

Lutheran-Anglican Dialogue in 19th Century India

*D. Isaac Devadoss**

Introduction

C.T.E. Rhenius, a German Lutheran missionary, committed to serving among the people who had been ignorant of the Gospel message. He made use of the opportunity given by the 'Church Missionary Society'¹ (CMS). He came to Madras in 1814, worked for six years in and around Madras. He established many schools for the locals. He translated the gospels and other books for the school children. In 1820, he left Madras and settled in Tirunelveli. He established about 400 schools and 371 churches in different villages. He encouraged the local people to be self-reliant and self-supporting. He published many pamphlets, and he translated some books into Tamil. He established various Philanthropic societies, to help the poor. He formed a few Christian settlements in order to protect the Christians from the persecution. He formed the Religious Tract Society to produce various tracts in different languages. During his work in Madras and Tirunelveli, he always had some problem with the Anglican society. These tensions finally led to the schism. In 1835, CMS dissolved its connection with Rhenius because of various reasons, which will be discussed in detail in the second part of this paper. The first part will be focused on the relationship between the Anglican missions and the German Lutheran missionaries, before Rhenius.

1. Co-operation between the Anglicans and the Lutheran Mission

From the beginning, the English mission of Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK)² was interested in the Danish mission of Tranquebar, South India. IN 1709, Antony William Boehm³, who was a chaplain to Prince George of Denmark, the husband of Queen Anne translated the missionary reports of Tranquebar mission into English and published them in London.⁴ In 1710, SPCK invited the Tranquebar missionaries to be their corresponding members. As a missionary of the Danish-Halle mission, ordained in Denmark,⁵ Barthomolous Ziegenbalg⁶ (1683-1719) and Henry Plütschau⁷ (1677-1746) felt themselves bound by the liturgy and customs of the Danish church. At the beginning of 1712, the SPCK sent a printing press to Tranquebar with types and paper; also silver and 250 volumes of the Portuguese New Testament all of which were carried freight free by the company.⁸

* Rev. D. Isaac Devadoss is Lecturer in History of Christianity, Bishop's College, Kolkata.

The Tranquebar missionaries sent reports of their work and accounts to England, and consulted SPCK on important points of policy such as ordinations, the location of missionaries, and the opening of new work. But communications were so slow and uncertain that in practice the missionaries did, as they liked. With Lutheran missionaries and in the absence of Anglican bishops in India, it was impossible for SPCK to insist on Anglican church order; but they tried to enforce the use of the Prayer book, which was quite early translated into Tamil.⁹ There was a good relationship maintained between the English mission and the Danish-Halle mission through out the eighteenth century. The Lutheran missionaries B. Schultze, Fabricius, Gericke, Schwartz, Rottler and others worked under SPCK without any prejudices.

Benjamin Schultze¹⁰ (1689-1760) was the first Tranquebar missionary who started the Anglican mission in Madras. He arrived in Tranquebar in the year 1719, along with the other two missionaries Nicholas Dal¹¹ (1690-1747) and Heinrich Kistemnacher¹². Gründler first ordained Schultze.¹³ He became the head of Tranquebar mission after the death of Gründler in 1720. In 1726, Schultze moved to Madras, and the SPCK accepted him as their missionary, and called its work in Madras as Madras mission. From August 16, 1728 Schultze was serving as an official missionary of SPCK. He was the one who started a new period in the ecumenical co-operation between Halle and London. Although he had been paid by SPCK, he had been getting continuous spiritual guidance from Halle.¹⁴

It was an unique kind of co-operation, in which the Anglican society did not insist on episcopal ordination of the Lutheran missionaries, while remaining loyal to the Lutheran confession felt free to minister under the patronage of the Archbishop of Canterbury, even to members of the Church of England and in Anglican churches.¹⁵

All Indian missionaries of the SPCK, as a rule were selected and ordained in Germany and then were presented to the SPCK and to the Archbishop of Canterbury in England, and after the completion of this exercise they were sent to India.¹⁶

Consolidation

After B. Schultze, J.P. Fabricius¹⁷ (1711-1791) consolidated the Anglican mission. He came to Tranquebar in 1740. After two years of working at Tranquebar, he moved to Madras to take over the position left vacant by Schultze.¹⁸ Fabricius, joined the 'Madras mission' and served there for many years. He opposed the Anglican catechism, when his colleague J.E. Geister¹⁹ introduced it to the congregation in Cuddalore on 31st January, 1746. This was something new for the congregation in Madras because it had been established as a Lutheran one. This catechism was too lengthy for the children and catechumens to learn by heart or understand plainly.²⁰ Fabricius felt that it would be confusing for the Christians to learn the Ten Commandments in a different order and to change the article of the Lutheran church.²¹ The Anglican catechism was dropped, shortly after its introduction, without its coming to the notice of officials in England. Towards the end of Fabricius' life, Tranquebar missionaries took care of him and he died as Danish missionary, on 24th January, 1791.²²

In 1788, C.W. Gericke²³ (1742-1803) succeeded Fabricius at Madras. He was a student and colleague of Christian Frederick Schwartz²⁴ (1726-1798), at Cuddalore which was under Madras mission. From 1784, Gericke was working under SPCK among the Eurasians, especially the neglected children. In 1800 and in 1802, he went to Tirunelveli where he baptized a large number of people.²⁵ He died in 1803 at Vellore.

In 1776, J.P. Rottler (1749-1836) arrived at Tranquebar and served there upto 1803. He went to Madras to take over the mission after the death of Gericke. The Governor, Lord William Bentinck, appointed him to succeed Gericke, in-charge of the Female Orphan Asylum.²⁶ He had no anti-Anglican prejudices. He translated the Anglican Book of Common Prayer into Tamil, and introduced it in his congregation.²⁷ Rottler was re-ordained by the first bishop of Calcutta, Bishop Middleton, at the age of seventy.

Tirunelveli was visited by the native priest and catechists of the Danish mission at Tranquebar, and a small congregation was formed under their instruction. Savarimuthu, a member of the Tiruchirapalli Church, stayed at Palayamkottai to promote the mission work from 1771.²⁸ There were many Lutheran missionaries working under English mission, but a few missionaries went to Tirunelveli and rendered their services there.

In 1787, the SPCK appointed J.D. Jaenicke²⁹ as a missionary to South India. Earlier, he was working in the mission school at Tanjore, but he was more interested in Mission work. He was sent to Palayamkottai from Tanjore, by Schwartz on 12th September 1791. He stayed at Palayamkottai for about ten months. Because of his sickness he could not stay at Palayamkottai, he returned to Tranquebar.³⁰ After some time, again he visited Palayamkottai in 1794, with his sickness. At last, on the 10th May, 1800 he died in the forty-first year of his age.³¹ Being a Lutheran, he worked as an SPCK Missionary under Schwartz.

