing and

stimulating atmosphere ; a danger of languor has come with ‘these piping times of peace’; many profess an hereditary Methodism,—they have been gently led in early youth to join the Class-Meeting. It is clear that, under such circumstances, much more depends on the Leader than did a hundred years ago. The members need to be quickened, to be instructed, to be led on ; zeal, wisdom, experience, the gift equally of pungent and of persuasive speech, a moving earnestness and depth of character, must concur to the equipment of a thoroughly competent Class-Leader. Such men may not be very numerous ; yet we cannot doubt that they might be found in sufficient numbers to meet the demands of our Society, if the great object of seeking out and training such Leaders were studied with the zeal which its importance demands. Unfortunately, for want of such Leaders beforehand, in some instances, the very men and women who ought themselves to be in training for the office, or to have been appointed to it, stand aside from the Methodist Society.

CHAPTER II.

CLASS-LEADERS.

WE have shown, that, much more now than fifty years ago, the character of the Class-Meeting depends on the character and quality of the Class-Leader. We showed that, in former days, if a Leader were but earnest and lively, it was often enough; but that now-a-days he needs to be much more than this. The times are peaceful—persecution has ceased to be formidable; there are many hereditary Methodists who, not having learnt much in a little time in the school of sharp and deep experience, have the greater need to be schooled by a wise and thoughtful Christian Mentor; there is also an amount of intellectual activity, as respects the frame of Christian doctrine and the meaning of Christian experience, and especially the mutual relations of doctrinal and experimental truth, which must be met by a corresponding intelligence, clearness, and comprehensiveness in the statement of Christian doctrine and the description of Christian experience. For these and the like reasons Methodist Class-Leaders to-day must be men of thoughtfulness as well as

fervour, men of individual quality and force as well as men of Christian sympathy and principle.

We would not say anything which might even appear to reflect on the general character of Class-Leaders, but it is no wonder that *some* Classes languish ; the wonder is that any members attend their meetings. Even in prayer the Leader is sometimes cold and dry and formal. In many cases he is but little furnished with texts of Scripture to apply in his counsels, and is utterly unfurnished with suitable stanzas of Christian hymns. Still more frequently he is destitute of individual quality, altogether deficient whether in force and pungency of remark, or in the power of persuasive speech, can neither rouse, nor search, nor melt. His part, from first to last, is made up of the most conventional phrases, the commonest quotations, the most hackneyed and empty generalities. With such a Leader it is scarcely possible for the members to keep from sinking to the level of a formal monotony. These Leaders may be good men ; in many cases, as members, they were even warm and lively. But having no mental resources, and not more than ordinary piety ; having, probably, no time properly to prepare for the duties of their office, and perhaps also little idea of the need of special

preparation, or of the sort of preparation required; the continual strain upon them of meeting week by week the same company of Christians, in order to converse upon the subjects of Christian experience, has soon exhausted their supply of thoughts and of phrases, and now the routine has become a tame repetition with little profit to the members, and perhaps even less to the Leader. To prevent anything like this, in early Methodism, Mr. WESLEY enjoined that the Leaders should often meet each other's Classes.

A grave defect observable in some Leaders and their Classes, is the want of simplicity and frankness. This defect may be noted in what, in other respects, seem to be flourishing Classes. The Leader uses a well rounded generality of phrase, and his members successfully imitate his example. He speaks much of his desires, and something of his principles, but not clearly of his experience. The lights and shadows which pass over the course of a genuine spiritual experience are not reflected in his weekly statement, nor consequently in those of his members. Some Leaders seem to be above ever being overtaken in a fault,—they appear to dwell in a serene and lofty region where they have no sore temptations, no obstinate and recurring besetments, and

where they know not only no falls, but no slips or stumbles. To confess to such things might perhaps be deemed inconsistent with their official dignity and superiority. The consequence, however, is, that the members take after the Leader. There are no frank, genuine, tender confessions of spiritual unfaithfulness, —of offences in word, in temper, in purpose, —of being ‘overtaken in a fault.’ Then the new member, conscious of the sore strife within himself, of his shortcomings and unfaithfulness, soon finds himself unable to tell frankly and simply of his own temptations, besetments, and failures, in the presence of those who have nothing, individual or real, to tell of the same sort, nothing that makes the voice to tremble, or the tear to start. We believe nothing would tend more to fill Class-meetings with Christian tenderness and life than great simplicity, as to this point, on the part especially of the Leaders. Nothing certainly would more conduce to impart to them interest, variety, and genuine feeling. Here indeed should lie the very truth and power of Class-Meetings.

Christian truth and simplicity, spiritual sympathy and earnestness, mental individuality and resource, steadfast culture of the mind, the memory, and all the faculties, with

a view to acquiring the requisite ability and furniture for efficiently conducting a Class these things are needful. Along with the largest charity, a Class-Leader should possess true discernment of character. He should equally cultivate the power to penetrate into the truth of motives, and the disposition to make the utmost allowance for the force of temptation and circumstance. In short, a Leader ought to be a man of insight and good sense, of great diligence, of a loving spirit thoroughly instructed in Christian doctrine no novice in Christian experience, and altogether devoted to his official duties, delighting in his work. If such men can only be provided in sufficient numbers, the objections we hear against Class-Meetings will sink into silence.

There are not a few persons in the congregations of Methodism who would join 'the Society,' if suitable, if competent, Leaders could be found for them. The case of such may sometimes be met by ministers forming Classes of their own. Young ministers, however, will often find it much more difficult properly to meet a Class, especially if it contains persons of deep thoughtfulness and of delicate spiritual sensibility, than to preach sermons. The minister who leads a Class

should not ordinarily be a very young man; and, however gifted, he will find scope for his gifts in the due care and proper leading of such a Class as we have just described. We are told that even ministers may be met with, and ministers of standing, who are by no means successful Class-Leaders. And we can readily believe it, if they have not made Class-leading a study, if they have accustomed themselves in all things to depend on merely *memoriter* preparations, or if they have been wont more lightly than lovingly to run through the work of the 'quarterly visitation.' But, generally speaking, a minister of experience, as he has had unrivalled opportunities for acquiring the power of Class-leading, will prove to be an edifying and competent Leader, even for the most thoughtful and cultivated Christians.

In view, therefore, of the condition and circumstances of Methodism at the present time, so different from those of the Societies of the last century, we would support the suggestion contained in an article in the *London Quarterly Review* for October, 1864, that experienced ministers should, whenever possible, have not only their Bible Classes, but their Society Classes. And to the reasons urged in that article would we add another, which we deem of the highest importance.

Ministers' Classes, made the best and most of, would form models and training-schools; and out of them might be selected Leaders of the best kind, apt and furnished, to take the lead of Classes containing men of like character and quality with themselves. We are persuaded that we must look in this direction for the solution of what is now one of the most pressing problems of Methodism.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.

WHILST we regard the question of Class-Meetings as at this moment one of the utmost importance for Methodism, we regard it at the same time as one to be solved practically rather than to be settled by discussion. Let but a full supply of thorough competent Leaders be secured, and the theoretical objections to the Class-Meeting will cease to make themselves heard. As, however, some discussion of the abstract question may perhaps just now be useful, we are induced to add some observations respecting it to what we have said in our former chapters.

The Class-Meeting may be regarded either simply as a means of Christian Fellowship, or as also a test of Church membership. We apprehend that few persons, at least within the circle of Methodist influence, would object to it in the former relation. The necessity of private and regulated Christian fellowship has always been felt among the circles of earnest Christians, and was never so great as now, when the world is busier than ever, and the cares and pleasures of life are more importu-

nate and intrusive than ever. In some form or other, meetings similar in purpose to the Methodist Class-Meeting have been held in every age. The analogy may be traced in the early Church and in the best fellowship of the Middle Ages, not only monastic, but free, as among the different 'brotherhoods.' In the Churches of the Reformation it had expression in the forms of pietism. In the Moravian Church the law of organised fellowship found the fullest development. In England, Fellowship-Meetings were frequent and greatly prized among the Puritans; from them the desire and habit of intimate and organised Christian fellowship seems to have been derived into the Church of England, where Dr. Woodward's Societies, on behalf of which the High-Church father of the Wesleys wrote an apology which might serve as an exposition and defence of Wesleyan Class-Meetings, were somewhat extensively established during the latter end of the 17th century; and at the present day, in one form or other, Fellowship-Meetings may be found among the various Christian churches of this country, having in particular become a common and cherished private institution of religion in many circles of the Church of England. Doubtless, also, the felt want of an organised arrangement for

securing mutual fellowship among Christians, on something like equal terms of brotherhood, is one reason why Plymouth Brotherhood has acquired so considerable a development.

Methodist Class-Meetings do but provide, in a regular way, for the satisfaction of a universally-felt spiritual necessity. Christians should hold free, intimate, yet guarded, spiritual fellowship; they need to be instructed by each other's experience, to be mutually enlightened, encouraged, comforted, admonished. To secure this, they should meet in small bodies, should meet regularly, should meet under the guidance of some experienced Christian with whom they may choose to unite themselves in this regular way of fellowship, and, thus meeting, should also be brought into spiritual intercourse and relation with their appointed and chosen spiritual 'pastors and teachers.' Let clear, simple, effective provision be made for these things, and we have a Methodist Class-Meeting. Let the abortive and irregular attempts at mutual fellowship which may be found in various other churches be but made complete, and something not materially distinguishable from the Class-Meeting will be the result. The want of some such organisation is felt in other churches to be a great weakness. The craving

after intimate spiritual fellowship is almost universal among tried, tempted, feeble, but earnest, Christian people, battling alone in the midst of sin, care, and sorrow. Not to have duly provided for its satisfaction is one of the grave defects of the national churches of Protestantism. Rome, in this as in other things, gains incalculable strength from recognising, and in its own way satisfying, what so many Protestant churches ignore. The Romish Confessional is the *perversion* of the idea of intimate Christian fellowship. Here as elsewhere *corruptio optimi pessima*. The terrible cunning, which seems to be one of the 'familiar spirits' of the Papacy, has seized hold of a most potent instinct, and has enslaved it. The Confessional is the greatest strength and the greatest curse of Popery. The counterpart truth to this counterfeit lie is *mutual* Christian fellowship and confession. 'Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.' Methodism embodies the true principle, and, if the embodiment be worthy, this must remain its greatest strength, its essential power. Fellowship—mutual, active, equal fellowship—was the beginning of Christianity, its earliest law and life. If we are to have power and unity, there is no alternative between this and

priestly domination. Organised Christian brotherhood and fellowship, or organised sacerdotal despotism, must be the fundamental idea in any great spiritual community. The former is the formative idea of Methodism, as it was of the Primitive Church. Out of this fundamental fellowship all the organisation of Methodism is developed. Leaders and stewards, local preachers, separated ministers, each with their due prerogative and authority, all unfold out of this common fellowship and life.

