





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





# Index

- (1) Pastoral Letter (Bennett)
  - (2) Letter to Abp. of Cant. by (Keigrot)
  - (3) Real danger of the Church (Gresley)
  - (4) Second statement of Abp. (Gresley)
  - (5) Third statement of Abp. (Gresley)
  - (6) Three Reformatations (Hook)
  - (7) Protestant Sisters of Mercy: Report.
  - (8) Letter to Abp. of Canterbury on  
"Shore" case (Bp. of Exeter)
  - (9) Correspondence between Duke of Argyll  
& Bp. of Glasgow.
  - (10) Letter to Dean of Salisbury (Sidney, Herbert)
  - (11) Presbyterian Rights.
  - (12) Reformers v. Macaulay's History (Harrington)
  - (13) Speech on Marriage Bill (Wood)
-



A  
PASTORAL LETTER

TO

HIS PARISHIONERS. 

BY

THE REV. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A.

Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.



LONDON:

W. J. CLEAVER, BAKER STREET,

PORTMAN SQUARE.

MDCCCXLVI.

## SUBJECTS OF THE LETTER.

	PAGE
1. THE SPECIAL SERVICES OF THE CHURCH . . . .	1
2. THE INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIETIES OF THE PARISH . .	8
3. THE DIVISION OF THE THREE MORNING SERVICES AS NOW JOINED TOGETHER . . . . .	9
4. THE BUILDING AND ENDOWING OF A NEW CHURCH, SCHOOLS, AND PARSONAGE . . . . .	15



## A PASTORAL LETTER.

---

MY DEAR BRETHREN AND PARISHIONERS,

THREE years have now passed, since, by the Providence of God, we were first brought together in the Pastoral relationship of our beloved Church. This lapse of time is, I hope, sufficient to justify me in thus formally addressing you in a pastoral letter. Many circumstances combine just at this present juncture to render it advisable that I should do so, and I hope that you will peruse, at your leisure, what is here said, in the same spirit as it is written, solely for our common blessing, and the glory of God.

First, I wish to represent to you the position in which we stand at present, and then, what further objects we have in view in the advancement of Christ's kingdom in this parish.

By degrees, and under successive Acts of Parliament, the Church and District of St. Paul's has been invested with a complete parochial character in things ecclesiastical, the Minister thereof having become a Perpetual Curate and Body Corporate, and invested with sole cure of souls over those committed to his charge. The District is completely cut off, as far as the things of Religion are concerned, from all connection with St. George's, Hanover Square, and also from St. Peter's, Pimlico, and forms a Benefice distinct in itself. Churchwardens are appointed for the administration of the temporal affairs of the Church, and for the execution of all things necessary for the order and management of Divine Service. All the rites and ceremonies of the Church (with the exception of funerals) are now performed at St. Paul's, according to the usual laws and customs of parishes, and all persons living within the boundaries, desiring Holy Baptism, Churching of Women, Marriage, Visitation of the Sick, and other holy ministrations of the Church, are bound to apply to the Clergy of this District, and to no other. I mention this, because many persons are under an erroneous impression that they may legally apply to other Churches for these rites, according to their own discretion. It is obvious, by the Law, they cannot; but according to the usual custom of parishes, they are bound to apply to their proper District Church, which stands to them in the same light as though it had been the ancient Parish Church. On the one hand, I myself scrupulously abstain from performing any of the offices of the Church (except with the permission of their own Parish Priest) for any not strictly parishioners of St. Paul's; and I may justly claim it as due to the Church and Parochial system in general, that parishioners of St. Paul's, when the Law both of the Church and of the Land has so ordered it, should strictly attend to the boundaries marked out for them. Of course it would be most difficult as well as unkind to enforce this against any individual or individuals; but I point it out as a thing in general desirable, for the attainment of a higher order of parochial connection, and a closer tie of pastoral duty, between the Parish Priest and those for whom he ministers.

Now for the purpose of a due understanding of the manner in which the holy rites of the Church are administered at St. Paul's, I subjoin the following rules, which will be found upon examination in strict accordance with the Book of Common Prayer:—

### Holy Baptism.

1. NOTICE. Notice should be given *to the Curate* at the Church not later than at the Evening Prayer the day preceding, or at Morning Prayer on the day of the intended Baptism.

2. TIME. The time appointed is at EVENING PRAYER. It may be on any day of the week, but more properly on Sundays or Holy Days.

The time of Evening } On Week days.. is 5 o'clock.  
Prayer } On Sundays . . . is 3 o'clock.

Holy Baptism is invariably administered *after the second Lesson* in the presence of the congregation, such being the express command of the Church.

3. SPONSORS. Two God-Fathers and one God-Mother are required for a male child. —Two God-Mothers and one God-Father for a female child. According to the laws of the Church, the Sponsors should be communicants, and no parent ought to stand as Sponsor to his own child.

4. DUTY OF SPONSORS. It is a mistake to think that the Sponsors are answerable for the sins of the child. All that the Sponsors have to do, is to answer the Baptismal pledge—“*in the name of the child;*” and afterwards, (as much as in them lies,) to see that the child be brought up in the christian faith.

5. REGISTRATION. It is a wicked thing to deprive little children of their admission into Christ's Church, on the plea that their names have been registered in a book. Registration is nothing more than a plan of the State to ascertain the number of children that are born, and has nothing whatever to do with the Church. Baptism must be by a lawful minister, with water, in the name of the Holy Trinity. After the Baptism, the child's name is registered in the Books of the Church (*without any payment.*)

6. FEES. It is a great abuse of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism to demand a Fee for its celebration. THERE IS NO FEE. The Parishioners of St. Paul's are particularly requested to notice, (and let it carefully be remembered, in order that there may not be any hinderance in bringing little Children unto Christ,) that no person in this Church is authorized *to demand any Fee whatsoever, from any person whatsoever, for Holy Baptism.* It is a Service of the Church, “without money and without price.”

### Churching of Women.

1. TIME. The time appointed is immediately before the commencement of Divine Service, *in the presence of the congregation*, according to the words of the Psalm which is used in the Churching: “I will pay my vows now in the presence of all his people.”

On Sundays, 3 o'clock, or  $\frac{1}{2}$ -past 6 o'clock—Evening Prayer.

On Wednesdays and Fridays, 11 o'clock—Litany.

On all Week days, 5 o'clock—Evening Prayer.

As the Churching is *before the Service*, it is important to be in the Church in good time. After the Churching the woman should take her place in the congregation, for the usual prayers.