In 1785, Schwartz sent Sathianathan³² to Palayamkottai to take care of the small congregation. After five years, on the 26th December, 1790, Sathianathan received ordination at the hands of the missionaries, according to the rites of the Lutheran church.³³ In 1791, Schwartz informed the society about his intention regarding the ordination of Sathianathan. Sathianathan was working at the best of his ability, by the discipline of the Lutheran church, but he received his salary from SPCK through European missionaries.

In 1795, J.C. Kohlhoff baptized Sundaranandam, native of Tirunelveli, at Tanjore, and named him David. In 1796, Schwartz sent him to Palayamkottai as a catechist to help Sathianathan. David worked among his relatives, as a result four families of twenty persons received baptism in October, 1797, at Vijayaramapuram.³⁴ The new converts had to undergo many insults and persecution. Ultimately, they abandoned their village and migrated en masse to another place. David purchased a piece of land, in Jaenicke's name, in August 1799 and settled the new converts there and built a prayer-house, it was named Mudalur (first village). It was established by SPCK mission, but the mission workers were Lutherans.³⁵

Another London Missionary Society's³⁶ (LMS) missionary, William Tobias Ringeltaube³⁷ (1770-1820) reached Tranquebar in December, 1804, with two other missionaries.³⁸ The choice of their station was left to themselves. Mr. Kohlhoff, was in-charge of the missions of the SPCK without any other missionary's assistance. SPCK mission extended its work from Tranquebar to Cape Comarin, so Kohlhoff was not able to supervise all the congregations. He had often requested the SPCK to send additional helpers to the field. Therefore, Kohlhoff invited Ringeltaube to help him because Ringeltaube was given free will to choose his field.³⁹ Ringeltaube took temporary charge of the SPCK's Tirunelveli mission in Kohlhoff's name and on his responsibility.⁴⁰

Ringeltaube had worked for nearly two years in Tirunelveli for SPCK. The ministrations of the Danish and German clergymen were accepted in English territories. The missionaries used the English Prayer Book and translations of it, they taught the English catechism in their schools. Lutheran ministrations at baptisms, burials and marriages were welcomed in absence of chaplains. They officiated at the English service on Sundays.⁴¹

In November 1816, the government chaplain James Hough came to Tirunelveli.⁴² He applied to the CMS which had already started work in Madras, in 1814 and in Travancore in 1816. Hough suggested many things to the CMS and the SPCK, one important thing was the urgency of sending a European missionary to take charge of the schools and mission work in Tirunelveli because of his poor health, which made it impossible for him to stay on in Tirunelveli.⁴³

Tension between the Anglicans and the Lutherans in the 19th Century

The Lutheran missionaries were very comfortable when they were working under Anglican mission, throughout the eighteenth century. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Anglican Bishop Middleton came to India, in 1814 and the SPCK handed over its mission field to the SPG. In the meantime, the Danish — Halle mission came to an end. English took over the mission for a period of time (1808-1815). Now the Anglicans changed their policy that led to the problem of liturgy.

During the last decade of eighteenth century the situation changed in Europe. The church as a whole, had become indifferent to the mission and had not been able to overcome its self-sufficiency and introvertism.⁴⁴ Through the Napoleonic wars the connections between Halle, Copenhagen and India were severed. The English occupied Tranquebar on 18th May, 1801 and again on 13th February, 1808 as Denmark was in alliance with Napoleon.⁴⁵

In this situation, the needs of the Indians and of the missionaries increased. So, they sent back many of the children from the school. The king of Tanjore helped them for four years. In May 1820, A.F. Cämmerer⁴⁶ (1767-1834) handed over the eleven congregations that belonged to Tranquebar temporarily to the English mission (SPCK) in Tanjore with their 1900 souls, 11 chapels and 11 catechists for which the monthly expenses were Rs. 150 only. Thus all the stations outside of Tranquebar

were turned over in 1825 and about 20,000 Lutheran Christians became Anglicans.⁴⁷ From 1816, the Tranquebar missionaries received their salaries from the Anglican bishop of Calcutta for almost two years, and contributed every month Rs. 150.⁴⁸ Thus, the Anglicans began to dominate the Lutherans.

The Liturgy Issue

In 1813, when the charter of the East India Company came up for renewal, the British Parliament passed the Section XXXIII of the Act⁴⁹, it gave the provision of having a bishop in Calcutta and three archdeacons in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay.⁵⁰ With regards to this, the first Bishop Middleton came to Calcutta on 25th November, 1814. Once the bishop came to India the entire mission setup was changed, because Bishop Middleton asked the European clergies in India to get the license from him to continue their ministry. His relationship with CMS missionaries was not smooth, because the CMS missionaries had not been sent by the church, but by a private and voluntary society. These missionaries did not want to get the licence from the bishop.⁵¹ Differences and tensions developed between the European missionaries and the Anglicans. In 1816, Bishop Middleton issued order to the missionaries to follow the Anglican order.⁵² Rhenius did not accept the Bishop's order, and he had disputes and controversies both with the Corresponding Committee in Madras and with the Parent Committee in England.⁵³ From this time, the Lutheran catechism and Liturgy began to be continually edged out.

In 1825, a radical change took place, when the SPG agreed to take over all the work of the SPCK in India. As a chartered society, the SPG felt itself bound to carry on the work on purely Anglican form. It appointed as missionaries, those who had received ordination in the Anglican tradition.⁵⁴ Earlier, the Anglican Society (SPCK) accepted the Lutheran ordination in India. In 1819, J.P. Rottler was re-ordained according to the Anglican order, who joined the Anglican Mission in 1803. In 1826, Schreyvogel⁵⁵, was ordained in Tranquebar, accepted Anglican ordination and worked for Anglican mission.⁵⁶ In 1829, Rhenius did not accept this Anglican policy, which became a burning issue.