We do not pretend that Class-Meetings are, in their form, a precise reproduction of any special institute or organisation in the Primitive Church. But we do say that, in their spirit and principle, they are a true and effective adaptation of the great law and principle of the Primitive Church to the conditions of modern society and life. We do not believe in any stereotyped plan of church organisation or church government. Our position is that the principles which were, as we may say, held in solution in the primitive community at Jerusalem, and which by degrees came to be developed in distinct forms and moulds in the organised Christianity of the first ages, must, as principles and according to their spirit, govern the development of the different

Christian churches in all ages; but that, on this very account, that development must vary, within wide though definite limits, according to the varying circumstances and conditions of different countries and nations, and of successive ages. To meet the conditions of common life in the present age, to answer the requirements of modern society and civilisation, we believe that there is no church organisation better adapted than the Methodist,—no means of Christian fellowship, on the whole, so suitable and effective as the Methodist Class-Meeting. This consideration might alone suffice to justify Methodism in making the Class-Meeting the test of church membership. But other considerations of importance may be added, which will serve absolutely to justify the position in this particular taken by Methodism, and to these we will advert in another chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE TEST OF MEMBERSHIP.

THE Class-Meeting is essential to Methodism. Take it away, and there can be no such thing as Methodism. Its life is extinct; its economy is dissolved; its special means of grace are at an end; the peculiar training and quality of its Prayer-Leaders, Class-Leaders, Local-preachers, and separated ministers, are done away.

The Class-Meetings of Methodism, taken in connection with its Lovefeasts, at which all the members of a society or a circuit come together for free mutual fellowship, and with its Prayer-Meetings, the efficiency and power of which depend so greatly on the Class-Meetings, may be said to represent, for the present age, more nearly, perhaps, than can be found elsewhere, the free and lively mutual fellowship of apostolic Christianity. They afford, we venture to think, the truest rendering of the primitive spirit into the forms and conditions of a modern organisation, which can be found at the present day, at least on a large scale.

And it is a singular advantage possessed

by Methodism, that its central means of church-fellowship, that which is equally adapted to young and old, to the inquirer and the mature believer, to the sorrowful and the rejoicing, to the poor and the rich, and out of which the whole growth of the system, as a living organisation, has unfolded, has been constituted the one and only special *test* of membership. Of course it is understood that attendance at Class must be combined with a consistent and God-fearing deportment in every-day life. He who meets in Class must profess to have a paramount 'desire to flee from the wrath to come,' and must 'bring forth fruits meet for repentance.' This being so, the member of the Class is also a member of the Methodist branch of Christ's church, and entitled to take his place, as one of the Lord's disciples, at the holy table of the Sacramental Supper.

Nothing can be simpler than this ; nothing, we think, more scriptural. No artificial barrier is set up. No Shibboleth is exacted. The gate is as wide open, as was the gate of access to the apostolic churches. And yet, practically, this leads to little abuse or licence. In fact, this test, which might seem so loose, is really more effective than any other to be found in contemporary churches. For it

is a living, ever present, test. *As a general rule*, persons who have lost all genuine sense of religion, will not—find that they cannot—continue to frequent the simple and spiritual Fellowship-Meetings of the Methodist Societies.

Still, we hear again and again, that the only scriptural test of church membership is participation of the Lord's Supper ; and therefore that, however excellent Class-Meetings may be, we have no right to impose them as a test upon the members of our Societies. We believe that this extraordinary objection is the fruit of a confusion of ideas, scarcely to be met with outside of Methodism. At all events, it is only in place on the lips of the broadest of Broad-Churchmen, a nationalist or universalist who repudiates all distinction between the church and the world. We fancy we could lay our finger upon the spot where this unlucky seed of error and folly was first sown, five-and-twenty years ago, in the pages of a Methodist publication. Unfortunately, like many another empty verbal fallacy, it has imposed upon some, and has even been allowed a certain amount of weight in some Methodist apologies ; when, in fact, it is utterly futile and unmeaning. A few years ago, in an important discussion in the Conference relat-

ing to this very point, it was conclusively dealt with by Mr. Arthur and others. Nevertheless, as it is still repeated here and there, we must again be at the trouble of setting forth the simple and plain truth of the matter.

The fact is, then, that the Lord's Supper is not at all the *test*, but the *seal and token* of church-membership.

'The badge and token this,
The sure confirming seal.
That He is ours, and we are His,
The servants of His will.'

But, besides the seal and token, each church must surely have its proper test of church-membership. Unless all church discipline is to be nullified, this must be conceded. Unless every man may come to the table who pleases, there must be some test by which the fitness of postulants is to be ascertained. Accordingly, every church has, at least in theory, its own test. Congregationalists have theirs. The author of the *Customs of the Dissenters* complains that the ordeal at first is so severe as to be repellent, and is at the same time not altogether fair or quite consistent with Christian propriety and humility,—while, after the first ordeal, the conditions of continued membership are practically almost