2. OFFERING. There is no Fee for Churching of women; but by the Rubric, at the end of the Service, (See the Prayer Book,) the woman is to "offer accustomed offerings." From the poor the smallest gift (even a penny) as a thank-offering to GOD. Above the class of poor, every woman should offer according to her ability.
3. MANNER OF THE OFFERING. The Offering is not a charge or fee, but a voluntary token of thanksgiving to God. Therefore the place for making it is at the Altar. The Priest will receive the Offering in the Offertory Basin directly the Churching is over, and will place it on the Altar, as unto the Lord.
4. HOLY COMMUNION. The woman who has been churched, should receive the Holy Communion at the first opportunity after her Churching.

## Marriage.

1. BANNES. If both persons live within the boundaries of St. Paul's, then the Banns are to be published in St. Paul's Church *only*; but if one of the persons lives in another Parish, then the Banns must be published in that Parish *also*; and if it is desired to solemnize the Marriage in St. Paul's, a certificate must be brought from the other Parish, stating that the Banns have been so published. All persons living within the boundaries of St. Paul's must have their Banns published in St. Paul's Church. It would be contrary to law to resort to any other Church.
2. LICENSE. If a License from Doctors' Commons be substituted for the Banns, then the License must be brought to the Church at the time of solemnizing the Marriage.
3. NOTICE. Notice of *publishing Banns* may be given to the Clerk, or to the Curate, at any of the hours of Prayer; namely, 8 o'clock morning, or 5 o'clock evening, any day, or 11 o'clock morning on Wednesday or Friday. Notice may also be given at the Clerk's residence, 39, Wilton Crescent. Notice of *Marriage* may be given in the same way, at least one day preceding.
4. TIME. The time most convenient for solemnizing Marriage is 10 o'clock; but Marriages may be solemnized at any hour between 8 o'clock morning, and 12 o'clock at noon.
5. THE FEES OR DUTY. The customary Fees or Duty in this Parish are as follow:—  
     For the publishing of the Banns. . . . . Two Shillings.  
     For a Marriage by Banns . . . . . Ten Shillings.  
     For a Marriage by License . . . . . Thirteen Shillings.
6. TIME OF PAYING THE FEES OR DUTY. It is desired (if possible) that the Fees or Duty should be brought into the Church, duly prepared, and laid upon the Priest's Book at the time of the Marriage, together with the Ring. Such is the direction of the Prayer Book, and if not inconvenient, it would be well to adhere to the Direction. See the Marriage Service:—  
     "*The man shall give unto the woman a Ring, laying the same upon the Book, with the accustomed Duty to the Priest and Clerk.*"
7. FORM OF THE SERVICE. The Service must be considered in two portions. The first portion is performed in the "*Body of the Church*," as far as the first Blessing.—(See the Rubric.) The remainder is performed at the ALTAR, terminating with the Exhortation. If it is desired, the Choristers will attend and chant the Psalm with the Organ.
8. HOLY COMMUNION. It is convenient that the new married persons, with their friends, should receive the Holy Communion at the time of their Marriage. If this should be desired, due notice must be given over-night, and

the Altar will be prepared for the celebration of Holy Communion. This, if well considered, is highly appropriate, as an act of solemn thanksgiving and joy, tending to bring the blessings of God upon Marriage by the highest channel of His Grace.—(See the *Prayer Book*.)

I am aware, from the general violation of the rules of the Prayer Book which has prevailed and still prevails throughout London, that the Laity have not generally been accustomed to think so strictly of these matters, as I have myself been bound to do; and I am also aware that in consequence of this, many have sought other Churches for the baptism of their children, and churchings, and marriages—Churches wherein they have found the Clergy more willing to accommodate their former habits, and less scrupulous in violating the rules of the Church. Now I would beseech such to consider whether they do rightly—whether, if things are really appointed according to their Prayer Book, they ought not as a principle to submit themselves to those set over them in the Lord. If things are *not* according to the Prayer Book, then there is the Bishop to whom they can immediately apply, and the Parish Priest who orders things wrongly will stand corrected; but if there are any Laws in the Church, and Laws have any meaning, (and the Priest faithfully *obeys* them) what must become of the churchmanship of parishioners who *disobey* them? Will they not come, strictly speaking, under the name of Dissenters, or at least Non-Conformists? I fear they must. I trust, my Brethren, that you will argue these questions honestly with yourselves, and putting aside all considerations of your own likings and prejudices, henceforward join with me (though it may be irksome at first) in standing faithfully and manfully by the Laws, Canons, and Rubrics of the Church, of which you are professing members.

The last century has shewn what has been the result of violating and forsaking the Laws of the Church, namely—Dissent and Schism, social disunion, moral profligacy, open rebellion, hatred of the Church, and contempt for her rulers, and altogether a general ignorance of God. Has the Church *thriven* on neglect of her rules? Has she *overcome* Dissent, by accommodating herself to it? If not, why should we not try the opposite system, and hope, that by a stricter obedience to her behests, God's blessing may ultimately await us, and we may prevail, by consistency, over our gainsayers? Our immediate ancestors have tried one plan, and have signally failed. They cast aside the Church's discipline, threw all Religion into internal spiritual fervors, and spurned at order and ordinances. What were the fruits? The fruits were Wesleyanism, and Schisms innumerable, in such as had any religion at all; and infidelity and grossness of life unrebuked, untaught, and uncared for, in those who had none; a careless and worldly Clergy; a godless and rationalizing laity. Now is it unreasonable to try the other plan—to try what simple obedience can do? There is a grace about obedience, which must be acceptable before God in Christ, and the rather as it demands any sacrifice of our own will. Let us return to the ways and times of our forefathers—those golden times, when men loved the Church Catholic, though they repudiated Popery, and contended against Puritanism, though they loved the word of God. I speak now to my Brethren of the higher orders—to the nobility and gentry who live in this

Parish. I do honestly express to them my opinion, that they have it in their power, and *they only*, as a class, to bring back life and spirit to our Church, and I entreat of them to exert that power. Unless they *do exert* that power, the inroads of the enemy will surely prevail, and we shall be lost. I do, without any subterfuge, openly say, looking on the gross negligence of a great portion of their body, that danger presses round us—Latitudinarianism on one side, Popery on the other: the Church of England stands in the mean, and she appeals to the richer and nobler of her children now to put out their hands and sustain her. How sustain her? By conforming to her ancient rules and customs. By *obeying* her. By looking upon her as a *Church*—as one having *authority*. By displaying to the world that they do think she is the *truth*. By getting rid of that strange nonchalance, and carelessness, and lounging sort of Religion, which so many of them have, esteeming it apparently a thing of the drawing room, or of the day's fashion, instead of a thing of life or death, which is to last for ever. Religion is surely something all-paramount—of momentous consequence; or it is a fable. Men ought not to profess her, unless they *mean* something. If they do mean something, let them *shew* that they mean it. Better the “violent who take the Kingdom of Heaven by storm,” than the “Gallios who care about none of these things.” It is the apathy of the higher orders that most injures us. Their unwillingness to move—their slumber—their tardiness to think—their reluctance to open their eyes, and see before them. They (be it spoken without offence) as a class, being merely *nominal churchmen*, have made the many *positive Dissenters*. They being *virtually* disobedient, have caused the poor to be disobedient *really*. The few of the people that are sincerely religious—that have *hearts*—that believe in a Church as something alive, look on in astonishment. They fly discomfited, when they see such treatment of her by her great ones. She seems to them, and not unnaturally, without strength—a mere skeleton, without spirit, or flesh, or blood. What then do they? They seek shelter in Rome, or hide themselves in Dissent.