2. Rhenius and His Mission

Charles Theophilus Ewald Rhenius, was born on 5th November, 1790 at the Fortress Gardens in the province of West Prussia. At the age of seventeen Rhenius committed his life to Jesus Christ. In the year 1810, he applied for and obtained permission to enter a seminary at Berlin, and joined the seminary on 6th May, 1811. Rhenius had undergone a hard training at Berlin. In response to the Church Missionary Society's (CMS) request of missionary candidates, it was decided to send Rhenius to England. On 7th August, 1812, Rhenius was ordained at Berlin as a minister of the Lutheran Church of Prussia to be a missionary. A fortnight after his ordination, Schnarre and Rhenius proceeded to England. Rhenius spent eighteen months in England. On 7th January, 1814, Schnarre and Rhenius took formal leave of the society and left England for India, on 4th February, 1814.⁵⁷

In 1814, the CMS enlarged their help and directly began to work in South India by sending out their first missionaries, Rhenius and Schnarre to Tranquebar. In November 1814, a corresponding Committee⁵⁸ of the society was formed in Madras.⁵⁹ Rhenius and Schnarre landed in Madras on 4th July, 1814. Marmaduce Thompson, then one of the company's chaplain at Madras, received them. They visited the schools in Madras and made the acquaintance of a few missionaries like Vaughan, Rottler and Mr. Mortlock. After a fortnight at Madras, they left for Tranquebar on 20th July.⁶⁰ During this time they received a very first message from Tranquebar that John had died, under whose guidance they had expected to labour. Rhenius had been acquainted with Rev. John when Rhenius was in Europe.⁶¹ Rhenius was asked to go to Tranquebar to learn the missionary methods and to superintend the schools of the Danish mission.⁶²

When they reached Tranquebar, Cämmerer⁶³ and D. Schreyvogel received them. Rhenius began to learn Tamil by the help of local people.⁶⁴ He was interested to know the people's behaviour and culture, and also assisted the work that was going on at Tranquebar through a committee of their friends at Calcutta. On 10th January, 1815, he left Tranquebar for Madras.⁶⁵

Relationship with the Society in Madras

In the year 1820, the situation had changed in Rhenius' work. There was difference of opinions between Rhenius and the Committee of the CMS at Madras and in London. The five years that Rhenius had spent in Madras were years of less than perfect peace. In 1820, the corresponding Committee seems to have reached the conclusion that it would be better if Rhenius worked at another place.⁶⁶ Rhenius was preparing to return to Europe, rather than compromise his principles. Madras Committee proposed to him a change of station.⁶⁷

While Rhenius was worrying about his future, James Hough requested the Madras Corresponding Committee to send missionaries to Tirunelveli without delay. In response to James Hough's invitation, the Madras Committee sent Rhenius to Palayamkottai. Rhenius left the mission affairs in the hands of Baranbruck and started to proceed to Palayamkottai on 2nd June, 1820.⁶⁸

Rhenius' Mission in Tirunelveli

C.T.E. Rhenius, arrived in Palayamkottai with his wife and children on 17th July, 1820. Bernard Schmidt arrived little late on 20th October, 1820.⁶⁹ Rhenius proceeded to a house in the Fort, which had been arranged for him by Hough. Hough had purchased this property for the CMS in 1818 and had built a school, seminary, and bungalow. Hough handed over the CMS properties (three churches and eleven schools in and around Palayamkottai) to Rhenius.⁷⁰

Rhenius started his mission work through translating the scriptures into Tamil and the compilation of a pamphlet, entitled *The Essence of the True Vedam*.⁷¹ Rhenius had frequently visited various places in the district, sometimes with Schmidt and at other times with his local catechists or the pupils of the seminary. He used to meet

the people in the schoolrooms or streets, and speak with them on religion and distribute tracts. He attracted people through the local language.⁷² He preached them on the creation and salvation of men, profusely quoting from their *Vedas* and *Puranas*, which attracted the people's attention.⁷³

During Rhenius' time the poor and the oppressed were coming in groups to accept Christianity. In the beginning of 1825, there were 838 families from ninety different villages who became Christians.⁷⁴ In September 1825, there were 125 places in which more than 1000 families were under Christian instructions.⁷⁵ The following year 514 village families wanted to admit themselves into Christianity, and in 1832 there were 2519 Christian families.⁷⁶

Rhenius adopted the church government and worship similar to those of the English dissenters.⁷⁷ Rhenius had administered the Lord's Supper, he shared the sacraments to the communicants in a sitting posture, and they passed the cup from one to another.⁷⁸ He did not follow the rubric of the Anglican Common Worship Book. He did not put the symbol of cross on the forehead of the persons who were getting baptism.⁷⁹ He used his own translation of Tamil Lord's prayer in the service.⁸⁰ He used the German Lutheran hymns in the services.⁸¹ He was the one who started morning and evening worship in all the churches, especially in all Christian settlements.⁸²

From 1826, the Christian villages increased in number. In order to meet the expenditure, Rhenius formed the *Dharma Sangam*, native Philanthropic society on 2nd June, 1830.⁸³ In 1827, Rhenius purchased a site, formerly known as Pooliurkurichy, with the money sent by a devout Prussian gentleman, Count Dohna of Scholdin and named it 'Dohnavur' after him.⁸⁴ A mission house was built and it became a mission center in 1828. At the end of 1834, there were eleven Christian villages established by the native Philanthropic society.⁸⁵

On 2nd June, 1834, Rhenius established a Widow's Fund Society, for the catechists and schoolmasters' widows on the basis of the head catechist's report. The report was that on the proposal of West⁸⁶ they had established a 'Friend-in-Need' Society for poor widows.⁸⁷ Within one year, 158 rupees was in the account of Widows' Fund. By Rhenius' instructions all mission districts had established a Poor Fund, to which the congregations contribute and from that amount they provide for their poor, the sick, and the widows. The collections had raised monthly not only in money but also in kind like rice, cotton, and jaggery.⁸⁸ Rhenius established a number of indigenous societies through which he carried out gospel work as well as social reforms. On Reformation Day, 31st October, 1822, he established a Religious Tract Society for the publication of Tamil tracts.⁸⁹

Educations Work

Schmidt devoted himself to education, while Rhenius was in charge of the field and evangelistic work. Rhenius and Schmidt had been opening new schools in suitable localities, supervising and inspecting them regularly. In June 1828, there were 30 such schools established in various places.⁹⁰

Rhenius and Schmidt had always acted together and almost everyday they sat together and discussed matters concerning their ministry. Every Saturday evening they met with the local catechists and once in a month, all catechists and schoolmasters assembled to give their report and share their views and laid out a plan to work for the future.⁹¹ The schools in Tirunelveli were divided into two branches. First, those under the care of regular schoolmasters, which they called schoolmasters' school.⁹² Secondly, those under the care of catechists, which they called catechists' schools.⁹³