valueless, and quite inadequate to sift away from the church withered and formal members. He earnestly desires a simpler and more open access into church-membership, and at the same time a readier and more effective way of testing continuously those who have already become members, and of separating the dead from the living. The Church of England has practically no test, as it has for its members no provision either of discipline or of active mutual fellowship. Nevertheless, even the Church of England has, in theory, its test. The postulant for the Sacrament should have received confirmation, and should hold spiritual fellowship with his Minister in private on each occasion, previous to his admission to the Lord's Table. In Popery, the test and preparation is confession: here, as elsewhere, that church has set up a damnable perversion of the right and true idea, which is, that living, ordinary fellowship in and with the church, coupled with a godly and Christian deportment, should be the condition of access to the table of the Lord. Nothing, then, can be more consistent or defensible than the position assumed by Methodism, namely, that the ordinary condition of access to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in its Societies, is, and ought to be, active church-fellowship in the

~~~~~  
way of the Class-Meeting. For special cases, such as of strangers, of stated attendants who have been trained as members of other churches, or of the physically ailing or incompetent, Methodism makes exceptional provision, as all churches have to leave some latitude for such exceptional provision.

That all appertaining to this point in Methodism is perfect, that nothing more can be done to render its system in this, or in any other respect, more harmonious, complete, and efficient, we do not undertake to maintain. But we are prepared to maintain, with devout gratitude to Divine Providence, the scriptural legitimacy and excellence of its general principles; and, in particular, that the Class-Meeting ought to be upheld as the great means of ordinary fellowship, and as the best and fittest regular test of membership among the ecclesiastical Societies which constitute its great aggregate of living Christianity. We advise all the Ministers and true friends of Methodism to take up, as to this point, a bold and immovable position.\*

\* Whilst maintaining all that is written in the text, I ought to add that, in my opinion, some supplementary or complementary provision is necessary with regard to the regular and duly guarded admission to the Lord's Supper in our churches of such persons as, whilst they are under the pastoral care of the ministers and are recognised as Christian people, are not members of our Society Classes. (1879).



THE CAUSES OF DECREASE AND  
MEANS OF INCREASE.





# THE CAUSES OF DECREASE AND THE MEANS OF INCREASE.



## CHAPTER I.

### DECREASE : ITS CAUSES AND REMEDIES.

THERE is one aspect of this matter which has not, we think, been yet set forth in print, but which we think it important to apprehend and bear in mind.\* About fifty thousand members must be annually added to our numbers as a Connexion, before we can count any net increase whatever. So many are required to cover our annual losses by deaths, emigration, intermigration (of people going to seek for employment), and back-sliding. And, in fact, very nearly fifty thousand new members, as the returns presented to the Conference showed, were actually joined to the Methodist Church in the last year, although the net decrease was thirty-six. If, instead of between forty-nine and fifty thousand, fifty-five thousand had been added, there would have been an increase of five

\* The pages which follow were first published as articles in the *Watchman* newspaper in the years 1864 and 1865.

thousand and several hundreds. It follows from this, that if but one member more in ten were added than last year, if but one tenth more of result were realised, there would be a net increase of five thousand. To us, we confess, this is a very encouraging thought. The comparison between last year, and the increase of two or three years ago, is not really as between a minus quantity and a large positive result, but as between fifty and fifty-five, or ten and eleven. Let us but be one tenth more prayerful, more faithful, more diligent, and this will tell upon the result.

Far indeed be it from us to put the case in this way, in order to encourage those who are 'at ease in Zion' to continue at ease. Very different is our meaning. We have long felt that the recent rates of augmentation in Methodism have been altogether below the proper standard. We ought to have been adding members to our Societies by tens and scores of thousands a year. Never had we by any means so many chapels, or chapels so commodious and attractive; never congregations nearly so large; never had we a ministry so well educated, and, intellectually considered, so effective; never, probably, did we stand better in regard to public influence and esteem; never had we nearly so many Ministers in

proportion to the members in Society, or to the number of our chapels ; and yet there seems to have been, as respects the grand matter of conversions, an evident decline in power. Surely this is a matter far too serious for us to wish in the least to minify it. We are grateful for the Jubilee year ;\* we recognise the liberality of the people of Methodism ; we have a happy confidence in the orthodoxy of the ministry ; we rejoice to see beautiful sanctuaries multiplied, unencumbered and unprofaned by disastrous burdens of debt ; we delight in the comely order and the ‘ beauty of holiness ’ which increasingly adorn our services ; but we should be faithless to our trust, if we suffered these secondary blessings and glories to hide from our view, or from that of our readers, the great central and vital deficiency on which we have been dwelling. We have, however, thought it essential, before attempting to investigate the causes of the present deficiency, that we should know accurately what and of what sort it is ; and, before attempting to indicate the true remedies, that we should understand to what degree we need to be revived, in order to change the decrease over which we mourn into an increase.

The serious consideration in regard to the

\* The Missionary Jubilee of 1863-4.

numerical decrease in our Methodist Church is, that, for several years preceding, the net additions to the Society had been growing smaller. To find out the real cause of the falling off in power, the first thing to be done obviously is to analyse the returns, and discover where the diminution takes place. When that is done, we learn that for many years past Methodism has made comparative little way in London, and that, notwithstanding the large amount of liberality and enterprise recently shown in the erection of chapels, and the very great increase in the Methodist congregations of the metropolis, the cases of distinct and ascertained conversions are fewer in proportion than formerly, and consequently the number of members, when it does not diminish, shows but a small increase.\* We discover, still further, that, in too many of the largest towns of the kingdom, Methodism numbers within its Societies a much smaller proportion of the population than it did thirty years ago, and in some instances has absolutely a smaller number of members in Society, although perhaps it may have greater public influence. We observe, also, that for several years past there has been a positive decrease

\* Since this was written the rate of growth for Methodism in London has increased considerably.

in a considerable proportion of the agricultural districts of the country. At the same time, we find that in a number of rising towns, and of newly occupied and largely peopled manufacturing neighbourhoods, Methodism has within the last twenty years developed more rapidly, more generously, and in better and happier proportions than had perhaps been known in its history. Such instances have occurred especially in Lancashire, some parts of Yorkshire and Staffordshire, in Durham, and in South Wales.

With these facts in view, which—with the remarkable exception of one North-Midland District, where there has been a large and at present inadequately explained decrease during the past year\*—will be found, as we believe, pretty well to cover the breadth of the case, we are prepared to draw some general inferences respecting the causes of the recent apparent decline of Methodism in spiritual energy and result. Of course, we do not look upon the case of a District where, after a very large increase in the preceding year, there may have been a small net decrease, as one calling for explanation or for special remark.

It appears to us then that hereditary wealth and influence, whether landed, manu-

\* See Note at the end of this chapter.

facturing, or mercantile, is unfriendly in some respects to a system so characterised by free fellowship, and so open to the development of spontaneous energy, as Methodism. Hence Methodism is likely to have great difficulty in maintaining its relative position and influence forty years hence in the young and thriving manufacturing towns—the creation of the last twenty or thirty years—where at present it is so strong. We do not say that it may not do this. But, assuredly, foresight, adaptation, much study and labour, much religious earnestness and consistent spirituality, and not a little of intellectual force and culture, will be necessary if it is to improve or maintain its present position.

It appears, moreover, that the tendency of modern fashions, habits of thought, and surface-culture, while favourable, so far as the middle-classes are concerned, to attendance upon an earnest and intelligent ministry, are unfavourable to the profounder and more searching and spiritual offices and means of religious worship and communion. Hence, perhaps, a larger number than ever of middle-class tradespeople are attracted to the Methodist ministry, while fewer of them in proportion than formerly become members of the Methodist Church.

It appears that, in the rural districts,—partly, no doubt, from the influence, speaking generally, of the landed aristocracy, who naturally support, and of late years have more zealously supported, the territorial and established church, but chiefly, we believe, from the diligence of the clergy, the training of the National Schools, and the thorough working of the pervasive parochial system, with its appurtenant organisation of district visitors and the like,—Methodism finds it a harder task than ever to maintain its hold upon the agricultural population of the country. We are aware, indeed, that in these districts the population rather decreases than increases. But, on the other hand, the number of ministers and of day-schools has largely increased; so that, on the whole, we adhere to the general conclusion thus stated.

Doubtless the two great hindrances to our progress which, after such a survey as we have just made, are seen to rise pre-eminent, are, first, the growing spirit of worldliness in our congregations, arising out of the increasing temptations to gaiety, display, luxury, and frivolity, of the present prosperous age, and next, the increasing zeal and energy of the parish clergy and their well-drilled assistants. The latter is a hindrance to the spread

of Methodism in many places, but yet is often (not by any means always) a great help to the spread of Christianity. Even in this case, however, we are not content to see Methodism decrease that the Establishment may increase. The Establishment is not to be trusted alone. If alone, and without counteraction or rivalry, it almost inevitably becomes formal, lethargic, and withal oppressive.

It is plain that the pervasive influence of the parochial organisations cannot be counteracted by mere ministerial activity. The clergy outnumber the Methodist ministers fifteen or twenty fold. But surely the Methodist army of class-leaders, prayer-leaders, and visitors of the sick, stimulated and supplemented by the pulpit services, not only of the ministers but of the local preachers, and under the general direction of the former, ought to be able to do effectual service in conserving and extending Methodism, notwithstanding all the zeal and diligence, whether truly Christian or merely sectarian, of the parochial clergy.

The case of the towns, especially of the middle and lower middle-classes in the towns, with whom Methodism has most to do, is perhaps the hardest to be met. In many instances wealth has increased far beyond intelligence; ostentatious luxury is unchastened

by refinement ; social parties imitate the show and profusion of the classes higher placed, without the real culture which refines and graces the luxury of those classes. Hence dinner parties, where hospitality borders on excess, and the conversation is barely redeemed from vulgarity, and never aspires to be instructive or truly Christian, or in any way improving. Hence evening parties, where there is no sustained conversation, except what may be seasoned with personal gossip ; where there is neither religious earnestness nor cultivated intelligence. Such a state of things is most pernicious to the church. Where the ministers connive at it, much more where they are so feeble or so little spiritual as actively to share and countenance it, it is impossible to expect any spread of godliness among those circles. But the whole subject, on one aspect of which we have here touched, is of wide scope and of supreme importance, and cannot here be adequately treated. Suffice it to say that a firm and godly ministry in the towns, at once cultivated and spiritual, seems to be one of the paramount conditions of success ; and that everywhere, especially in the country, and among the masses of the town population, that ministry will be most successful the effect of which is most directly

and decisively to bring forth individually devoted and working Christians. It is not a merely eloquent or attractive pulpit ministry which will build up a church; but one which sends the hearers home to pray and labour, and especially one which makes professing Christians feel their personal responsibility in regard to the souls of their neighbours. Such a ministry in the pulpit,—and in private and social life, the savour and influence of a largely cultivated, kindly, genial, but at the same time sober, earnest, godly, and spiritually-minded pastoral presence and character,—are the two greatest needs of the time. We are very far from meaning to say that these requisites are absent. All we intend is, that they were never so much needed; and that they will be needed more and more. Any comparative deficiency must, as things are, at once make itself known in the diminished power with which the machinery of Methodism does its work.

---

[NOTE.—I may say in this note that, after making such inquiries as I could, I came to the conclusion that the large decrease in the particular district referred to (at p. 201), one of several successive decreases, had been increased by the neglect which had been growing up for several years in requiring Class tickets to be shown, or special notes of admission to be obtained from the