Just let me instance what I mean by a case in point. The nobility and gentry are unwilling to obey the rule of the Church, as I have set it forth above, in bringing their infants to the House of God, to be baptized, in the presence of the congregation, after the second Lesson. They would rather have Baptism performed in their drawing room, or at least, if in Church at all, at a private hour. I have just now read, in the *Morning Post*, as follows:—

#### CHRISTENING OF \_\_\_\_\_.

This interesting ceremony was performed at \_\_\_\_\_, in the presence of a select circle, consisting of \_\_\_\_\_. After the ceremony, a superb dejeuner was given at the family mansion in \_\_\_\_\_.

Now compare this with what the Church desires. The Church calls Baptism a Sacrament—the Sacrament of Regeneration, not an “*interesting ceremony*.” The Church calls the “select circle,” in the presence of whom it ought to be performed, “*the Congregation*”—the congregation of the faithful—noble and simple alike, poor and rich together; not a “*select circle*.” What! shall there be an exclusiveness or “*selection*” of the great only, to be present at the Baptism of a child of a Christian parent? Shall there be a display of empty pride at the very moment when the devil and his

works are to be renounced? Observe, my Brethren, whither this tends. The poor man argues thus:—Why, if there is a “select circle” made by Lord A., or Mr. B., for the Christening of his child, why may not I have a “select circle” at the Meeting House? If *he* violates the rule of the Church, and is ashamed or afraid of his brethren *in the Church, according to the Church’s Law*: why am I to be pronounced wrong, if I do the same. Now, would it not be well for the rich and great to remember that not one of their actions is unnoticed by the poor, not one of their habits, not one of their words, particularly in Religion. Their example, their teaching, their obedience or disobedience, is the turning point of the Church’s safety at this present juncture. May God of His infinite mercy put it into their hearts to be wise in time, and the Pastors and Rulers to be faithful, making no distinction of persons in the Church’s ceremonies and sacraments; but to be as the great Head of the Church Himself was, the same to all men, suffering the disapprobation and the hatred of the world, if so be only they can win men once more to be obedient sons and daughters.

I now pass on to speak of the Societies and Institutions established in our Parish, and of the needs we still have for the completion of the ornamental work of our Church; and the latter first. The East Window is still unfurnished with painted glass. The *Rere Dos*, or stone work at the Altar, is still incomplete; and the Church Clock, though erected, is still unpaid for. But all this must at present be passed by—we must do what we can for another year or two, just merely paying for what is unavoidable by our usual annual collection at Whitsuntide. I say we must pass it by this year as for things only ornamental, and throw our main strength in Alms-giving into the scheme which I shall set before you, in the latter part of this letter, for things vitally necessary.—(See p. 15.) All we shall attempt this year for our own Church of St. Paul’s, is the payment of the Church clock, and the erection of proper gates and railings, and a path-way at the West door. The latter will be a work of necessity, as the approach to the Church, unless repaired, will by next winter be little better than mud.

But I must speak of our

### SCHOOLS.

We have four different Schools.—Three at the Knightsbridge end of the District, and one at the Queen Street end. The three at Knightsbridge are, I.—Boys. II.—Girls. III.—Infants. The one at the Queen Street end is for Infants only; but this it is hoped will very shortly be enlarged by the scheme for building a New School House, to which I will advert in a subsequent part of this letter.—(See p. 15.) All further information about the Schools will be seen by referring to the Annual Report.

### SOCIETIES.

In this, I shall first advert to the Institution of “SISTERS OF CHARITY.” These are Christian women who live together under certain rules, and whose office it is under the Clergy to visit and nurse the sick; to instruct the poor, to bring children to the font, to help the aged and infirm; and, in short, to

perform all the good works of our Christian calling, the fruits of "CHARITY." For the extension and permanent prosperity of this institution we have need of your countenance and alms-giving; and any pious women of a deep and devotional character who would personally join this institution, dedicating themselves to the service of God and the Church, I should be thankful to receive, and should be happy to communicate to them the Rules under which they live. If there be any such, I would anxiously call upon them for their co-operation in the good works of Christianity, as a source of strengthening the Church, according to their power, more valuable than any other of its kind. Let them not be afraid of the name. "Charity" is not a word that any Christian need fear. The rules are simple, the office humble, but the happiness of doing good is beyond price. Gladly should I receive more of such "Sisters" to join in this holy work with their brethren the Clergy.

II.—Secondly, I would advert to the "PROVIDENT SOCIETY." This is a Society in which Weekly Savings are received from the poor and labouring classes, and being invested in the Savings' Bank, are returned in winter with interest of threepence for every shilling saved. The value is returned thus increased, in clothing, coals, and other necessaries of life, according to the choice of the Member. By this plan, habits of industry, forethought, and frugality, are encouraged among the poor, and the pauperism of the Workhouse avoided.

III.—Thirdly, I would advert to the "LENDING LIBRARY." This is a small Library of useful and instructive books, as well religious, as others, such as Books of Travels, History, and the like. The poor and servants, the children of the Schools and their parents, are thus provided with a supply of useful reading. It is obvious that if we teach the poor to read, and then having taught them, furnish them with nothing good upon which they may exercise the knowledge they have gained, they will then fly to the pestilential and infidel publications with which unhappily this metropolis abounds. I entreat of you then my richer brethren, that you will aid this Library, either by gifts of books which you can spare from your own libraries, or may purchase; or that you will make some little donations in money to be so laid out. We have need of at least Fifty Pounds' worth of books, for a proper supply according to the demand, in addition to those which we have already purchased. The avidity with which the books are sought for is most gratifying.