In 1833, there were three girls' schools, established by Rhenius. One was in the mission compound; one in Tirunelveli, another one was in Rajapalayam.⁹⁴ The girls studied the same curriculum of other schools. Girls' school at Tirunelveli was established for Christian girls only, here the children were from the congregation. Rajapalayam Tamil school's schoolmistress was the wife of the catechist, here also the same lessons were followed.⁹⁵

Writings and Translation work

Rhenius had started the revision of the Bible in 1815. He continued that work even after he was shifted to Tirunelveli. Rhenius, for the use of the seminarians, translated into Tamil the history and geography of the various countries written by European authors.⁹⁶ He produced a book for the instruction of the converts in general, entitled *Spiritual Instructions*.⁹⁷ In 1827 he published a pamphlet of sixty pages entitled, *An Essay on the Principles of Translating the Holy Scriptures with Critical Remarks on Various Passages, Particularly in Reference to the Tamil Language*.⁹⁸ Rhenius chose a style that was in-between that of the educated and the uneducated. He brought the language of the Bible more in the tune with the culture of the Tamilians. The British members of the Revision Committee could not approve of it. The British notion was that all languages under the empire should be levelled down to English.⁹⁹

On 21st August 1834, Rhenius published the review of Harper's *Church, Her Daughters and Handmaidens* and also an Address to all Christians on Union.¹⁰⁰ On 23rd September 1834 Rhenius completed *The English and Tamil Grammar Book*.¹⁰¹ In 1836, Rhenius published the book *Grammar of Tamil Language* a volume of 300 pages.¹⁰² Rhenius composed a *Tamil Grammar in English* and he finished *The Summary of Divinity* in Tamil, just before his illness but his translation of the Scriptures had been left incomplete.¹⁰³ Rhenius financed the printing of his Bible, books and tracts and textbooks in great numbers. Rhenius received regular monthly grant from Madras Corresponding Committee for the maintenance of Tirunelveli mission. Apart from that he received financial help from Germany, England, and other parts of India.¹⁰⁴

Tension between Rhenius and the Anglicans

The policies of the British East India Company was that they preferred people of other faiths to Christians in order to show to the public that they were not partial to their own religion. And the other thing is that the English government gave a big amount for the Hindu temple festivals and also to maintain the idols. Rhenius objected

to these two policies, and in 1831, Rhenius gave the appeal to the English government to change these two policies.¹⁰⁵ But his voice was not heard.

The Committee learned with great regret that you should have taken so serious a step as that of transmitting the account of the Tinnevely mission to Bengal for publication without any previous communication with them; and especially so, after the many injunctions to the contrary which the Committee have, from time to time, forwarded to you. It appears to the Committee that you must be under some misapprehension respecting their instructions or you would hardly have so needlessly violated them; and, in order to bring this subject to something like an issue, I am directed to call upon you for explicit answers to the two following questions: First, whether you were under the impression that this Committee had prohibited the publication of all documents of this kind until their approbation had been previously obtained; and Second, if you were under that impression, what induced you to violate their instructions in the present instance? In conclusion, I am directed to request that the publication of this document may be stopped if it be practicable to do so, after so long a delay.¹⁰⁶

On October 10, 1827, the missionaries Rhenius and Schmidt replied to the secretary of the Madras Corresponding Committee, that as per their knowledge there was a general principle that the missionary should not circulate or publish any tract or pamphlet without the previous sanction of the Committee. But from the beginning, they protested against this general principle and adopted their own principle that a missionary has the right to circulate such tracts. The Committee was not strict on the general principle for past eight years, when the missionaries published tracts without the permission of the Committee.¹⁰⁷

Since the Committee had been silent for last eight years on this matter they took it for granted, and sent the matter to Calcutta for publishing. As for their concern they did not violate any principle.¹⁰⁸ From that time onwards there remained a tension between Rhenius and the Corresponding Committee. Translation work was the main part of the missionary work. The Translation Committee of Madras asked Rhenius to translate the scriptures into Tamil. In June 1823, Rhenius went to Madras and met the Translation Committee and discussed with them their observations on his translation of Matthew's gospel. But the General Committee found some difficulties regarding a few differences between his translation and the English version. The General Committee wanted to adopt the English version as the standard one and resolved that the translation should be made according to the English version.¹⁰⁹

Rhenius and the Translation Committee protested against this idea and they stressed that the originals ought to be the standard one. The question is not whether a translation agrees with the English or not, but whether it agrees with the original or not. In these circumstances in 1826, Rhenius published a pamphlet of sixty pages entitled, *An Essay on the Principles of Translating the Holy Scriptures with Critical Remarks on Various Passages, Particularly in Reference to the Tamil Language*.¹¹⁰ The Essay has four major principles¹¹¹ of the translation work where he explained how to do translation. This caused further tension between Rhenius and the society.

The Tirunelveli mission was extensive and large. European missionaries were not able to continue their mission because of their physical fitness, so Rhenius was

interested in ordaining native missionaries. For that, he wrote to the Madras Corresponding Committee asking for permission to ordain seven of his catechists. The Committee accepted his request and laid down some conditions for the candidates.¹¹² Initially, Rhenius asked permission to give ordination to the seven catechists according to the Lutheran order, because the bishop's arrival from Calcutta would take a long time. The Committee did not accept Rhenius' request, the reason was that then they had a bishop in Calcutta who had the power to ordain Indians, since 1824.¹¹³ A long controversy began which lasted from 1830 to 1834. At one stage, Rhenius and Schmidt replied that the catechists were not willing to have Anglican ordination. The committee asked them to give the names of the seven catechists and their reasons to decline. Rhenius and Schmidt wrote a letter to the H. Harper, the Secretary of the Corresponding Committee on 8th October, 1830. In that they had mentioned the seven names and the reasons¹¹⁴ to decline the sacred office. Again, Rhenius requested the Committee to authorize him to ordain the catechists according to the German Evangelical Church on the basis of the example of SPCK and CMS which gladly admitted Lutheran ordination in earlier times, acknowledging Lutheran churches a sister church. Rhenius argued that the Article thirty-fourth¹¹⁵ was in favour of his request. The Committee did not accept Rhenius' argument and it became the moot point for the schism.