minister in charge, as a condition of attendance at the quarterly Love-feasts. In that district, as in nearly all others, especially in the more populous parts of the country, the rule of showing tickets or notes was, until about twenty years ago, strictly enforced, as it still is in our best organised circuits, especially in the north of England. But it had begun to be largely discontinued some years before 1864. All sorts of Methodists attended each other's Love-feasts, without any restriction. The habit, indeed, had partly grown up in our churches because of the laxity of other Methodist bodies in regard to their Love-feasts. Of course it followed that, the fence once being removed, any person whatever was able to enter these peculiarly spiritual—and, according to their ancient and proper idea, these almost confidential—assemblies of Christians, coming together to speak of their special experiences in the things of God. Of course, also, such a promiscuousness of attendance could not but greatly lower the character of the meetings—impairing their sacredness and tending to impose silence on the Christians of deepest and rarest experience. Still further, such laxity deprived the ministers of one of the best and, in former times, most productive opportunities of gaining access to 'anxious inquirers,' and directing them to the care of suitable leaders. In the best days of Methodist discipline, as I remember them, it was a rare thing for the minister, at any considerable Love-feast, not to have the opportunity in this way of gaining personal access to several persons under religious concern, of giving them suitable counsels, and of recommending them to the care of suitable leaders. A company of leaders always attended the minister in the vestry. What Methodism has lost, both in the way of spiritual influence and of numerical increase, during the last twenty years, from this cause alone, it is impossible to calculate. It is

hardly too much to believe that this single cause of loss would account for every decrease during that period, whilst it has correspondently reduced every increase. Nor must I omit to notice another aspect of the same evil.

If the Class Member's Ticket is never asked for, except at the Covenant Service once a year, and alas ! not in all cases asked for even in that most solemn service, which in some places,—as yet, I believe, happily but few,—is open to all comers ; why should the member set any great value on his ticket ? The value of the Class-Meeting itself is greatly discounted when it is ascertained that all special church privileges, for which membership should be the qualification, are to be enjoyed without Class Membership. Surely this state of things calls aloud for effectual remedy. (1879.)]

## CHAPTER II.

### THE MEANS OF INCREASE FOR THE CHURCH.

THE decrease of last year is not forgotten by Methodism, not forgotten by the ministers, quite as little forgotten by the people. There is a deep, a painful anxiety in many minds as to the present state and prospects of the Connexion. Is the small decrease of last year to be turned at the next Conference into a large increase? Or will there be again a decrease? Or will a small increase permit us to hope that by degrees, sure, if slow, the lessons of the decrease are being learnt, and the Connexion rising towards the complete mastery of the difficulties which have been gradually gathering around its position during late years? These are questions proper to be asked. Small hope, indeed, should we have for the future of Methodism if we thought that many among her ministers or people had ceased to trouble themselves about the growing deficiency of Methodism in spiritual results during the last few years; or that the questions we have just asked would be dismissed with dislike by many as discouraging or unseasonable. It is the worst of signs when a man in business is afraid

to investigate his books, or to be cross-questioned about his prospects and the state of his affairs. The most hopeful symptom of returning prosperity in Methodism will be a settled endeavour on the part of the whole Connexion, and most of all on the part of the ministers and leading office-bearers, to bottom the causes of the decrease, and to insure future success, not only by a busy diligence in working all the machinery of Methodism, but by such a use of the lessons taught by late deficiencies as may secure a better quality of work for the future. It may be that there is a lack of oil as well as of steady working power, or that the oil is not of the highest purity and excellence; it may be also that there is a deficiency in that fineness of tact and skill of handling which mere steady plod in working by no means insures, which only a loving interest in the process and the results will ever give to the workman.

We would gladly expect a large increase as the result of this year's labours; yet we shall not in the least be discouraged if the increase be small. The comparative failure in power came on gradually; there were first inferior increases, falling smaller year by year, and then at length a small decrease. But for the hopes inspired by the investigations and

humble intercessions of the past season, we should not have been surprised by a larger decrease during the present year, as signalling the accumulating pressure of causes which have been operating, with increasing power, for several years past. As it is, however, we cannot doubt that the tide has begun to turn. It may not have turned in time to secure a large increase during the present year, but we cherish the hope that at least a second decrease will be averted.

We have endeavoured to ascertain and to exhibit the various circumstances and influences which have concurred to bring about the present state of things. We have shown that the decrease has taken place after a long season of unexampled material enterprise and prosperity in Methodism, in the midst of the best Connexional feeling, and at a time when the provision of ministers and sanctuaries has become large, complete, and, in every human respect, effective, far beyond the precedent of any former times. We have noted that, in the large towns, the Societies have decreased, while the congregations have increased. We have shown that there are circumstances and influences connected with the growing prosperity of our nation, and especially with the amazingly rapid increase

in wealth of the middle classes, which are very adverse to the spirituality of our Societies, which continually tend to taint the church with worldliness, and which, although they even contribute to fill our sanctuaries with people too 'respectable' not to go to a place of worship, render the special fellowship of Methodism very uncongenial to a large proportion of the worshippers. We have shown, also, that an all-engrossing and continually intensified clerical influence, fortified by an all-pervasive system of National Schools, powerfully counteracts the influence of Methodism in the agricultural districts of the country. And, in a special series of papers, we have endeavoured to illustrate the special and serious difficulties in the way of prejudice and misconception which the vital and central element of Methodism, its Class-Meeting, has had of late years to contend against, and to point out how far there is a necessity for re-vitalising that institution, not only by a steadfast, unflinching exposition and enforcement of its character and merits, but in the way of seeking out and training suitable persons for sustaining the office of Class-Leader.

There are, however, some errors of a most potent character, in regard to the best style

and the special purpose and virtue of preaching, which we have not had an opportunity of indicating, but which, in our judgment, have as much to do as any other causes with the present deficiency of Methodism. For years past the desires of many of the congregations of Methodism have been set upon a sort of preaching which has not been the best for creating or building up a living church of Christ. They have desired, what has been called, but has very seldom really been, ‘intellectual preaching’; and again they have sought for that sort of inflated and sonorous composition which is often absurdly described as ‘splendid preaching.’ That people who wish to go to public worship regularly, but have no idea of going through anything so serious, or earnest, or ‘disagreeable,’ as the conviction of sin, or thorough repentance, or sound conversion,—what old-fashioned divines would have called ‘the pangs of the new birth,’—should desire, at their weekly sitting in the chapel, to be pleased and entertained, is only natural. To be interested, and somewhat excited, without being too painfully or humbly searched, too closely dealt with, too pointedly arraigned, too alarmingly and individually closed with in a conscience-grapple, this is what they demand. A little thought, a good deal of paint-

ing, any amount of pathos, which does not come too close home, even a terrible pageant, *at a distance*, and with which no voice comes, crying, *Thou art the man!* no handwriting on the wall which individualises the guilt and the fear,—such elements as these go to make up the ideal, for many people, of a very desirable and ‘popular’ preacher. According to the demand can hardly fail in some degree to be the supply. That it has not been more largely forthcoming is owing to the good measure of godly fidelity which has prevented a greater conformity to prevailing tastes on the part of the preachers. It is never to be forgotten that a regular chapel-going people, who remain indifferent to spiritual religion, are the least likely to relish the preaching they most need; and that in proportion as the element of middle-class worldliness prevails in Methodist Societies and congregations, the demand is likely to be for a style of preaching characterised by intellectual pretension rather than power, by show and blazon, rather than by taste or true beauty, by gaudiness and glare and tinsel, rather than by fidelity or true Christian and soul-moving eloquence. We need more in Methodism of earnest, natural, home-coming pulpit discourse, which flows out of the full and prayer-enkindled premeditations of a soul

familiar with sacred studies, mighty in the Scriptures, steeped in evangelical love and pity, on fire with a passion for preaching CHRIST'S truth and Gospel, and for saving the souls of men. In the pulpit the closely compacted essay and the highly-wrought rhetorical display are equally out of place. The best preachers of the Church of England never offend by producing such compositions there, and yet there are few better preachers in England. Their style is plain and truly earnest; they read less frequently than formerly; while they never indulge in mere finery or in sounding verbiage.

Not a word have we to say against true eloquence. Of this there cannot be too much, duly associated with clear and impressive exposition. Words cannot be too burning, so they come straight and true from the heart; sentences cannot be too clear or strong. The preacher's sayings should often flash like the lightning, and cleave the soul like a sword; and in the passion of his melting pity, or of his flaming love and zeal to win and save souls, his passages of remonstrance and entreaty may well now wail with the tenderest pathos, and now rush like a torrent. But in all this the hearers should not feel that they are pleased, and be looking at each other with

delight; consciousness of pleasure, the exercise of critical judgment on what is spoken, should be lost in a profound inward impression, and all thought of those around, in the sense of GOD above.

But a yet more subtle and not less injurious error often fallen into by truly good people, is the idea that a church is to be built up mainly, primarily, through *attractive* preaching and the consequent filling of the sanctuary with crowded hearers. No doubt to fill the chapels is a great point, but the real and right way to build up and increase a Christian church is by the influence and activity in daily life, and in enterprises of holy charity, of the Christian church itself. He is the best minister who is instrumental in infusing the most earnest, active, intelligent, practical Christianity into the souls of his people at large. In the end, he will be the means not only of saving more souls, but of permanently gaining more hearers, than any other to his church or chapel. No preaching, however truly beautiful, eloquent, or attractive, will avail to resuscitate a languishing church, or to make it operate powerfully upon the unconverted, unchristian population amidst which it is placed, so long as the members of the church continue to look to the attraction and eloquence

of the pulpit as the one great and direct means of converting the people, instead of their own personal Christianity and individual devotedness to CHRIST and to the good of their fellow men. This is a point of so much importance, and so little understood even yet, that we shall return to it again. Methodism a hundred years ago spread mainly through the individual zeal and fidelity of its members, each one of whom felt himself to have a burden to bear and a testimony to deliver. Let the same spirit be as widely diffused as formerly, and Methodism will still greatly and swiftly grow.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE GREAT WORK OF THE CHURCH.

THERE are two things chiefly needed in connection with our churches and congregations; that the unconverted hearers should be effectually awakened, and that the outlying masses, who attend no place of worship, should be reached by Christian influence and brought within hearing of the preacher's voice. The first of these two things is to be effected by the conjoint operation of plain, faithful, sound, and loving, enforcement of the truth from the pulpit, and of earnest, consistent, holy, living, on the part both of the preacher and the people. If this latter condition is lacking, the virtue of the preaching, whatever its excellence, will be to a serious extent neutralised. Whereas, if it be present, it will go not a little way to compensate for many deficiencies in the preaching. The second of the two things we have named can only be accomplished by means of the individual activities, and the distributive and diffused influence, of the members of the church, as operating in their daily life, shining with a steadfast illumination on the pathway of their

customary walk, flowing out with an irrepressible force and freshness into every channel to the avenue of which they come. Christian believers collectively are to be the 'light of the world'; and individually they are 'so to let their light shine before men,' that their fellows 'may see their good works and glorify their Father which is in heaven.' Christian believers are 'the salt of the earth.' Individually—as the particles of salt—they must be brought into close contact and penetrating intercourse with the world in its mass and multitude; only thus can society be salted with Christian life and influence.

The great triumphs of early Methodism were not won among 'respectable' church-going people, but among those who made no profession of religious seriousness, of whom those who were not profane and openly godless were at least utterly ignorant and negligent of all religious doctrine and ordinances. The Methodist preaching struck home to the hearts of colliers and furnacemen and tanners. Prayer-meetings were held, and presently Class-Meetings came to be held, among the wayfarers of 'the highways and hedges,'—in the regions where 'publicans and sinners' had their abode. Within such regions the preacher often took his stand—in some swarm-

ing lane or alley, or in some thronged public place, or on the green of some abandoned village-outskirt, or of some dark and utterly neglected hamlet. Thus Methodism spread and prevailed. At that time Methodist preachers had scarcely any call to feed a gathered flock; pastors they hardly even claimed to be; peculiarly ministerial character and functions were denied them; the labours needful for the regular and edifying Sabbath discourse to an instructed people were rarely demanded of them. At that time, too, the evangelistic, the truly Missionary, labours of the itinerant were wonderfully seconded by the enterprise of his 'local' brother, and by the scarcely less stirring zeal of the gifted prayer-leader, class-leader, or exhorter, who, with or without a plan and an appointment, were active, 'in season and out of season.' The whole Methodist people, in fact, was at work,—busy each and all as ants in an ant-hill,—sallying out singing, in their spare hours, like bees to the furzy common,—all alike intent upon spreading the 'good news' of salvation. It may be said, with literal truth, of many of them, that this work they 'esteemed more than their necessary food.'