Such is all that I have need to say of the past and present. I now pass on to plans for the future. And first—

#### AN EARLIER HOUR FOR MORNING PRAYER.

All well know, from frequent observations in the Pulpit, that I have very much at heart a further improvement in the manner of performing Divine Service on Sundays. That is, the commencing of our Morning Prayer at an earlier hour, and allowing an interval to elapse before we commence the Service of Holy Communion. This is already done, on all Week Days, and on all the Fasts and Festivals of the Church, and the value of the division of the Service on these days is so great, and so readily

acknowledged, that I am not without hope, but that in time, we shall all readily embrace the same method on the Lord's Day also. The labor, anxiety, and mental pressure, both upon the Clergy as well as upon the Laity, at least such of them as are Communicants, is overwhelming, occupied as we are with an average of 120 Communicants every Lord's Day. We now begin the Service at Eleven, and seldom conclude before half-past Two. At half-past Two the Congregation come in for the Evening Service, women for Churching, and children for Baptism; so that we are occupied with very little intermission, from Eleven o'clock, A.M., to Five, P.M., that is, six hours; and that, remember, with the most solemn offices to perform, requiring the utmost stretch of the mind, in the presence of a congregation of seldom less than 1700 persons in the Morning, and perhaps 1200 in the Evening; and withal the *second* Evening Service following closely after, at half-past Six, P.M.

Now I do not grudge this labor—God forbid. I rejoice in it. Only I fear lest, as we are but as yet bodily creatures, the earthly part of us, the body and the mind will eventually give way, and we shall sink under it. I fear also, that although we have already weekly communion, still many may be deterred from the Holy Sacrament, particularly invalids, and the aged, and many women, and above all the poor, from the great length of time now occupied, and so there be a hindrance in the divine work to many souls. Now let us fairly consider this question on its real merits. I will first dispose of certain objections that are made.

#### OBJECTIONS.

I.—I do not like the idea of commencing Morning Prayer on Sundays at an earlier hour, because my business and trade compels me to sit up late on Saturday night, and I cannot wind up my accounts and complete my week's business till Sunday morning. I then require more rest in bed on Sunday morning than on any other, and could not well be at Church before Eleven o'clock. As it is, I am frequently late, owing to business on Sunday morning which is unavoidable; and indeed, many of the Shops are open and business going on till perhaps Ten o'clock—or later.

II.—I do not like the idea of commencing Morning Prayer on Sundays at an earlier hour, because I am in the habit of joining in great dinner parties, and sometimes going to the theatre, and the opera, which places of amusement very frequently do not close till one or two o'clock on the Sunday morning. It would, therefore, be very inconvenient to think of an earlier hour. As it is, I am frequently unable, and so are my servants, to go to Church even at eleven, and then I am tired and languid, and anything but fit to worship God.

III.—I do not think there is any necessity for dividing the Services. There is too much singing, and great time wasted in the Choral method of performing the Prayers and Psalms at St. Paul's. It is true I am fond myself of going to Westminster Abbey, and particularly the Chapel Royal, where we have beautiful chanting and anthems; but then, these things are not meant for a Parish Church. Let the Service be done as at other places.

IV.—I do not like innovations. I never heard of Morning Prayer being performed by itself. Let us keep to the old paths.



## ANSWERS TO THE OBJECTIONS.

I.—The Institution of the Sabbath, from whence our Lord's Day derives its principle of Rest, was meant for a *Religious* Rest. A Religious Rest involves an abstinence altogether from such work of accounts, or matter of business as the Objector describes. The work of the week should be thrown further back. If such work is done so late on Saturday night as to incapacitate a man from rising early on the Sunday morning, that work is virtually an infringement of the Day of Rest, just as much as though it had been done on the very day. If we can "rise early, and late take rest" on any other day, and *only* on Sunday spend the morning in idleness, is that offering to God our hearts and bodies as He would have them? Now if the Church bell were to invite men at an earlier hour to come and sing God's praise, and worship Him,—the Rising Sun,—“the Day Spring from on high”—if the practice of our lives were to make Sunday begin in the *morning*, and not at approaching noon; we might perhaps (God helping us) do more to abolish the common Sunday trading which now prevails in this Town, than all the Societies in the world. Let the Church bell sound—the trader will be driven to shut up his place of merchandize, and the merchant his account book, and the gentleman his newspaper. Sunday has begun. The people are at prayers. Come with me and worship GOD, not Mammon. “Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it Holy.”—ALL the Sabbath Day—not from noon to evening, but from *morning* to night.

II.—You are a Christian. Put off theatres and balls, above all, the opera on Saturday night. Let your servants have rest, and your own mind and spirit composure. Pause in the world's career of never-ceasing pleasure. For one night at least Think. What fitness can you be in on Sunday morning to come to the House of God; weary, jaded, your mind dissipated with the excitement of carnal pleasures? Is this a mind to *pray*? Of course Holy Communion you can never think of? It would be a sin. And will you object to good Christians worshipping God at an early hour, because you are a dissipated worldlying yourself? Would you neither enter God's kingdom yourself, nor allow others who would be willing to enter, to do so? Sacrifice Saturday evening to God. Then come and worship Him in the beauty of Holiness on Sunday morning, with a mind and spirit fresh, active, and willing.

III.—This is a matter of simple love of God. Shall we not perform our Services and sing unto God with the *best* member that we have? When we *can* sing not sing? Do what is careless, slovenly, cold, and undevotional, when we know what is right, and have means to do it? Besides look at the noble and the rich. How we read of *them*, as the Objector acknowledges, flocking to the Chapel Royal, to enjoy the Choral Service. Can they then turn round and object to the same Choral Service for the poor? There is only one Prayer Book for the Chapel Royal, as well as for the Parish Church; for the poor man, as for the rich. What is right for the one is right for the other. Besides, the consumption of time is in the administering Holy Communion, not the singing. It is the presence of 120 Communicants and upwards weekly. It is this which occupies the time. Would they who are non-Communicants hinder the approach of the Communicants, and for

the sake of their own selfish prejudices, become a stumbling-block in the way of Christ's kingdom in the hearts of the righteous? Surely a consistent man, and a reasoning man would say—It is true; the Church commands Holy Communion weekly, and the Clergy are right in celebrating it: I must not hinder that which is good for others, tho' I may not take advantage of it myself.

IV.—Innovation is on the other side. Innovation must be laid to the charge of those who have mingled together Services which were meant to be separate; not to those who desire to restore their ancient uses. He that only carries his ideas of the Church to the beginning of his own life, is not competent to speak about Innovations. Now let us hear what is said by an eminent writer on the Church Services.