On 18th May, 1835, Rhenius received a letter from Tucker along with the resolution of the Home Committee. The Committee resolved that the CMS dissolved its connection with Rhenius on account of the Book Review.¹¹⁶ Actually, Harper¹¹⁷ requested Rhenius to review his book entitled *The Church, her Daughter and Handmaidens*, promising to publish it in his *Observer*. Initially Rhenius refused to do it, but because of Harper's continuous approach Rhenius accepted it. In the review, Rhenius attacked the tents, rituals and practices of the Church of England. He stated that many of the matters were not in accordance with the scriptures.¹¹⁸ He sent it to Harper but he prolonged the delay in publishing it. Every time Rhenius approached him, Harper would say that he would publish it in the very same *Observer*, but he never did so. At last, Rhenius published it in August 1834, and distributed it everywhere.¹¹⁹ As the Review touched the sentiments of the Anglican Church, the Home Committee took action against Rhenius and the CMS dissolved its connection with Rhenius.

According to Rhenius the doctrine of the Church of England is built not upon the Prophets and Apostles. Therefore, not altogether Evangelical, hence her government is not apostolic and her Liturgy is also not apostolic – the threefold office Bishop, (Presbyter) Priest, and Deacon is contrary to the apostolic twofold office Bishop or Presbyter and Deacon. There was no apostolic practice as bishop over other office.

He gave three suggestions to the churchmen. First, "not to identify the forms and constitution of the Church of England with the Church of Christ." Second, "not to hang the existence of the Christian Church upon earthly monarchs." Third, "churchmen in defending their system cease to give meanings to words which they do not possess, a mode which seems to have been resorted to solely in order not to acknowledge that the church is in error."¹²⁰ Rhenius' arguments are systematic and cogent. In addition to unequivocal scripture references, church traditions and the

writings of Church Fathers, he brought the history of the Roman Catholics and Anglican Churches in strong support of his arguments.

The Schism and its Consequences

It became obvious that Rhenius could no longer serve as CMS Missionary in Tirunelveli. Tucker, the Secretary of the Madras Committee himself came to Tirunelveli on 28th May, 1835, and made a personal request to Rhenius to leave Tirunelveli.¹²¹ As a result Rhenius and his German colleagues Schaffter, Müller, and Lechler resigned from CMS and returned to Madras. Then they proceeded from Madras to Arcot to open a new mission station.¹²²

In the meantime, another unfortunate development took place in the mission, which complicated the situation still further. The senior Catechist, David who had his training under the Lutherans and who had done great work in co-operation with Sathianathan, resigned from the mission when he was questioned by Tucker about his accounts of the mission funds entrusted to him. With his influence, he was able to induce thirty-six mission catechists to declare in favour of Rhenius to whom he sent a deputation with a request to return to Tirunelveli. On 7th September, 1835, Rhenius received that letter and again on 19th September he received another letter from Palayamkottai.¹²³ In compliance with those requests Rhenius returned to Palayamkottai on 22nd October 1835, but Tucker and Pettitt requested Rhenius to leave the place in order to avoid the unpleasant situation. But Rhenius refused to leave, and stayed on the banks of the river *Tamraparani*.¹²⁴

About sixty-seven congregations were with Rhenius, while 176 remained with the CMS. Bishop Corrie, the first bishop of Madras, visited Palayamkottai in early 1836 and tried to bring about reconciliation and peace in the divided church, but Rhenius had come to stay and was unwilling for any negotiation. Rhenius' argument was that though the mission had spent money, he was the one who had done the work and the people were entitled to decide for themselves whom they would follow.¹²⁵ His colleagues, Schaffter, Müller and Lechler joined him soon after his return. Rhenius wrote letters to his friends in India and abroad asking for support to his new mission named German Evangelical Mission.¹²⁶ All had given their support, so that Rhenius could continue his mission without difficulties.

The schism evoked a great deal of newspaper and pamphlet controversy in England, and much more in India. Schoolmasters and catechists were frequently changing sides; and the congregations also were seesawing, while in some places both the factions had congregations side by side. Those with the Rhenius faction came to be known as *Melpaccatbar* (western side people) as they had their headquarters to the west of the river *Tamraparani*, while the CMS party, which continued in the church Compound, were known as the *Keelpaccathar* (eastern side people). There was some resort to violence, and a danger of prolonged litigation in connection with the property of the mission, however they were all amicably settled.¹²⁷ Later this schism was known as 'Rhenius schism.'

Rhenius continued his work for three more years in Tirunelveli. His ill health did not permit him to continue his work. Consequently, on 5th June, 1838 he entered into his eternal rest.¹²⁸ The schism ended with his death, after that Lechler had left the district in 1837 and joined LMS. Schafter, rejoined the CMS in September, 1838 and continued his mission in Tirunelveli district. Müller, the son-in-law of Rhenius, wanted to continue the newly established mission; however, after working for some time on his own, he found it very hard to manage. He worked with LMS for a while, then he rejoined CMS in May, 1840 with his congregations and the division in the church came to an end.¹²⁹

Conclusion

There were Lutheran missionaries who worked under Anglican Societies, but Rhenius was the one who was bold enough to express his view and to criticize the Anglican Order which, in his observation was not in accordance with the Word of God. He refused to perform anything, which he felt would be a hindrance to the local people. The controversy was actually not between the Lutherans and the Anglicans but between Rhenius, a Lutheran and the Anglican mission, which eventually ended up in a split. But the mission method which followed by Rhenius to stabilize the local congregation is still the backbone of the Tirunelveli Church. Still there are many Lutheran Pietistic elements existing in Tirunelveli Church which are introduced by Rhenius. After Rhenius, the Tirunelveli Church was under Anglicans and from 1947, it is under CSI. Tirunelveli Church is the product of Lutheran and Anglicans.

NOTES

1. On 12th April, 1799, the Society for missions to Africa and the East was established by some members of the Church of England, to help in the propagation of the Gospel in Africa and in the East. In 1812, the name had changed as Church Missionary Society (CMS). It represented private enterprise in missionary endeavour. It was associated with the Evangelical party in the Anglican Church. In 1814, it began its mission in South India. Until 1815, only German missionaries were working for CMS. A. Bagshaw, *The Founding of the Church Missionary Society, 1799* (Kottayam: Triple Jubilee Souvenir, 1966), 1. cf. W.S. Hunt, *The Anglican Church in Travancore and Cochin 1816-1916*, Vol.1, (Kottayam: CMS Press, 1920), 3. K.V. Eapen, *Church Missionary Society and Education in Kerala* (Kottayam: Kollett Publications, 1985), 10. H.C. Perumalil & E.R. Humbye, eds., *Christianity in India: A History in Ecumenical Perspective* (Alleppey: Kasm Publications, 1972), 225.
2. In 1698, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was formed, its Chief object being to provide Christian literature and to promote Christian education both at home and abroad. It was a non-church mission movement, mostly lay people. Charles Henry Robinson, *History of the Christian Missions* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1915), 58.
3. The Lutheran and Anglican relationship in south India was deeply influenced by certain political situation in London: Queen Ann (d. 1714) was an Anglican. But George, her husband, was a Lutheran from Denmark. The Anglican priests in London were unwilling to give Eucharist to a Lutheran. This was the reason that George appointed Anton Wilhelm Boehme as his personal chaplain. Boehme was educated in Halle, Germany. He helped Ziegenbalg and his successors until his death in 1722. Daniel L. Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England: Anthony William Boehm and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
4. J.Gnanaseelan Jacob Sundersingh, "The Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India: A Study of its Relationship to the Movements for Lutheran Unity, with Special Reference to TamilNadu and Andhrapradesh" (Unpublished M.Th. Thesis, Senate of Serampore College, 1992), 48.