Now it would be an utter mistake to suppose that the field is not the same, in all

essential particulars, to-day as in the days of John Nelson and Thomas Walsh. There are the same classes, neither less ignorant, nor less godless and profligate, nor, alas! less numerous (absolutely, whatever may be the case relatively), at the present day, than a century ago. The case, however, is of necessity widely different now with the ministers of the Wesleyan Church from what it was at that time with the itinerant preachers of John Wesley. Now Wesleyan ministers are pastors indeed, pastors loaded with an oppressive multitude of duties and responsibilities, and withal called to feed the gathered flock 'with knowledge and understanding.' In order that the same sort of work, with the same blessed results, may be done now which was done by the early Methodist labourers, the Ministers must call to their aid the whole body of Christian believers, headed by the local preachers, the class-leaders, the prayer-leaders, and organised into bands of tract-distributers, sick-visitors, district-visitors, Sunday-school teachers and visitors, ragged-school teachers, &c. Only in this way can the waste be reclaimed, and each Methodist congregation become a centre of healing and saving influences to the population among which it is placed. Only in this way, that is

to say, can the great work, *the work*, of the church be accomplished.

For this *is* the church's work—its one work, to which everything else should be subsidiary,—and the obligation to do it lies upon every individual member of the church, man or woman. It was not on the apostles only, but on all the disciples, that the Saviour, standing on the mountain in Galilee, laid His solemn injunction—to 'go forth into all the world,' and to 'preach the Gospel to every creature.' The first disciples acted on this injunction. (Acts viii.) So did the first Methodists; and so must their successors do also, if, 'the word of the Lord' is indeed, 'to run and be glorified.'

This work is, doubtless, as our quotations teach, and all Scripture teaches, to be accomplished by 'preaching.' But the preaching by which it is to be immediately accomplished, is not the set discoursing in sanctuaries, blessed and delightful as this may be, but rather the irregular, the less premeditated, the altogether homely and personal truth-dealing of the preacher in the street or the cottage, or of the prayer-leader in the room, or of the Christian man pleading with his fellow, or the Christian woman testifying to her sinful sister of 'the grace of God in Christ.'

No pulpit eloquence can ever charm the

swarming fish out of the dingy reaches and depths of the crowded city-sea into the meshes of the Gospel-net. Those whom the pulpit orator draws are, besides Christian professors, almost exclusively the well-dressed, and the more or less intelligent,—those who are not altogether unfamiliar with the inside of a place of worship. Not one in five hundred of the congregation belongs to the classes of which we have been speaking. Let a Punshon, or a Coley, or a Spurgeon, preach for years together every Sunday in Old Spitalfields Chapel, London, or in Bridgewater-street Chapel, Manchester, and what impression would their preaching *alone* make on the people who swarm in the foul courts and alleys which surround Brick Lane and Houndsditch, or Deansgate? Whoever has taken pains to study this problem will be at no loss to answer. No perceptible impression whatever would even such preachers make on the dark neighbourhood around merely by their preaching. Such experiments have, in fact, been tried again and again, and the result is ever the same. It is only by organised effort in conjunction with the preaching, by the sustained and wisely-directed and thoroughly Christian activities of the worshipping people themselves, that any impression is ever made

in such cases. It is a sad fact that those who know and care least about church or chapel, even where the best preaching is continually heard—those who most utterly ignore the sanctuary and the service, and probably in many instances cannot tell you anything whatever about it, are those who live under its very shadow. And yet all this seemingly callous waste, is, in fact, virgin soil, which only needs adequate, sustained, and appropriate effort, to cause it to be of all fields the most ‘fruitful,’ to make it ‘rejoice and blossom’ as ‘the garden of the LORD.’

# Standard and Popular Works,

PUBLISHED AT THE

WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE.

---

## THEOLOGICAL.

---

- Arthur (W.)** The Tongue of Fire; or, the True Power of Christianity. By the Rev. W. ARTHUR, M.A. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.; Gilt edges, 1s. 4d.
- Dunn (L. R.)** The Mission of the Spirit; or, the Office and Work of the Comforter in Human Redemption. By the Rev. LEWIS R. DUNN, Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S. Edited by the Rev. JOSEPH BUSH. Crown 8vo. Price 2s.
- Edmondson (J.)** Sermons on Important Subjects; with an Introduction by the Rev. T. JACKSON. Two Vols. Crown 8vo. Price 6s.
- Fletcher (J.)** An Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense; or, a Rational Demonstration of Man's Corrupt and Lost Estate. By the Rev. JOHN FLETCHER. 12mo. Price 2s.
- Fletcher (J.)** Five Checks to Antinomianism. By the Rev. JOHN FLETCHER. 12mo. Price 4s. 6d.
- Fletcher (J.)** The Works of the Rev. John Fletcher; with his Life, by the Rev. JOSEPH BENSON. Complete in Nine Volumes. 12mo. Price £1 11s. 6d.
- Geden (J. D.)** Didsbury Sermons: Being Fifteen Discourses preached in the Wesleyan College Chapel, Didsbury. By JOHN DURY GEDEN, Tutor in Hebrew and Classics. 8vo. Price 7s.
- Gregory (B.)** The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints: Being the FERNLEY LECTURE for 1873. With Notes, and Essays on The History of Christian Fellowship, and on the Origin of 'High Church' and 'Broad Church' Theories. By the Rev. B. GREGORY. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Gregory (J. R.)** An Examination of the Doctrines of Conditional Immortality and Universalism. By the Rev. J. ROBINSON GREGORY. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

- Hannah (J.)** *Introductory Lectures on the Study of Christian Theology*: with Outlines of Lectures on the Doctrines of Christianity. By the late Rev. JOHN HANNAH, D.D.; to which is prefixed a Memoir of Dr. Hannah, by the Rev. W. B. POPE, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Horbery (M.)** *An Enquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Duration of Future Punishment*. By MATTHEW HORBERY, B.D. Reprinted from the Edition of 1744. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Jackson (T.)** *The Duties of Christianity; theoretically and practically considered*. By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Price 4s.
- Jackson (T.)** *The Institutions of Christianity, exhibited in their Scriptural Character and Practical Bearing*. By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. Crown 8vo. Price 5s.
- Jackson (T.)** *The Providence of God, viewed in the Light of Holy Scripture*. By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. New Edition with Improvements. Crown 8vo. Price 4s.
- M'Affee (D.)** *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth. Twelve Sermons on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity*. By the Rev. DANIEL M'AFEE. With a Preface, by the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Crown 8vo. With Portrait. Price 6s.
- Pope (W. B.)** *A Compendium of Theology: Biblical, Dogmatic, Historical*. By the Rev. WILLIAM B. POPE, D.D., Theological Tutor, Didsbury College. Second Edition; Revised and Enlarged, with copious General Index, Compiled by the Rev. G. A. BENNETTS, B.A. 3 Vols., 8vo. Price £1 11s. 6d.; Half Morocco, cloth sides, Price £2.
- Pope (W. B.)** *Sermons, Addresses, and Charges delivered during his year of office*. By the Rev. W. B. POPE, D.D., late President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference. 8vo. Price 8s. 6d.
- Pope (W. B.)** *The Person of Christ: Dogmatic, Scriptural, Historical. The Fernley Lecture for 1871. With two additional Essays on the Biblical and Ecclesiastical Development of the Doctrine, and Illustrative Notes*. By the Rev. W. B. POPE, D.D., Theological Tutor, Didsbury College. 8vo. Price 7s.
- Pope (W. B.)** *The Prayers of St. Paul. Being an Analysis and Exposition of the Devotional Portion of the Apostle's Writings*. By the Rev. W. B. POPE, D.D., Theological Tutor, Didsbury College. 8vo. Price 7s.
- Prest (C.)** *The Witness of the Holy Spirit*. By the Rev. CHARLES PREST. Third Edition. Crown 8vo., cloth, red edges. Price 3s.
- Randles (M.)** *For Ever! An Essay on Eternal Punishment*. By the Rev. MARSHALL RANDES. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. Price 5s.
- Robinson (E. J.)** *How to Pray and What to Pray For. An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer and Christ's Introductory Sayings*. By the Rev. EDWARD JEWITT ROBINSON. Crown 8vo. Price 5s.

- Robinson (E. J.)** *The Caravan and the Temple, and Songs of the Pilgrims.* Psalms cxx.—cxxxiv. By the Rev. E. J. ROBINSON. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Robinson (E. J.)** *The Mother of Jesus not the Papal Mary.* By the Rev. E. J. ROBINSON. Crown 8vo. Price 6s.
- Treffry (R.)** *Enquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ.* By the Rev. RICHARD TREFFRY, JUN. Crown 8vo. Price 6s.
- Unsworth (W.)** *The Aggressive Character of Christianity.* By the Rev. WILLIAM UNSWORTH. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Waddy (S. D.)** *Sermons.* By the late Rev. SAMUEL D. WADDY, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 4s.
- Watson (R.)** *Sermons and Sketches of Sermons.* By the Rev. RICHARD WATSON.  
Three Volumes, demy 8vo. Price 18s.  
Three Volumes, post 8vo. Price 10s. 6d.
- Watson (R.)** *Theological Institutes; or, a View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity.* By the Rev. RICHARD WATSON. Four Volumes, royal 18mo. Price 14s.
- Watson (R.)** *The Works of the Rev. Richard Watson.* With his Memoirs, by the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON.  
Thirteen Volumes, demy 8vo. Price £3 18s.  
Thirteen Volumes, post 8vo. Price £2 5s. 6d.
- Wesley (J.)** *Fifty-three Sermons by the Rev. John WESLEY, M.A.* Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.  
These Sermons, and Mr. Wesley's Notes on the New Testament constitute the Standard Doctrines of the Methodist Connexion.
- Wesley (J.)** *Sermons on Several Occasions.* By the Rev. JOHN WESLEY, M.A. Complete edition, containing One Hundred and Forty-one Sermons, and a Life of the Author by the Rev. JOHN BEECHAM, D.D.  
Three Vols., crown 8vo. Price 7s. 6d.  
Fine Edition, three Vols., crown 8vo. Price 10s. 6d.  
Library Edition, three Vols., demy 8vo. Price 18s.
- Wesley (J.)** *The Prose Works of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.* Edited by the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. This Edition contains all the Latest Corrections of the Author; and includes the Life of Mr. Wesley by the Rev. JOHN BEECHAM, D.D.  
Library Edition, Fourteen Volumes, demy 8vo. Price £4 4s.  
Cheap Edition, Fourteen Volumes, post 8vo. Price £2 2s.
- Wiseman (L. H.)** *Christ in the Wilderness; or, Practical Views of our Lord's Temptation.* By the Rev. LUKE H. WISEMAN, M.A. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Wood (T.)** *The Doctrines of Annihilation and Universalism viewed in the Light of Reason, Analogy, and Revelation.* By the Rev. THOMAS WOOD. Crown 8vo. Price 2s.

COMMENTARIES, DICTIONARIES, &c.,  
ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

---

- Aids to Daily Meditation:** being Practical Reflections and Observations on a Passage of Scripture for each Day in the Year. Crown 8vo., cloth. Price 3s. 6d.
- The Holy Bible:** with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical. By the Rev. JOSEPH BENSON. With Maps and a Portrait of the Author. Six Volumes, Imperial 8vo., cloth, red edges. Price £3 3s.
- A Biblical and Theological Dictionary:** Illustrative of the Old and New Testaments. By the Rev. JOHN FARRAR. With Four Maps and Ninety-six Engravings. Cloth, red edges. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- An Ecclesiastical Dictionary:** Explanatory of the History, Antiquities, Heresies, Sects, and Religious Denominations of the Christian Church. By the Rev. JOHN FARRAR. Crown 8vo. Price 5s.
- Helps to the Study of the Bible,** containing Analytical Notes, and Summaries of the several books; Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Tables; List of Animals, Birds, Reptiles, Plants, &c., found in Scripture; Tables of Weights, Measures, and Time; Words Obsolete or Ambiguous; together with a new Index to the Bible, Cruden's Concordance, a Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Foolscap 8vo. Cloth, red edges. Price 2s.
- The Proper Names of the Bible;** their Orthography, Pronunciation, and Signification. With a brief Account of the Principal Persons, and a Description of the principal Places. By the Rev. JOHN FARRAR. 18mo. Price 1s. 6d.
- A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments;** containing copious Notes, Theological, Historical, and Critical; with Improvements and Reflections. By the Rev. JOSEPH SUTCLIFFE, M.A. Imperial 8vo., cloth, marbled edges. Price 12s. 6d.
- The Synoptical Dictionary of Scripture Parallels and References;** being an Index of the Texts of Scripture Classified; forming a Methodical Summary of the Principles, Doctrines, Precepts, and Facts of Scripture. 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.
- A Biblical and Theological Dictionary:** Explanatory of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Jews, and neighbouring Nations. With an Account of the most remarkable Places mentioned in Sacred Scripture; an Exposition of the principal Doctrines of Christianity; and Notices of Jewish and Christian Sects and Heresies. By the Rev. RICHARD WATSON. Royal 8vo., cloth, red edges. Price 12s. 6d.
- An Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark,** and of some other detached parts of Scripture. By the Rev. RICHARD WATSON. Demy 8vo., Price 6s.; 12mo., Price 3s. 6d.

- The New Testament, with Explanatory Notes.** By the  
Rev. JOHN WESLEY. With the Author's last Corrections.  
Pocket Edition. 18mo. Price 2s.  
Large-Type Edition. 8vo. Price 4s.  
Library Edition, fine paper. Demy 8vo. Price 6s.
- The Prophet of Sorrow; or, the Life and Times of  
Jeremiah.** By the Rev. THORNLEY SMITH. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- The Holy Child Jesus; or, the early Life of Christ: viewed  
in connection with the History, Chronology, and Archæology of the Times.**  
By the Rev. THORNLEY SMITH. Foolscap 8vo. Price 1s. 6d.
- An Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.** By  
the Rev. HENRY W. WILLIAMS, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 6s.
- An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.** By the  
Rev. HENRY W. WILLIAMS, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 6s.
- Scripture compared with Scripture. A Plan for Daily  
Bible Reading throughout the Year.** Arranged by E. G. C. Price 4d.  
Limp cloth, gilt edges, 6d.