“The original custom of the Church, Eastern and Western, was to celebrate the Matins and the Communion at different hours. Such is still the custom at those three Cathedrals abovementioned, [Winchester, Worcester, and Hereford,] and at the College of Winchester; and, as Wheatly informs us, formerly at Merton College, Oxford; and tradition gives the same account of Canterbury, and possibly of many other places. It would appear from passages in Archbishop Grindal's Life, that the same custom prevailed in the Diocese of York, *till altered by his authority*. Whether his interference in this respect was beneficial is more than questionable. From many circumstances of his life, it is evident that his early foreign training had incapacitated him from a sufficiently discriminative estimate of our Liturgy. In country parishes indeed, where the population is scattered, this division might have the effect of inducing a neglect either of the Morning or the Communion Service, since attendance on both would often be impracticable. But in towns and in Cathedral cities especially, this objection does not exist, from the nearness of the inhabitants to the Churches. The division might have the effect, in the first place, of giving to the worshippers a more distinct apprehension of the peculiar character of each several Service, who now, from the extreme length of the three conjoined offices (especially on Communion Sundays) are unwillingly compelled to absent themselves; and in the last place, of affording opportunities to different members of families, who now cannot attend simultaneously, of going to Church once at least in the morning, whereas now many are obliged to postpone their public devotions till the evening. Besides this, as regards the Cathedral Service in particular, all excuse would be removed for omitting any part of the prescribed office (as the Anthem), or of mutilating any of the characteristic features of the Cathedral mode. A simple recurrence to the spirit of the Church's regulations in this respect, as many others, would supersede many of those awkward and unauthorized contrivances, which are now often considered necessary.

Were the Communicants as numerous as every zealous clergyman assuredly desires, such a division would be *imperatively necessary*: even now is it not required in *at least the great London Churches*.\*

But suffer me to do something more than merely answer objections. All these objections, when examined, will be found to consist in a mere

\* *Jebb's Choral Service.* p. 227-8.

selfish secular spirit, each man looking to his own little comforts and ways rather than at the wants of others—not considering truth, and God's glory. I would desire to put before you in a short way the

### INCONSISTENCIES

involved in the junction of the Services, at Eleven o'clock.

1. In the *Collect for Grace*, we thank God that He has brought us "safely to the *beginning* of this day," the hour of so doing being *noon*, and the *sun at its meridian*.
2. We repeat—(one certainly must be needless.)
  1. Two Addresses to the People.
  2. Two Confessions of Sin.
  3. Two Absolutions from Sin.
  4. Two Creeds.
  5. Two Sets of Lessons:—
    1. The Lessons of Matins.
    2. The Law, Gospel, and Epistle.
  6. Two Sets of Psalmody
    1. The Psalms of David.
    2. The Hymns of the Eucharist.
  7. Two Prayers for the Queen.
  8. The Lord's Prayer five times.

Now let any candid person examine the constitution of the two Services without the prejudice of habit. The whole spirit of each is most assuredly independent of the other, just as much as Evensong is independent of Matins.

But from this let us turn to the

### ADVANTAGES

of a separate performance of the two Services.

1. If Morning Prayer were by itself at an earlier hour, many poor and others might find room in the church, whence now they are entirely shut out.
2. The *whole* of the Sabbath would be sanctified, and not as now, the morning left for secular pursuits of trade, and reading of newspapers, and lying in bed.
3. Another opportunity would be given for hearing the Word of God, a Sermon being added to the Matins' Service for early worshippers.
4. Infirm, aged, weak persons, and invalids, might have an opportunity of coming to the Altar for the holy Eucharist, the time being shorter.
5. The poor might have an opportunity of coming to holy Communion, and also servants, whereas they are now utterly debarred from any attempt to do so—the Service not terminating until (as before observed) half-past Two o'clock.
5. We should *all*, both clergy and laity, particularly children, worship God with greater alacrity, and spirit, and not be, as too many of the best of us are, lethargic, weary, and cold in our devotions.
6. The clergy would have time to rest between the Communion Service and the Evening Prayer, whereas now (very frequently) they have not time even to take off their robes.

In short, the more we turn the question round and round, the more we see the great spiritual blessings which would arise from it; and the more I daily think of it, and converse with others about it, the more convinced I am that there would not be a more efficacious plan for restoring the true principles of our Church, for regaining the lost affections of our people, and for throwing a deeper and more spiritual feeling into the worship which we offer to Almighty God.

And now the question comes, *Can it be done?* The fourteenth canon directs that "the Common Prayer shall be said or sung distinctly and reverently upon such days as are appointed to be kept holy by the Book of Common Prayer, and their Eves, and at convenient and usual times on those days, and in such place of every Church as the Bishop of the Diocese or Ecclesiastical ordinary shall think meet for the largeness or straitness of the same, so as the people may be most edified." The question then will turn upon the point—whether to have the Morning Prayer at an earlier hour, say Nine o'clock in the Morning—leaving the holy Communion for a somewhat later period of the day, say Eleven o'clock, or half-past Eleven—would fall within this canon so as to be a convenient and usual time. Now seeing that we have daily prayer at Eight o'clock in the morning at our own church, and seeing that some churches have it at 7 o'clock; seeing that the Chapel Royal has it at Twelve o'clock even on Sundays, and the Cathedrals at Ten o'clock, even on Sundays; it would follow, I think, that our taking any other hour besides that of Eleven would be quite within this canon, and even without reference to the ordinary, it might at once be done, so long as it was *convenient* and for edification, which is the point I have been striving to shew. Still to do anything *without the Bishop*, is not good, to do anything in direct opposition to his wishes, in a matter which had the slightest aspect of doubt upon it, would not be in accordance with the Priest's ordination vow of obedience. Wheresoever indeed the power that commands is superior to the Bishop—there the Priest's duty is to obey the superior power, even against the wishes of the Bishop, for the Bishop himself is bound to obey the law of the Church. But in the matter before us, a question of convenience and order, his advice and opinion should certainly, even if not for duty, still for the spirit of kindness and Christian love, be ascertained. But supposing the Bishop's concurrence obtained, there cannot be any difficulty whatsoever. It may be done on any Sunday; a few weeks will see the great blessing attending it, and we shall have the satisfaction, I feel sure, of doing more towards the hallowing of the Christian Sabbath, than by any other means which could be devised. I am borne out in the opinion that there would be no difficulty, from a fact which I am exceedingly glad to be able to communicate to all who may be interested in this subject, namely, *a very recent adoption of the plan in the Diocese of Chester*. I have a letter before me from the clergyman of a parish in the county of Cheshire, the population under 3,000, and an agricultural parish, in which in January last, with the Bishop of Chester's concurrence, the Morning Service is now performed at Nine o'clock morning, and the Litany and holy Communion at Eleven o'clock, and he speaks of it in his letter, as succeeding beyond his utmost expectations; and he adds, "I feel certain that in *populous* districts it would be a great boon to our people." If then in an agricultural parish, such as the one I describe, with a population

under 3000, how much more would it be sure to benefit and spiritualize the people in such a parish as *this*, with a population very nearly of 14,000, and a great portion of them close within the reach of the Church.