D. ISAAC DEVADOSS

5. The purpose of Missionaries ordination in Denmark was to link them to the church in Denmark and to place them under an obligation to maintain in India the Danish way of doing things. Stephen Neill, *A History of Christianity in India, 1701-1858*, Vol.II/1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 117.
6. He was born at Pulsnitz, in Lusatia, on 24th June, 1683, studied at Halle, was ordained and arrived in India, landed at Tranquebar, 9th July, 1706. He was one of the first Royal Danish Missionaries, died at Tranquebar on 23rd February, 1719. J. Ferd Fenger, *History of the Tranquebar Mission*, second edition (Madras: M.E. Press, 1906), 239.
7. He was born at Wesenberg in Mecklenburg, studied at Halle, was ordained at Copenhagen. He came to India along with Ziegenbalg, left India in 1711, and died as pastor of Beyenflieth in Holstein, about 1746. *Ibid.*
8. Frank Penny, *The Church in Madras* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1904), 184. cf: Stephen Neill, *A History...*, pp.34-35.
9. M.E. Gibbs, *The Anglican Church in India 1600-1970*, (New Delhi: SPCK, 1972), 15.
10. Schultze, born at Sonnenburg, in Brandenburg; in 1689, studied at Halle. He landed at Madras on 25th July, 1719, was ordained at Tranquebar in 1720. In 1726, he left Tranquebar to Madras and from 1728, he became an official missionary of the SPCK. He went back to his home in 1743, and died at Halle on 25th November, 1760. Fenger, p.239.
11. Dal, born at Anslæt, in Sleswick (Denmark), on 2nd April, 1690, studied at Jena and Halle. Came to Tranquebar with Schultze, was ordained at Tranquebar, on 7th June, 1730, died on 5th May, 1747. *Ibid.*
12. Born at Burg, in Magdeburg, came out with Schultze and Dal in 1719. He died within two years, on 16th February, 1722. *Ibid.*, 240.
13. E.R. Beierlein, *The Land of the Tamilians and Its Mission*, translated by T.D.B. Gribble, Reprint (Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1995), 138. cf. Fenger, *op.cit.*, p.8.
14. Hugald Grafe, "Benjamin Schultze and the Beginnings of the First Indian Protestant Church in Madras" ICHR (June, 1967), pp.35-54.
15. *Ibid.*, 45. cf. Penny, p.199.
16. *Ibid.*, 46.
17. Born at Cleeberg, on 22nd January, 1711, studied at Giessen and Halle. He was ordained at Copenhagen in 1739, came to Tranquebar in 1740, and laboured there till 1742. He became B. Schultze's successor in Madras, died there in 1791. Fenger, *op.cit.*, p. 241.
18. Stephen Neill, *A History...*, p.43.
19. He was born at Berli, studied at Jena and Halle, was ordained in Wernigerode in 1731, arrived at Madras in 1732, went with Sartorius to Cuddalore in 1737, returned to Madras in 1743. He died on the way to Europe on the voyage in 1746. Fenger, p.240.
20. A. Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar* (Madras: CLS, 1956), 80.
21. Andreas Gross, "Lutheran Missionaries and their Relation to other Christians" (Unpublished, Presented in the Seminar, at Gurukul College, October, 2002), 2.
22. Stephen Neill, p.45.
23. He was born on 5th April, 1742, at Colberg in Pomerania, studied at Halle. He was ordained at Wernigerode in 1765, arrived at Tranquebar on 6th June, 1767, went to Cuddalore, laboured at various places, died at Vellore, on 2nd October, 1803. Fenger, p.248.
24. He was born at Sonnenburg in Brandenburg on 26th October, 1726, studied at Halle, was ordained at Copenhagen on 17th September, 1749, landed at Cuddalore on 30th July, 1750, laboured more than 11 years in Tranquebar, commenced the Mission in Tiruchirapalli, settled at Tanjore in 1778, he was associated with the SPCK from 1762 and he died in Tanjore on 13th February, 1798. Fenger, p.242.
25. R. Caldwell, *Records of the Early History of the Tinneveli Mission* (Madras: Higginbotham and Co., 1881), 23.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Stephen Neill, p.215.
28. James Hough, *The History of Christianity in India, Vol.III* (London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seely; Hatchard and; Nisbet and Co., 1845), 660.