~~~~~

BIOGRAPHICAL.

—————

- Asbury (Francis), The Pioneer Bishop: Life and Times of.**
By W. P. STRICKLAND. Royal 32mo. Price 1s. ; Gilt edges, 1s. 4d.
- Alpine Missionary (The); or, the Life of J. L. Rostan,**
Missionary Pastor in France, Switzerland, and the Channel Isles. By the
Rev. MATTHEW LELIEVRE. Translated from the French Edition, by the
Rev. A. J. FRENCH, B.A. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Bamford (J.) The Disciple among the Poor: Memorials
of Mr. John Bamford, of Shardlow.** By his Son, the Rev. JOHN M.
BAMFORD. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. With Photographic Portrait, 3s. 6d.
- Bramwell (W.) The Christian Minister in Earnest. A
Memoir of the Rev. William Bramwell; containing Extracts from his Cor-
respondence, and a Delineation of his Personal and Ministerial Character.**
By the Rev. THOMAS HARRIS. With a Portrait. Royal 18mo., gilt edges.
Price 3s.
Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.
- Bumby (J. H.) The Life of the Rev. John H. Bumby.**
With a brief History of the Progress of the Wesleyan Mission in New
Zealand. By the Rev. ALFRED BARRETT. With a Portrait. 12mo.
Price 3s.
- Bunting (William M.), Memorials of. Being Selections
from his Sermons, Letters, and Poems.** Edited by the Rev. G. STRINGER
ROWE. With a Biographical Introduction by THOMAS PERCIVAL BUNTING.
Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.

- Carvosso (W.)** *Memoirs of William Carvosso.* Written by himself, and edited by his Son. With a Portrait. Royal 18mo. Gilt edges. Price 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.
- Clarke (A.)** *The Life of Dr. Adam Clarke.* By the Rev. Dr. ETHERIDGE. With a Portrait. Post 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s. 6d.
- Coke (T.)** *The Life of Thomas Coke.* By the Rev. Dr. ETHERIDGE. With a Portrait. Post 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s. 6d.
- Dixon (J.)** *The Life of James Dixon, D.D., Wesleyan Minister.* Written by his Son, RICHARD WATSON DIXON, M.A., Minor Canon in Carlisle Cathedral Church. With three Portraits of Dr. DIXON, and a Vignette of his Birthplace. Crown 8vo. Price 7s. 6d.
- Dixon (T.)** *The Earnest Methodist. A Memoir of the late Mr. Thomas Dixon, of Grantham.* By his Nephew, the Rev. JOSEPH DIXON. Foolscap 8vo. With Portrait. Price 2s.
- Entwisle (J.)** *Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Entwisle:* with copious Extracts from his Journals and Correspondence, and Occasional Notices of Contemporary Events in the History of Methodism. By his Son. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
- Father Reeves, the Methodist Class Leader.** By EDWARD CORDEROY. 18mo. Price 1s.
- Fletcher (J.)** *The Life of the Rev. John Fletcher.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BENSON. With a Portrait. 12mo. Price 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.
- Fletcher (Mrs.)** *The Life of Mrs. Fletcher.* By the Rev. HENRY MOORE. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.
- George (E.)** *Memoirs of Elizabeth George.* By the Rev. HENRY J. PIGGOTT, B.A. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.
- Grimshaw (W.), Incumbent of Haworth.** By the Rev. R. SPENCE HARDY. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
- Hessel (Eliza.)** *True Womanhood; or, Memorials of Miss Eliza Hessel.* By the Rev. JOSHUA PRIESTLEY. Crown 8vo. With Portrait. Price 2s. 6d. ; gilt edges, 3s.
- Hunt (J.)** *The Life of John Hunt, Missionary to the Cannibals in Fiji.* By the Rev. GEORGE STRINGER ROWE. Foolscap 8vo. With Portrait and other Illustrations. Price 2s. 6d. ; limp cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Jackson (T.)** *Lives of Early Methodist Preachers.* Chiefly written by themselves. Edited, with an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. Library Edition, Six Vols. Crown 8vo. Price 15s. Cheap Edition, Six Vols. Foolscap 8vo. Price 9s.

- Jackson (T.)** *Recollections of My Own Life and Times.*
By THOMAS JACKSON. Edited by the Rev. B. FRANKLAND, B.A. With an Introduction and Postscript by G. OSBORN, D.D. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 5s.
- M'Owan (P.)** *A Man of God; or, Providence and Grace Exemplified in a Memoir of the Rev. Peter M'Owan.* By the Rev. JOHN M'OWAN. Crown 8vo. Price 5s.
- Maxwell (Lady).** *The Life of Darcy Lady Maxwell.* By the Rev. WILLIAM ATHERTON. With Selections from her Diary and Correspondence. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Miller (W. E.)** *Life of the Rev. W. E. Miller.* By the Rev. Dr. DIXON. Foolscep 8vo. Price 2s.; limp cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Nelson (J.)** *The Journal of Mr. John Nelson.* Royal 18mo. Price 1s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 10d.
- Newton (R.)** *The Life of the Rev. Robert Newton, D.D.* By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s. 6d.
- Ouseley (Gideon.)** *The Life of Gidéon Ouseley.* By the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Seventh thousand. Crown 8vo., with Portrait. Price 3s. 6d. Tree-marbled calf, gilt edges. Price 10s. 6d.
- Powell (Walter.)** *The Thorough Business Man.* Memoir of Walter Powell, Merchant, London and Melbourne. By the Rev. B. GREGORY. Crown 8vo., with Portrait. Price 3s. 6d.
- Priestley (M. A.)** *Memorials of Mary Anne Priestley, Wife of the Rev. JOSHUA PRIESTLEY.* By her Husband. Foolscep 8vo. With Portrait. Limp cloth, Price 1s. 3d.; cloth, gilt-lettered, Price 1s. 6d.
- Richardson (C.)** *The Peasant Preacher: Memoir of Mr. Charles Richardson.* By the Rev. J. E. COULSON. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.; Gilt edges, 1s. 4d.
- Rogers (Mrs.)** *The Experience and Spiritual Letters of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers.* 18mo. Gilt edges. Price 1s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 10d.
- Rogers (Mrs.)** *The Experience, Letters, and Journal of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers.* Royal 18mo. Gilt edges. Price 3s. 6d.
- Shaw (Barnabas.)** *The Story of his Life and Labours in South Africa.* By the Rev. WILLIAM MOISTER. Crown 8vo. Portrait and Illustrations. Price 3s. 6d.
- Shaw (W.)** *Memorials of the Life and Labours of the Rev. WILLIAM SHAW, late General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in South Africa.* By his oldest surviving Friend. Crown 8vo. With Portrait. Price 6s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

- Shaw (Mrs.) Long Life and Peace: Memorials of Mrs. ELIZABETH SHAW, of St. Austell.** By the Rev. ROBERT C. BARRATT Foolscap 8vo. Price 3s.
- Shillington (T. A.) Christian Thoroughness: A Memorial Sketch of THOMAS AVERELL SHILLINGTON, J.P., of Portadown.** By the Rev. JOHN DWYER, Author of 'Christian Work for Gentle Hands,' &c. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
- Shrewsbury (J. B.) Christ Glorified in the Life, Experience, and Character of Joseph B. Shrewsbury (late Medical Student, and Wesleyan Local Preacher, of Bradford, Yorkshire).** Written by his Father. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.; Gilt edges, 1s. 4d.
- Smith (J.) Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Labours of the Rev. John Smith.** By the Rev. R. TREFFRY, Jun. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. Dr. DIXON. Royal 18mo. Gilt edges. Price 3s. Cheap Edition, without the Introductory Essay. Price 1s.
- Stoner (D.) Memoirs of the Rev. David Stoner.** By the Rev. Dr. HANNAH and Mr. WILLIAM DAWSON. With a Portrait. Royal 18mo. Gilt edges. Price 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s.
- Taylor (M. C.) Memoir of the Rev. Michael C. Taylor.** With Extracts from his Correspondence. By the Rev. B. HELLIER. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Threlfall (W.) Memorials of the Rev. W. Threlfall.** By the Rev. SAMUEL BROADBENT. 18mo. With Portrait. Price 1s. 6d.
- Toase (W.) Memorials of the Rev. William Toase.** Compiled by a Friend. With an Introduction by the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Treffry (R.) Memoirs of the Rev. R. Treffry, Jun.** With Select Remains, consisting of Sketches of Sermons, Essays, and Poetry. By his Father, the Rev. RICHARD TREFFRY. With a Portrait. 12mo. Price 4s. 6d.
- Tucker (Mrs. J.) Memoir of Mrs. Jane Tucker, wife of the Rev. Charles Tucker, some time Missionary to Haabai and Tonga.** By Mrs. G. F. WHITE. Edited by the Rev. H. W. WILLIAMS, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.
- Turner, James; or, How to Reach the Masses.** By E. M'HARDIE. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
- Vasey (T.) The Life of the Rev. Thomas Vasey.** By his Widow. Crown 8vo. With Portrait. Price 2s. 6d.
- Waddy (S. D.) The Life of the Rev. Samuel D. Waddy, D.D.** By his Youngest Daughter. Crown 8vo., with Two Portraits. Price 5s.