But now, my Brethren, I pass on to a totally distinct subject, that one indeed which is the main reason of my writing to you this letter—that one, which I have most at heart just now, and in which I have most need of your individual exertion and co-operation. It is contemplated to build a new Church, to be dedicated to

### St. Barnabas,

and with it a new School House, and a Parsonage House. The School House is to contain 600 children, 200 boys, 200 girls, and 200 infants; and the Church it is hoped will be large enough to contain about 1000 persons. The Church is to be entirely free, and without pews or galleries. The land for this purpose has been most kindly given by the Marquis of Westminster, and also the value of the houses thereupon. The estimated cost of this undertaking is as follows:—

For the Church in all things complete . . . .	9000	0	0
For the Schools . . . . .	2700	0	0
For the Parsonage . . . . .	2000	0	0
	<hr/>		
Total	13,700	0	0

Let us say then, to provide against contingencies, that we require for our purpose £14,000. How shall we raise it? Wherewithal shall we do this great thing? First of all, I kneel down in prayer to Almighty God that He may, by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the merits of His Son Jesus Christ, stir up your hearts to a noble liberality, so that you may by Him directed, give your alms freely and generously to Him. And then looking round upon this Parish, I think of the many rich and noble persons who dwell round about us, to whom individually in many cases *the whole sum* would be a gift worthy of them; but certainly to some forty or fifty of them the subscription of the fortieth or fiftieth part would be an adequate gift, and really but a moderate gift, in the service of Him to whom they owe all things.\*

Let not any one think that I speak wantonly in this matter, or at random, or that I put before you a scheme which is impracticable, or that it is an unjust tax upon you, or that the whole thing is unnecessary, and has

\* It will of course be observed that I have not in this estimate calculated upon any accession to the funds from *public societies*. I have purposely avoided doing so: First, because I think that so wealthy a neighbourhood as this would in some sort suffer disgrace in being compelled to resort to public funds; and Secondly, because it would deprive us of the great privilege and blessing which assuredly it would be, to raise the whole sum *among ourselves*. If however, we should fall short, we can then (but it will be a grievous thing) resort to the public societies, and obtain some small addition by way of grant. For the *Schools*, we shall receive a grant from the Privy Council and the National Society.

nothing to do with you. I proceed to speak more at length on these points, and to shew,

I.—That the scheme for building a new Church with Parsonage and Schools, *is not unnecessary*.

St. Paul's District contains a population, to put it at the lowest, of 12,000; but I strongly suspect, from private calculations which I have recently made, that the real amount is more nearly 14,000. It is a long narrow strip of land running from Hyde Park down to the river Thames, near Chelsea Hospital, about the length of a mile and a quarter. About 6,000 of the poorer classes live in the district adjoining Chelsea Hospital, and these are at the furthest distance from the Church. Even had they room in St. Paul's, their proper Church, they could not conveniently and habitually attend, owing to the great distance; but they have not room even when they come; and it is painfully known to us, the clergy of St. Paul's, that most of these persons go to public worship *no where*; they are not even Dissenters or Romanists, or worshippers of God in *any* way. In some cases, I have met with deliberate arguments from them, that *going to public worship* is no part whatsoever of their duty; in fact, were I to speak the dreadful truth, a great portion of them are practically without God in the world, living and dying as the beasts that perish. I think we may safely say that there are many hundreds in our parish unbaptized, certainly many thousands unconfirmed, and more than two-thirds have no notion whatsoever of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as in any way necessary to salvation. They have no worship, no Communion, no means of grace, no hearts towards God—no hearts towards man. What shall we say then? Am I, their Pastor set over them, as well as over all others in this District, to leave them thus? Is it *unnecessary* to attend to their wants? Shall we suffer them thus to perish eternally, while we look on and congratulate ourselves upon our Christianity? And what I say for the *Church* will equally apply to the *School*; for if the parents are without a knowledge of God, you may be sure that the children will be so also. It is a fearful thing to think of the time when the next generation shall come forth into the world, the godless children of the godless, so propagating the kingdom of Satan, and handing down their lives to *their* children more godless still. We calculate upon a fair average that there are 2,000 poor children needing education, and as yet we provide for little more than 400. We calculate that there may be about 12,000 persons in want of a place of worship, while we provide room for 2,000. Is there then *no case*? You will surely agree with me that it is not a wanton act on my part, to ask you for your immediate help. Each day brings greater need; each hour may save a soul. If you will only be stirring, and quick in the service of your Master's kingdom, what good may be done. May the Lord give you the will, as He has given you the power.

II.—It is not an *unjust tax upon you*; for even setting aside the great Catholic principle of preaching the Gospel to the poor without regard to locality; even setting this aside, still the existence of this poor population (I am speaking to the rich) now immediately around you, depend entirely upon *yourselves*. You are the indirect creators of it. It is you that have brought them here, from the magnificent dwellings in which you live, and

the horses and carriages which you keep, and the many servants whom you require to minister to your wants. Belgrave Square—Eaton Place—Chesham Place, and Lowndes Street, with others of the like grandeur and comfort of dwelling, is the cause of Ebury Street, and Queen Street, and Clifford's Row, and New Grosvenor Place, being filled with a population of poor men, women, and children, striving, laboring men, working from hand to mouth, day by day, to sustain life. These persons are the *servants of your servants*—labourers, carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, painters, helpers in stables, charwomen, with aged and infirm parents—many widows of your own former servants, and the like. It is then not *unjust* (if you *will* call it a tax) that you should have this tax; but remember this is only the *lowest* ground. I, on my part, speak of it as your privilege; but if *you*, on your part, will speak of it as a tax, then let it be so—but it is not unjust. But again, you reply, I have my *country* house to look to, and the poor of my *country* estate to maintain, and I would rather give of my abundance to them than to the poor of London, with which I have but an occasional connection. God forbid that we should deprive you of the power of giving your alms where God has made you lords of the soil. But if you confine your responsibility in alms-giving, and providing the wants of Churches and Schools to your country estates, ought you not in justice to confine your *residence there also*? If God has so abundantly blessed you as to enable you to draw from the land over which He has set you for a time, such abundant wealth as to justify you in dwelling in *two houses* in different localities, ought you not in proportion to give of that abundance in *two places*? It is, I repeat again, the existence of your wealthy house here, that causes the poverty of the population here. Surely it cannot be with a safe conscience that you turn away when we shew you the wants which you have created *here*, by saying, I give my alms elsewhere. O, no, my Brethren, God has given you enough for both. Do not strain things so tightly. Though indeed it may require much persuasion to move you (if you are unwilling), still it does not require much argument to prove, that this tax upon you (if a tax) is a just one; that as a Parishioner *here*, here an alms-giver God will look for you to be.