29. Jaenicke was of Bohemian origin, but born at Berlin on 27th July, 1759. He studied at Halle. He arrived at Madras on 27th August, 1788. Caldwell, *Records of the Early History...*, p.79.
30. *Ibid.*, p.52.
31. *Ibid.*, p.64.
32. Surappan was a Roman Catholic, who embraced Protestantism and sent his son Sathianathan to Tranquebar to study the purer principles of the gospel. Within a few months Sathianathan led more than fifteen people to Christ and also prepared them for baptism. Seeing his enthusiasm to spread the gospel, missionaries appointed him as a Catechist in the Tanjore area. Hugh Pearson, *memories of the Life and Correspondence of the Reverend Christian Frederick Swartz* (New York: Appleton & Co., 1835), 28.
33. Hugh Pearson, *Memories of the Life and Correspondence of the Reverend Christian Frederick Swartz*. 3rd edition, Vol. II (London: J.Hatchard & Son, 1839), 156.
34. Caldwell, *Records of the Early History...*, p.60.
35. *Ibid.*, 61 cf. F. Hrangkhuma, ed., *Christianity in India: Search for Liberation and Identity* (Delhi: CMS & SPCK, 1998), 129.
36. LMS was founded in 1795. The founders were Anglican and Presbyterian clergies, then it was chiefly supported by members of Congregational Churches. They were not intended to establish any particular form of church order or government. Charles Henry Robinson, *History of Christian Mission* (Edinburg: T.&T. Clark, 1915), 478.
37. He was born at Scheidelwitz, in Silesia, in 1770, and studied at Halle. He was appointed as a missionary to Calcutta, by the SPCK in 1797, but he could not continue his mission work, the following year he abandoned the mission and returned to Europe and joined the London Missionary Society and was sent again to India. Caldwell, *Records of the Early History...*, p.124.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*, p.137.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Penny, p.199.
42. *Ibid.*, p.190.
43. Paul Appasamy, *The Centenary History of the C.M.S. in Tinnevely* (Palayamcottah: The Palamcotta Printing Press, 1923), 23-25.
44. J. Rhenius, *Memor of Rev. C.T.E. Rhenius* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1841), 173.
45. Hough, p.348.
46. He was born on 22nd June, 1767, at Wuterbausen, in Brandenburg. He studied at Halle, was ordained at Copenhagen in 1789, arrived at Tranquebar in 1791, where he was the only labourer for many years, died on 22nd October, 1837. Fenger, p.244.
47. *Ibid.*, p.177. cf. Stephen Neill, *A History...*, 214. Fenger. p.232.
48. *Ibid.*
49. And whereas it is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants... such as measures ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge and of religious improvement... so as the principles of the British government, on which natives of India have hitherto relied, for the free exercise of their religion, be inviolably maintained and whereas it is expedient to make provision for granting permission to persons desirous of going to or remaining in India for the above purpose... Victor Koilpillai, *The SPCK in India* (Delhi: ISPCK, 1985), 19.
50. *Ibid.*
51. Stephen Neill, p.262.
52. E.R. Beierlein, *The Land of the Tamilians and its Mission*, translated by T.D.B. Gribble, Reprint (Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1995), 157.
53. Paul Appasamy, p.58.
54. Stephen Neill, p.214.
55. Schreyvogel, born at Lindau, in Bavaria, on 16th January, 1777, was sent out as catechist to Tranquebar 1803, arrived in 1804, was ordained at Tranquebar in 1813, resigned and joined the English Church by re-ordination in 1826, died at Pondicherry on 16 January, 1840. Fenger, p.245.
56. *Ibid.*, p.508.
57. Gibbs, p. 61.

58. It is a Missionary Association in connection with the CMS, the chaplains who were ready to promote the views of the society were the members of the Corresponding Committee. The chief objects were, to collect, and supply to the society, information on subjects of the missionary nature, to act as friends and patrons of the society's missions and schools. To endeavour to raise funds, in aid of the general purpose of the Society, in the Madras Presidency. *Church Missionary Record, Detailing the Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society for the year 1830. Vol. 1* (London: Printed by Richard Watts), 78.
59. Western, p.142.
60. W. Taylor, *A Memoir of the First Centenary of the Earliest Protestant Mission at Madras* (Madras: The Asylum Press, 1847), 150.
61. Rhenius, p.25.
62. *Church Missionary Report, Vol. 1, 1830, 79.*
63. Cämmerer, born at Wusterbausen, in Brandenburg, on 22nd June, 1767, studied at Halle, was ordained at Copenhagen 1789, arrived at Tranquebar in 1791, and worked there till his death on 22nd October, 1837. Fenger, p.244.
64. Rhenius, p.28.
65. W. Taylor, p.202.
66. Stephen Neill, p.219.
67. Baierlein, p.219. cf. Rhenius, p.193.
68. *Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1820-1821* (London: L. B. Seeley and J. Hatchard and son, (P) Ltd., 1821), 142. cf. Rhenius, p.194.
69. Caldwell, *Records of the Early History of the Tinnevelly Mission*, p.200. cf. Rhenius, p.198.
70. D.S. George Müller, *The Birth of a Bishopric*, rpt. (Palayamkottai: Diocesan offset Press, 1992), 23.
71. Rhenius, p.198.
72. *Ibid.*, p.199.
73. *Ibid.*, p.233.
74. *Ibid.*, p.277.
75. *Ibid.*, p.284.
76. M.A. Sherring, p.322.
77. R. Caldwell, *Lectures on the Tinnevelly Mission Descriptive of the Field, the Work, and the Result: With an Introductory lecture on the Progress of Christianity in India* (London: Bell & Daldy, 1857) 53.
78. George Pettitt, *The Tinnevelly Mission of the Church Missionary Society* (London: Seeley, 1851), 102. cf. Paul Appasamy, p. 63.
79. J. Tucker, *A Review of the Tinnevelly Question* (Madras: The Church Mission Press, 1836), p.48.
80. *Ibid.*, p.49.
81. E.R. Baierlein, p.216.
82. J.L. Watty, ed., *Reminiscences of Bishop Caldwell* (Madurai: Addison & Co., 894), 227. cf. Caldwell, *Lecture on the Tinnevelly Mission*, 53. Paul Appasamy, p.63.
83. The Native Philanthropic Society consisted entirely of native Christians and the missionaries were handling the money. The Committee consisted of fourteen members beside the President, Secretary and the Accountant. The society's business was to care for the externals of the mission, such as lands for the settling of Christians and buildings for schools. *Church Missionary Record, 1835, Vol.6*, p.95. cf. George Pettit, p.108.
84. Jason S. Dharmaraj, "The History and Heritage of christianity in Tirunelveli Area" (Keynote address at a Consultation held at Palayamkottai from 23rd to 25th Oct. 1992) p.14. cf. Rhenius, p.312.
85. *Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society For Africa and the East*, pp.1833-1834, 140.
86. West was a Eurasian catechist stationed at Dohnavur.
87. Rhenius, p.465.
88. *Ibid.*, p.473.
89. R. Caldwell, *Lecture on the Tinnevelly Mission...*, p.120.
90. D.A. Christadoss, *Rhenius: The Apostle of Tirunelveli (Tamil)* (Palayamkottai: A Bethel Publication, 1976), 229.
91. *Church Missionary Record, 1835, Vol.6, p.102.*