- Watson (R.)** *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Richard Watson.* By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. With a Portrait. Royal 18mo. Price 3s. 6d. 8vo. Price 6s.
- Wesley (C.)** *The Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley.* Comprising a Review of his Poetry; Sketches of the Rise and Progress of Methodism; with Notices of Contemporary Events and Characters. By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.
- Wesley (C.)** *The Journal of the Rev. Charles Wesley.* With Selections from his Correspondence and Poetry, and an Introduction by the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. Two Vols. Royal 18mo. Price 7s.
- Wesley (J.)** *The Life of the Rev. John Wesley.* By the Rev. RICHARD WATSON. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Royal 32mo. Price 1s. 4d.
- Wesley (J.)** *His Life and his Work.* By the Rev. M. LELIEVRE. Translated by the Rev. A. J. FRENCH. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
- Wesley (J.)** *The Living Wesley, as he was in his Youth and in his Prime.* By the Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D., Principal of the Wesleyan Training College, Westminster. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
- Wesley (J.)** *The Father of Methodism: A Life of the Rev. JOHN WESLEY, A.M.* By Mrs. COSSLETT. Second Edition, enlarged. Foolscap 8vo. Forty-five Illustrations. Price 1s. 6d.
- Wesley (J.)** *The Journals of the Rev. John Wesley.* Four Vols. Crown 8vo. Price 10s.
- West (F. A.)** *Memorials of the Rev. Francis A. West.* Being a Selection from his Sermons and Lectures. With a Biographical Sketch by one of his Sons, and Personal Recollections by the Rev. B. GREGORY. Crown 8vo. Price 4s.
- Wharton (H.)** *The Story of the Life and Missionary Labours of the Rev. Henry Wharton in the West Indies, the Gold Coast, and Ashanti.* By the Rev. W. MOISTER. Crown 8vo. With Portrait and Illustrations. Price 3s. 6d.
- Wood (J.)** *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Wood.* With Extracts from his Diary. By the Rev. H. W. WILLIAMS. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.
-
- Wesley's (Rev. John and Charles) Poetical Works: A** New and Complete Edition. Reprinted from the Originals, with the last corrections of the Authors; together with the Poems of CHARLES WESLEY not before published. Collected and Arranged by the Rev. GEORGE OSBORN, D.D. Thirteen Volumes. Crown 8vo. Half Morocco, gilt edges. Price £3 18s.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

Elliott (C.) *Delineation of Roman Catholicism, drawn from the Authentic and Acknowledged Standards of the Church of Rome; in which her peculiar Doctrines, Morals, and Usages are Stated, Treated at Large, and Confuted.* By the Rev. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D. New Edition, with a Supplement; being an Exposition of certain changes which the Papacy has undergone during the Pontificate of Pius IX. By WILLIAM HARRIS RULE, D.D. Price 12s. 6d.; Half-bound in Morocco, 17s. 6d.

The Supplement is sold separately. Price 2s. 6d.

Rule (W. H.) *History of the Inquisition, from its Establishment in the Twelfth to its Extinction in the Nineteenth Century.* By the Rev. W. H. RULE, D.D. With Illustrations. Two Vols. 8vo. Price 15s.

Rule (W. H.) *Martyrs of the Reformation: a History of Martyrdoms, Confessions, and Sufferings, from the Dawn of the Reformation to the Nineteenth Century.* By the Rev. W. H. RULE, D.D. 8vo. Price 8s.

Robinson (E. J.) *The Mother of Jesus not the Papal Mary.* By the Rev. E. J. ROBINSON. Crown 8vo. Price 6s.

Authentic Report of the Discussion held in Rome on the Evenings of February 9th and 10th, 1872, between Catholic Priests and Evangelical Ministers, concerning the Coming of St. Peter to Rome, Translated by the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Paper covers, Crown 8vo., Price 6d.; Cloth, Price 1s.

METHODISM.

Pierce (Wm.) *Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists. Comprising a Complete Compendium of their Laws and Regulations, from 1774 to 1872.* Revised by the Rev. Dr. JOBSON. Royal 8vo., Price 15s.; Half Morocco, Price 20s.

Christophers (S. W.) *Class Meetings in relation to the Design and Success of Methodism.* By the Rev. S. W. CHRISTOPHERS. Crown 8vo. Price 3s.

Rigg (J. H.) *The Connexional Economy of Wesleyan Methodism in its Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Aspects.* By JAMES H. RIGG, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.

Rigg (J. H.) *The Churchmanship of John Wesley, and the Relations of Wesleyan Methodism to the Church of England.* By JAMES H. RIGG, D.D. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

Stevens (A.) *The History of Methodism from its Origin to the Centenary Year.* By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. Three Volumes. Crown 8vo. With Portraits. Price 15s.

The Methodist Family Library of Standard Biographical and other Works, designed to promote Spiritual Life. Twenty Volumes. Royal 32mo. Price 21s.; or in Handsome Box, 28s. Gilt edges, 27s. 6d.; or in Handsome Box, 35s.

Illustrated Books for School and Home.

PRICE FIVE SHILLINGS.

The History of Methodism, from its Origin to the Centenary Year. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. Three Volumes, Crown 8vo., with Portraits. Price 5s. each.

Romance without Fiction; or, Sketches from the Portfolio of an Old Missionary. By the Rev. HENRY BLEBY, Author of the 'Death Struggles of Slavery,' &c., &c. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Illustrations.

PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS.

Zoology of the Bible. By HARLAND COULTAS. Preface by the Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D. Imperial 16mo. 126 Illustrations.

Missionary Anecdotes, Sketches, Facts, and Incidents, Relating to the state of the Heathen and the Effects of the Gospel in various parts of the World. By the Rev. WILLIAM MOISTER. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Illustrations.

Northern Lights; or, Pen and Pencil Sketches of Nineteen Modern Scottish Worthies. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Crown 8vo. Portraits and Illustrations.

PRICE THREE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

'Land of the Mountain and the Flood': Scottish Scenes and Scenery delineated. By the Rev. JABEZ MARRAT. Imperial 16mo. Map and Seventy-six Illustrations.

Wycliffe to Wesley: Heroes and Martyrs of the Church in Britain. Imperial 16mo. Twenty-four Portraits and Forty other Illustrations.

Chronicles of Capstan Cabin; or, the Children's Hour. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Imperial 16mo. Twenty-eight Illustrations.

The Life of Gideon Ouseley. By the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Seventh Thousand. Crown 8vo. With Portrait.

Missionary Stories, Narratives, Scenes, and Incidents, Illustrative of the Providence and Grace of God in Connection with the Propagation of the Gospel in Heathen Lands. By the Rev. W. MOISTER. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Illustrations.

Sunshine in the Kitchen; or, Chapters for Maid Servants. By the Rev. B. SMITH, Author of 'Climbing,' etc. Fourth Thousand. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Way-Marks: Placed by Royal Authority on the King's Highway. Being One Hundred Scripture Proverbs, Enforced and Illustrated. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Engravings.

Gems Reset; or, the Wesleyan Catechisms Illustrated by Imagery and Narrative. Crown 8vo.

Vice-Royalty; or, A Royal Domain held for the King, and enriched by the King. Crown 8vo. Twelve page Illustrations.

PRICE THREE SHILLINGS.

Glimpses of India and Mission Life. By Mrs. HUTCHEON.
Crown 8vo. Eight Page Illustrations. Cloth, gilt edges.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

- A Pledge that Redeemed Itself.** By SARSON, Author
'Blind Olive,' etc. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations. Cloth, gilt edges.
- The Story of a Peninsular Veteran: Sergeant in the 43rd**
Light Infantry during the Peninsular War. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations.
- Rays from the Sun of Righteousness.** By the Rev.
RICHARD NEWTON, D.D. Crown 8vo. Eleven page Illustrations. Cloth extra. Gilt edges.
- In the Tropics; or, Scenes and Incidents of West Indian**
Life. By the Rev. JABEZ MARRAT. Crown 8vo., with Illustrations, &c.
- Climbing: A Manual for the Young who Desire to Rise in**
Both Worlds. By the Rev. BENJAMIN SMITH. Crown 8vo. Sixth Edition.
Revised and Enlarged.
- Our Visit to Rome, with Notes by the Way.** By the Rev.
JOHN RHODES. Royal 16mo. Forty-five Illustrations.
- Gems of Piety in Humble Life.** By the Rev. T. H. WALKER.
Royal 18mo. Eight Page Illustrations.

MARK GUY PEARSE'S WORKS.

Six Volumes, Crown 8vo., Cloth, Gilt Edges. Price 2s. 6d. each.

- 1.—**Daniel Quorm, and his Religious Notions.** FIRST SERIES. Forty-ninth Thousand.
- 2.—**Daniel Quorm, and his Religious Notions.** SECOND SERIES. Eighth Thousand.
- 3.—**Sermons for Children.** Thirteenth Thousand.
- 4.—**Mister Horn and His Friends; or, Givers and Giving.** Fifteenth Thousand.
- 5.—**Short Stories: and other Papers.** Third Thousand.
- 6.—**'Good Will': a Collection of Christmas Stories.** Fourth Thousand.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Homes and Home Life in
Bible Lands. By J. R. S. CLIFFORD.
Foolscap 8vo. Eighty Illustrations.</p> <p>Hidden Treasures, and the
Search for Them: being Lectures to
Bible Classes. By the Rev. JOHN
HARTLEY. Foolscap 8vo. With
Frontispiece.</p> <p>The Great Apostle; or,
Pictures from the Life of St. Paul.
By Rev. JABEZ MARRAT. Foolscap
8vo. Twenty-eight Illustrations
and Map.</p> <p>Martin Luther, the Prophet
of Germany. By the Rev. J. SHAW
BANKS. Foolscap 8vo. Thirteen
Illustrations.</p> | <p>Eminent Christian Phil-
anthropists. Brief Biographical
Sketches, designed especially as
Studies for the Young. By the
Rev. GEORGE MAUNDER. Fcap.
8vo. Nine Illustrations.</p> <p>The Tower, the Temple, and
the Minster: Historical and Bio-
graphical Associations of the Tower
of London, St. Paul's Cathedral,
and Westminster Abbey. By the
Rev. J. W. THOMAS. Foolscap 8vo.
Illustrations.</p> <p>Youthful Obligations. Illus-
trated by a large number of Appro-
priate Facts and Anecdotes. Fcap.
8vo. With Illustrations.</p> |
|---|--|

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS—*continued.*

Peter Pengelly; or, 'True as the Clock.' By J. JACKSON WRAY. Crown 8vo. Forty Illustrations.

The Stolen Children: A Narrative compiled from Authentic Sources, by the Rev. HENRY BLEBY, Author of 'Death Struggles of Slavery.' Foolscap 8vo., gilt edges, with Illustrations.

My Coloured Schoolmaster, and other Stories. By the Rev. HENRY BLEBY. Foolscap 8vo. Five Illustrations.

Female Heroism and Tales of the Western World. By the Rev. HENRY BLEBY. Foolscap 8vo. Four Illustrations.

Capture of the Pirates: with other Stories of the Western Seas. By the Rev. HENRY BLEBY. Fcap. 8vo. Four Illustrations.

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE.

'Little Ray' Series. Royal 16mo.

Little Ray and Her Friends. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Five Page Illustrations.

The Royal Road to Riches. By E. H. MILLER. Fifteen Illustrations.

The Breakfast Half-Hour. Addresses on Religious and Moral Topics. By the Rev. H. R. BURTON. Twenty-five Illustrations.

Gleanings in Natural History for Young People. Profusely Illustrated.

Broken Purposes; or, the Good Time Coming. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Five page Illustrations.