III.—But neither is my scheme *impracticable*. I have before stated that I consider the population in our District to be nearly 14,000, and I consider it in this way. I have taken a census of all the houses, dividing them into three classes: the houses of the rich, the houses of the poor, and the houses of the middle classes, *i.e.* those who are neither rich nor poor, but working their way in the world with comfort and respectability. The number is as follows:

1.—Houses of the Rich .....	367
2.—Houses of the Poor .....	547
3.—Houses of the Middle Classes .....	570
	<hr/>
Total .....	1484

Now in the houses of the poor, we have very frequently three or four families, and many of the houses of the middle class have lodgers and various inmates, besides the family of the house. Considering at a low rate, upon an average, ten persons in every house, we have the population

of 14,840. But we have now to deal only with the Rich. There are 367 houses of the rich, persons whose income varies from £100,000 per annum to £1000 per annum. But suppose we omit the 67—allowing for *objections*, or hardness of heart, or Dissent, or Schism of some sort or other, which would not allow the owners of such houses to join conscientiously in this good work—still we have 300 houses of the Rich. Now if we receive £50 for each house, we shall have £15,000, that is more than the sum required. We shall have £1000 to spare, which can be laid out in endowing the Church for ever, with a little stipend for one of the Curates. But suppose we fail in this estimate of £50 from 300 houses, still it is not to be supposed that the 570 houses of the *middle* classes will look on entirely without a contribution. What may we reckon as the produce of ordinary alms-giving from the middle classes, and the better tradesmen, in so good a cause. Put 70 aside for the same reason as before, still we have 500 remaining—may we not reasonably calculate upon one pound from each house, which would amount to £500, sufficient to counterbalance any over-estimate we may have formed of the liberality of the rich.

But let us put it again in another way, without regard to houses, but the persons who live in them:—

	£
One person at least may be moved to give a thousand pounds ..	1000
Two persons £ 500 each.....	1000
Four persons £ 250 each .....	1000
Eight persons £ 200 each .....	1600
Twenty persons £ 100 each .....	2000
One hundred persons £ 50 each .....	5000
Sums under £ 50 .....	2400
	14,000

Thus then, my Brethren, having shewn you that this my scheme is not *unnecessary*, that it is not *unjust*, and that it is not *impracticable*, what remains but that we set about the good work without delay.

But one thing more I must speak of—and that is the provision of the Clergy. The Church is not to be endowed with any *Pew Rents*, nor with any sort of forced payment for the privilege of worshipping God. It is a free Church—open to the poor man, and to the rich man, (if he pleases to worship there on an equality with the poor,) *free of payment*. But then utilitarians will come and say—How will you provide for the Clergy? Now by the calculations I have made for you above, it is plain that I am not one of those who act upon the spur of the moment, and without consideration. I have deeply thought of this; and as on other matters I am forced to recur to the ancient ways of the Church, so I think in this, if we throw ourselves with faith, upon God, that He of His infinite mercy will provide us the means. But what is the ancient way? First an *Endowment*. Some little endowment may even be provided from the funds which we may raise. Say, that if we raise £15,000, one thousand may be set apart for an endowment, and more in proportion if more be raised. But I think the ancient way is principally THE OFFERTORY.

First, at the new Church itself, the Offertory may be used every Sunday, as directed by the Prayer-Book, wherein each person may give of his alms



according to his ability. That offertory may be set apart in three portions—one third for the poor, one third for the officers and maintenance of the Church, and one third for the Clergy who serve at the altar; and then also, from our own sister Church, St. Paul's, we may *on our part* increase our offering, and send down to the Clergy of St. Barnabas one third of our present offertory for their maintenance. I calculate that from this we shall derive an income of at least £600 per annum, and hence we shall be able without any difficulty to provide for three additional Curates; who having their hearts in the vineyard of the Lord, will go forth rejoicing, and do His work. In addition also to that, remember that part of our plan is to build a Parsonage House, which would at least accommodate one Clergyman, if not *two*. So that here too we shall not (God willing) be at fault, but going forth in faith, there is no manner of doubt whatever, but that God will give us His blessing, and we shall prosper.

Reflect on this. There has never yet been in the whole Parish of St. George, Hanover Square, either in its original extent, or in its present sub-division, any Church or Chapel built upon a principle of *alms-giving*. Perhaps some may demur at this. The mind would of course revert to the many District Churches and Chapels which now exist, particularly in this neighbourhood; to St. Peter's, Pimlico, and to the Church in which we now worship God, and also to St. Michael's, lately consecrated. But you will merely have to consider that St. Peter's was built by a Parish Rate, which being *compulsory*, cannot well be called alms-giving; and that St. Paul's, as well also as St. Michael's, was built on a principle of apportioning the pews for the service of the rich, according to the amount of their subscriptions. *That* cannot be called alms-giving, seeing that the poor were only *accidentally* brought into the Church, and not as a principle. The pews in St. Paul's Church were appropriated to subscribers, and became their property (upon payment of rent) at the rate of £15 for every sitting.\* Now it may be disagreeable to be reminded of this. No doubt it is. But I must state it, that I may be borne out in my assertion, that no Church has yet been built by *alms-giving*; for that which has a personal return cannot be alms. Yet consider. Perhaps in no spot of like dimensions throughout the whole of England, and, therefore, throughout the whole of the world, *as one Parish*, could a people be gathered together in which there is a greater amount of wealth arising from land, from trade, from commerce, and from the practice of the learned professions, than in the original Parish of St. George. So that when we reflect according to the truth just explained, that such a Parish should never have brought about, either by individual liberality, or by the combination of many, the building of a Church on a principle of alms-giving, *i.e.*, a Church in which the wants of the poor should have the first place, and for which the money should not be saddled with a conditional return—that such a collection of Christians—the nobility, the landed gentry, the rich merchants and bankers, the very highest of the aristocracy, the legislature,

\* It is not meant by this in any way to detract from the purity of motive with which many no doubt conscientious persons gave their money for the building of St. Paul's. Many received no return whatsoever in the shape of pews, and *never intended so to do*. But it is only meant to shew *generally*, that as the plan was worked out, the principle was one of considering *the rich*, not the poor, and that those who received pews, whatever else they did, *did not give alms*.