LUTHERAN-ANGLICAN DIALOGUE IN 19TH CENTURY INDIA

92. Schoolmasters' schools were then 51 in number, situated within 40 miles of Palayamkottai. In this schools they gave important to Arithmetic, Catechism, Sacred History, and Scriptural passages to memory. Cf. *Church Missionary Record*, 1833, Vol. 4, 200.
93. Catechist's schools object was the instruction of the children belonging to the congregations. The same curriculums was followed, but the scripture was given more important. *Ibid.*, p.200.
94. Rajapalayam is 75 Km. Northwest from Palayamkottai.
95. *Church Missionary Record*, 1833, Vol. 4, 200. cf. Watty, p.227.
96. Rhenius, p.218.
97. *Ibid.*, p.220.
98. Sarojini Packiamuthu, "*Rhenius and Tamil*" (Paper presented in a Consultation on the History & Heritage of Christianity in Tirunelveli Area, Oct. 1992), 2. cf. Rhenius, p.299.
99. *Ibid.*, p.5.
100. Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Mission*, Revised by Owen Chadwick. 2nd Edition (England: Penguin Booke, 1986), 231.
101. *Ibid.*, p.468.
102. *Ibid.*, p.561.
103. Baierlein, p.220. cf. Rhenius, p.612.
104. *Ibid.*, pp.474-477.
105. "The native Christians were excluded from employment in government offices. A few Christians were employed as writers and translators or interpreters in the courts but this depended only on the gentlemen's will and were not expressly sanctioned by the authority of the government. The policy of the government allowed only Hindu and Mohammedans to be employed. The consequence was that even if a Christian be employed by the individual kindness of a magistrate, he was looked upon by the Hindus and Mohammedans with contempt as being there only by favour and sufferance and not by any right, such as they had. Thus, Christians were on this account despised and exposed to oppression."
 "Government defrayed the expenditure for the service of idols. When the huge car had to be drawn, the government sent out peons to force the people to come for the purpose, if the temples or the idols had been injured by time or weather, government paid the money for their repairs. The impression, which all this made upon the people, was that the company was the chief supporter of idolatry." *Ibid.*, pp.392-394.
106. *Ibid.*, p.320.
107. *Ibid.*, p.321.
108. "Rhenius' reply to the Secretary, Madras Corresponding Committee on October 10, 1827. As to the general principle, we know of no other regulation of the Committee's than that made eight or nine years ago. Viz. that the missionary shall not circulate or publish any tract or pamphlet without the previous sanction of the Committee; and the Committee will recollect that against this general principle, we have from the very beginning protested for reasons which we then fully stated. The Committee too, has at least tacitly admitted our project; and we have always adhered to our principle that a missionary has a right upon his own responsibility to circulate such tracts, as he thinks proper... Our whole proceedings during the last eight years have been fairly and faithfully made known to them; and since they were silent with respect to their earlier mentioned regulation, we took it for granted that they ceased to object to our principle... It is now too late to stop its publication; nor, under existing circumstances do we think this necessary."
 "This explanation will lead to the explicit answers to your two queries. To the first, we reply that we were not under the impression that the Committee had prohibited or rather that they continued to prohibit the publication of all documents of this kind, until their approbation had previously been obtained. We were indeed fully persuaded that they had given up their old rule. To the second, we answer that we have therefore not violated their instructions in the present instance since the Committee are fully aware of our protest against the general principle before stated; and this protest you will observe has no modification whatever." *Ibid.*, p.322.
109. Stephen Neill, 218. Rhenius, p.255.
110. *Ibid.*, p. 299.
111. "1) The translation ought to be made from the original languages and not merely from another version. 2) The translation ought not to be literal; but the idiom both of the originals and of the

- language into which they are translated should be carefully attended to. 3) In countries where there is so great a difference between the language of the learned and of the unlearned as among the Hindus, the translation of the Bible ought to be made neither according to the style of the one, nor according to that of the other; but the middle path should be kept between the two. 4) Passages which have been obscurely or incorrectly rendered in former translations should not be so rendered in new versions if their sense can be more clearly made out upon just evidence." *Ibid.*, p. 300.
112. "The candidates must wait for the arrival of the bishop, who was in Calcutta that time, and had to be ordained by him only. Before the ordination they had to accept that the Common Prayer Book, the Articles, the Homilies, and the Canons were all in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and should be obliged to use the form of worship prescribed in the Common Prayer Book only and no other." *Ibid.*, p.300.
113. Paul Richter, p.93. cf. Stephen Neill, p.220. Paul Appasamy, p.60.
114. The reasons were: 1) A sense of their inability and insufficiency for it. 2) Their being obliged to subscribe the swear to things, which they do not know; for instance, the Homilies and the Canons, both were not translated into Tamil. 3) Their being obliged to subscribe and swear to what they cannot conscientiously approve viz. that the 'Common Prayer Book', the 'Articles', the 'Homilies', and the 'Canons' are all accordant with the Holy scriptures. This they find, so far as they can examine them, not to be the case; for instance,
In the service of Children's baptism, baptism is stated to be regeneration; a cross is to be made on the child's forehead; sponsors are to answer in the child's name; the presence of parents is unnecessary. In the Catechism, where it is declared that the child is, in baptism made a member of Christ, the child of God and inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.
In the visitation of the sick, where the minister is made to say, I absolve thee from all thy sins.
In the Creed, where Christ is said to have descended into hell.
IN the Ordination Service, where the bishop is made to give the Holy spirit, by laying on of his hands and to charge the ordained with the power of forgiving sins.
These things they cannot find in the scripture; and they are calculated to mislead persons with respect to the truth as it is in Jesus.
4) Their being obliged to promise to use the form of worship prescribed in the Common Prayer only, and no other. This, likewise, is neither scriptural nor tending to edification, especially in this country, the mere reading of the whole service is not only by far too long but also it is always the same, it is calculated to make even the excellent prayers contained in it to be disregarded. *Ibid.*, pp.381-382.
115. It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike; for in all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. *Ibid.*, p.383.
116. *Ibid.*, p.479.
117. An English clergyman in Madras. Editor of religious news paper, a member of the Madras Corresponding Committee and Secretary of the Missionary Committee. E.R. Baierlein, p.224.
118. Paul Appasamy, p.61.
119. Rhenius, 501. E.R. Baierlein, p.223.
120. *Ibid.*, pp.63-69.
121. *Ibid.*, p.480.
122. *Ibid.*, p.481.
123. E.R. Baierlein, p.225. Tucker argued that there had been sufficient evidence to prove that not a single congregation invited Rhenius to come back to Tirunelveli. J. Tucker, *A Review of the Tinnevely Question* (Madras: The Church Mission Press, 1836), 75.
124. George Pettit, p.125. cf. Rhenius, p.496.
125. Paul Appasamy, p.64.
126. Rhenius, p.511. cf. Stephen Neill, p.221.
127. Paul Appasamy, p.64.
128. Rhenius, p.617.
129. Paul Appasamy, p.63.