The History of the Tea-Cup; with a Descriptive Account of the Potter's Art. By the Rev. G. R. WEDGWOOD. Profusely Illustrated.

The Cliftons, and their Play-Hours. By Mrs. COSSLETT. Seven Page Illustrations.

Ned's Motto; or, Little by Little. By the author of 'Faithful and True,' 'Tony Starr's Legacy.' Six Page Illustrations.

The Bears' Den. By E. H. MILLER. Six Page Illustrations.

A Year at Riverside Farm. By E. H. MILLER. Royal 16mo. Six Page Illustrations.

The Lilyvale Club and its Doings. By EDWIN A. JOHNSON, D.D. Royal 16mo. Seven Page Illustrations.

'Wee Donald' Series.

An Old Sailor's Yarn: and other Sketches from Daily Life.

The Stony Road: A Tale of Humble Life.

Stories for Willing Ears. For Boys. By T. S. E.

Stories for Willing Ears. For Girls. By T. S. E.

Thirty Thousand Pounds: and other Sketches from Daily Life.

'Wee Donald': Sequel to 'Stony Road.'

Foolscap 8vo. Series.

Three Indian Heroes: the Missionary; the Soldier; the Statesman. By the Rev. J. SHAW BANKS. Second Edition. Numerous Illustrations.

David Livingstone, Missionary and Discoverer. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Fifteen Page Illustrations.

Columbus; or, The Discovery of America. By GEORGE CUBITT. Seventeen Illustrations.

Cortes; or, The Discovery and Conquest of Mexico. By GEORGE CUBITT. Nine Illustrations.

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE. *Foolscap 8vo. Series.*

- Pizarro ; or, The Discovery and Conquest of Peru.** By GEORGE CUBITT. Nine Illustrations.
- Granada ; or, The Expulsion of the Moors from Spain.** By GEORGE CUBITT. Seven Illustrations.
- James Montgomery, Christian Poet and Philanthropist.** By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Eleven Illustrations.
- The Father of Methodism.** A Sketch of the Life and Labours of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M. For Young People. By Mrs. COSSLETT. Second Edition, enlarged. Forty-five Illustrations.
- Old Truths in New Lights.** Illustrations of Scripture Truth for the Young. By W. H. S. Numerous Illustrations.
- Chequer Alley : A Story of Successful Christian Work.** By the Rev. FREDERICK W. BRIGGS, M.A. Eleventh Edition.
- The Englishman's Bible : How he Got it, and Why he Keeps it.** By Rev. JAMES BOYES. With Thirteen Illustrations.
- Homes : and the Way to Make Home Happy.** By the Rev. DAVID HAY. Foolscap 8vo. With Frontispiece.
- Helen Leslie ; or, Truth and Error.** By ADELINE. Foolscap 8vo. With Frontispiece.

PRICE ONE SHILLING AND FOURPENCE.

- The Boatman's Daughter.** A Narrative for the Learned and the Unlearned. By the Rev. ALFRED BARRETT. 18mo. With Frontispiece.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

Royal 16mo. Cloth, gilt lettered.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Ancient Egypt : Its Monuments, Worship, and People. By the Rev. EDWARD LIGHTWOOD. Twenty-six Illustrations.</p> <p>Vignettes from English History. By the Rev. JAMES YEAMES. First Series. From the Norman Conqueror to Henry IV. Twenty-three Illustrations.</p> <p>Lessons from Noble Lives, and other Stories. Thirty-one Illustrations.</p> <p>Margery's Christmas Box. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Seven Illustrations.</p> <p>Stories of Love and Duty. For Boys and Girls. Thirty-one Illustrations.</p> <p>No Gains without Pains : A True Life for the Boys. By H. C. KNIGHT. Six Illustrations.</p> | <p>Peeps into the Far North : Chapters on Iceland, Lapland, and Greenland. By S. E. SCHOLES. Twenty-four Illustrations.</p> <p>The Railway Pioneers ; or, The Story of the Stephensons, Father and Son. By H. C. KNIGHT. Fifteen Illustrations.</p> <p>The Royal Disciple : Louisa, Queen of Prussia. By C. R. HURST. Six Illustrations.</p> <p>Tiny Tim : A Story of London Life. Founded on Fact. By FRANCIS HORNER. Twenty-two Illustrations.</p> <p>John Tregonoweth ; His Mark. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Twenty-five Illustrations.</p> <p>'I'll Try' ; or, How the Farmer's Son became a Captain. Ten Illustrations.</p> |
|---|---|

PRICE ONE SHILLING—*continued.*

The Giants, and How to Fight Them. By Dr. RICHARD NEWTON. Fifteen Illustrations.

The Meadow Daisy. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Numerous Illustrations.

Robert Dawson ; or, The Brave Spirit. Four Page Illustrations.

The Tarnside Evangel. By M. A. H. Eight Illustrations.

Rob Rat ; A Story of Barge Life. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Numerous Illustrations.

The Unwelcome Baby, and what Became of Him ; with other Stories of noble Lives Early Consecrated. By S. ELLEN GREGORY. Nine Illustrations.

Jane Hudson, the American Girl. Four Page Illustrations.

The Babes in the Basket ; or, Daph and her Charge. Four Page Illustrations.

Insect Lights and Sounds. By J. R. S. CLIFFORD, author of 'Animals of the Bible,' etc., etc. Profusely Illustrated.

William the Silent, Prince of Orange. A Biographical Sketch. By the Rev. J. W. THOMAS. Foolscap 8vo. With Portrait.

Life on the Waves ; or, Memorials of Captain George LEONARD. By the Rev. A. LANGLEY. With Illustrations. 18mo.

PRICE NINEPENCE.

Imperial 32mo. Cloth, Illuminated.

1. **The Wonderful Lamp ; and other Stories.** By RUTH ELLIOTT, Five Illustrations.
2. **Dick's Troubles ; and How He Met Them.** By RUTH ELLIOTT. Six Illustrations.
3. **The Chat in the Meadow ; and other Stories.** By LILLIE MONTFORT. Six Illustrations.
4. **John's Teachers ; and other Stories.** By LILLIE MONTFORT. Six Illustrations.
5. **Nora Grayson's Dream ; and other Stories.** By LILLIE MONTFORT. Seven Illustrations.
6. **Rosa's Christmas Invitations ; and other Stories.** By LILLIE MONTFORT. Six Illustrations.
7. **Ragged Jim's Last Song ; and other Ballads.** By EDWARD BAILEY. Eight Illustrations.
8. **Pictures from Memory.** By ADELINE. Nine Illustrations.
9. **The Story of the Wreck of the 'Maria' Mail Boat ; with a Memoir of Mrs. Hincksman, the only Survivor.** Illustrated.
10. **Passages from the Life of Heinrich Stilling.** Five Page Illustrations.
11. **Little and Wise : The Ants, The Conies, The Locusts, and The Spiders.** By the Rev. W. W. NEWTON. Twelve Illustrations.
12. **Spoiling the Vines, and Fortune Telling.** By the Rev. W. W. NEWTON. Eight Illustrations.
13. **The Kingly Breaker, Concerning Play, and Sowing the Seed.** By the Rev. W. W. NEWTON. Six Illustrations.
14. **The Fatherly Guide, Rhoda, and Fire in the Soul.** By the Rev. W. W. NEWTON. Twelve Illustrations.
15. **Short Sermons for Little People.** By the Rev. T. CHAMPNESS. Twenty Illustrations.
16. **Sketches from my Schoolroom.** By the Daughter of a Wesleyan Minister. Four Illustrations.
17. **Mary Ashton ; a True Story of Eighty Years Ago.** By the author of 'The Lancasters and their Friends.' Four Illustrations.

The above are sold in Limp Cloth at EIGHTPENCE.

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

The whole of the Seventeen Ninepenny books (*see page 15*) are sold in Limp Cloth at Eightpence each.

- Precious Seed, and Little Sowers. 18mo. Four Illustrations. Gilt edges.
- Janie: A Flower from South Africa. By Rev. R. LAMPLOUGH. 18mo. With Portrait.
- Freddie Cleminson: The Brief Story of a Blessed Life. By the Rev. T. M'CULLAGH. 18mo. With Portrait, etc.
- Soon and Safe: A Word to the Young Folks. By Rev. SIMPSON CRUMP. 18mo. Illustrations.
- Christianity Compared with Popery: A Lecture.
- Death of the Eldest Son. By CÆSAR MALAN.
- Emily's Lessons; or, Chapters in the Life of a Young Christian.
- Fragments for Young People.
- History of Joseph. By AGNES BULMER.
- Jonathan Saville's Life. By the Rev. F. A. WEST.
- The Sunday Scholar's Guide. By the Rev. J. T. BARR.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

Cloth, Illuminated, and Coloured Frontispiece.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. A Kiss for a Blow: Stories about Peace and War.</p> <p>2. Louis Henric; or, The Sister's Promise.</p> <p>3. The Giants, and How to Fight Them. By Dr. RICHARD NEWTON.</p> <p>4. Robert Dawson; or, the Brave Spirit.</p> <p>5. Jane Hudson, the American Girl.</p> <p>6. The Jewish Twins. By AUNT FRIENDLY.</p> <p>7. The Book of Beasts. Thirty-five Illustrations.</p> <p>8. The Book of Birds. Forty Illustrations.</p> <p>9. Proud in Spirit.</p> <p>10. Althea Norton.</p> <p>11. Gertrude's Bible Lesson.</p> <p>12. The Rose in the Desert.</p> | <p>13. The Little Black Hen.</p> <p>14. Martha's Hymn.</p> <p>15. Nettie Mathieson.</p> <p>16. The Prince in Disguise.</p> <p>17. The Children on the Plains.</p> <p>18. The Babes in the Basket.</p> <p>19. Richard Harvey; or, Taking a Stand.</p> <p>20. Kitty King: Lessons for Little Girls.</p> <p>21. Nettie's Mission.</p> <p>22. Little Margery.</p> <p>23. Margery's City Home.</p> <p>24. The Crossing Sweeper.</p> <p>25. Rosy Conroy's Lessons.</p> <p>26. Ned Dolan's Garret.</p> <p>27. Little Henry and his Bearer.</p> <p>28. Little Woodman and his Dog Cæsar.</p> <p>29. Johnny: Lessons for Little Boys.</p> |
|---|--|

The above are sold in Ornamental Stiff Covers at FOURPENCE each.

- Hattie and Nancy; or, The Everlasting Love. With Illustrations. 18mo. Cloth, gilt-lettered, 6d. (A BOOK FOR GIRLS.)
- Michael Faraday. By W. R. BURGESS. With Portrait and Illustrations. 18mo. Cloth, gilt-lettered, 6d. (A BOOK FOR BOYS.)