and the law, and though last not least, the *Church* and the *Crown*, (for the palace of Her Majesty the Queen is in the Parish of St. George)—that all should thus have been dwelling here together for many years, worshipping God in proprietary Chapels, whence of course the poor are altogether excluded, and in Churches such as St. Paul's, where the poor are only accidentally seen, and where pew-doors cry out "*Come not near this.*" (Bear with me my brethren, if I seem to be over-zealous. Is there not a cause?) I say—that such should have been the case, and all the time, nominally, we have been holding in our hands the Gospel of the Blessed Jesus, which says as a mark and proof of His religion, "*The poor have the Gospel preached to them.*" That such should have been the case—(am I speaking too strongly when I say it) is an overwhelming charge against the sincerity and reality of our faith. Do not think that I am severe or harsh when I say this. I am sure, if you will calmly reason and reflect, you must agree with me, that sin lies at our door *somewhere*; that we have wronged the poor, and therefore we must restore four-fold; that we have treated with injustice, those whom Christ loves most, as nearest and most like Him, and, therefore, now must make atonement. Look round for the poor. In which of the Churches are they? They have been driven from the pews to the open seats, and from the open seats to the door, and from the door, the door of God's house, they have been driven to the conventicle, or worse may be, to the preaching of the infidel in the parks, and open-places of the streets; or worse may be still, to the depth and darkness of despair in their own uninstructed hearts; discontented, ready for rebellion, alone, friendless, unloved, unloving. I do announce to you my brethren, as God's ambassador, that "*the poor have not the Gospel preached to them*"—and so announcing it, I implore you to give heed. There is a grievous disease among us—a heavy charge against us—a fearful sin—the neglect of the characteristic of Christ's Holy Religion—"THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL TO THE POOR." And so announcing it, I implore you to come forth and help in its remedy. God will no doubt forgive us the wrong we have done, if we honestly arise, and do our best to redeem it, for the sake of Christ. Let us do so. Let us take up the Gospel in our hands and go forth and say—"We come, though it be late—but still we come, and now at length will do our best. We come to teach you, O ye poor, the words of heavenly wisdom. May God forgive us that we have so long neglected you. Turn to us and hear what we have to say, confessing our sin, and pray for us again in the communion of our Church, as we for you."

And now, what further need I say. I leave this letter in your hands—I charge you with it, in God's name. I have stated to you frankly and fully my objects, my desires, my plans for your blessing, and this opportunity of Alms-deeds worthy of your Christian calling. If I have in the former part of my letter broached any topic which from peculiar habits or feelings on your part you do not approve, let it not, I beseech you, stand in the way of your approval of the latter part. It might perhaps have been better policy, had I put aside all topics wherein a difference of opinion might have arisen, as in what was said about the Services of the Church, and about the division of the Morning Prayer; but I think *policy* on the part of one who is responsible to God for the souls of men, a very dangerous ground of action.

God's blessing will not *eventually* rest on policy, if policy be assumed as a thing distinct from duty. I must tell you the truth, come what may, and trust that God will open your hearts to receive it; and that I may safely ask the question which St. Paul asked, "Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" God forbid! Let us work faithfully together. Come with me into the lanes and streets of this great city. Come with me and visit the dens of infamy, and the haunts of vice, ignorance, filth, and atheism, with which it abounds. Come with me, and read the story of Dives and Lazarus. Come with me, and turn over the pages of the Holy Book, by whose precepts your lives are, at least, in theory guided; then look at your noble houses, and the trappings of your equipages, the gold that glitters on your sideboards, and the jewels that gleam on your bosoms;—then say within your secret conscience, as standing before the great and terrible God at the day of judgment,—What shall I do, if I give not of the one to relieve the other. O my Brethren, come and let us reason together. All these things will have an end. Your rank and your earthly privileges, and your superiority above other men, will have an end. Seek for some other rank than that which you have here, higher privileges, a better superiority—where "the first will be last, and the last first." I shew you the way. I lead you in the way. I am appointed so to do. WILL YOU FOLLOW? God grant that you may. God grant that in dutiful allegiance to our dear mother the Church of England, undeterred by the frowns of the gainsayers, and fearless of the ridicule of the foolish, in order, patience, and sobriety, we may proceed together, as we have begun; thinking it gain, if the world speak against us, so long as God be for us. There stands before us still, the Church—the Catholic Church of England. She, in whose font of regeneration we were new born, in whose bosom we were nurtured, and by whose Sacraments we have been duly fed. Her ways are clear—her paths direct—her doctrine Apostolical. In these we will walk (God keeping us) as long as life shall remain, neither turning to the right hand nor to the left; and when the last hour shall come, in her folds still dwelling, we will fear no evil, but cheerfully pass through the valley of the shadow of death, because *His* rod and *His* staff, who is her head, will comfort us. Others may forsake or make light of the rules of the Church—let not us. Others may forsake their appointed Bishops and Priests—let not us. Others may make an outcry about the increasing power of the Church of Rome—let not us; but rather let us shew by our *actions*, by our prayers, by our Alms-deeds, by our self-sacrifice, by our daily devotion in the House of God, and by our constant communion at His holy Altar, that we understand the difference between a Catholic and a Romanist, and glorying in the name of one, so beat off all possibility of being mistaken for the other.

I am,

My dearly beloved Brethren and Parishioners,

Your faithful Pastor and Servant in Christ,

WM. J. E. BENNETT,

*Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's.*

ST. PAUL'S,

The Third Sunday after Easter, 1846.

## POSTSCRIPT.

The Trustees for receiving money, and managing the funds in aid of building and endowing the Church, Schools, and Parsonage of St. Barnabas, in the district of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, are the following:—

THE MARQUIS OF WESTMINSTER, *Giver of the Land.*  
 REV. WM. J. E. BENNETT, *Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's.*  
 THE HON. ELIOT YORKE, M.P. } *Churchwardens.*  
 MR. CHARLES BRISCOE, }

Money may also be paid into the hands of the Bankers direct.

MESSRS. HERRIES, FARQUHAR, & Co., St. James's Street.  
 MESSRS. BARNETT, HOARE, & Co., Lombard Street.

or the Treasurers,

HENRY BARNETT, Esq., 2, Halkin Street.  
 REV. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, 39, Wilton Crescent.

Very shortly, gentlemen will be appointed to aid in collecting money in their several neighbourhoods, and Receipts from the Treasurers will be given for all payments. *It is particularly requested, that a receipt be always asked for.*

It is suggested that those who give may do so under either one or all of the following heads:—

### St. Barnabas.

THE CHURCH.			THE SCHOOLS.			THE PARSONAGE.			TOTAL.		
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.

*Name and Address* \_\_\_\_\_

It is suggested also, that any sum which may be desired to be given, may be divided into two years, and so paid *half* in the present year 1846, and the other half in the next year, 1847.

It is suggested also, and indeed, my Brethren, I would very earnestly ask it, that you should make the success of this work *the daily subject of your prayers*. If you are poor, perhaps your prayers will be all that can be given, but give them even so, for they will bless and sanctify the work; and remember "the widow's mite." So shall we prosper.

W. B.

WM. DAVY AND SON, PRINTERS, 8, GILBERT STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE.











