

Poetry.

TO THE HEART'S-EASE.

Fair flower, canst thou tell why a gentle name
 Attends on thy beauty—is linked with thy fame?
 What charm for the sorrowful heart canst thou work?
 What spells for the soul "neath thy bright petals lurk?"
 When the thick sombre shades of the deepening night
 'Gain to drowsily darken the evening's light,
 When the soul lives in dreams, dost thou, as a fay,
 Leave thy Eden-like home—and away, away.

To the pillow where sleep lies in silence dead,
 And when thou art this bring bright tales in the ear,
 Do the days that are gone to the soul return?
 Does the heart for the long-lost friend then burn?

Among the bright gems round the Flower Queen's throne,
 Didst thou think thee, methinks, the likeliest one?
 To brighten the heart in the midst of its gloom?
 The tree that is dead canst thou freshen with bloom?

Did she in thy form a resemblance trace
 Between thee and the heart: when she gazed in thy face,
 Did she spy a bright dew-drop lingering 'neath
 Those eyelids, which quiver'd when touch'd by the breath
 Of the heedless zephyr?—Did Flora then say
 "Twas a glittering tear in the eye of her fay?"
 First because thou art tender and kind, sweet flower,
 Then, least thy home in the green leafy bowers?

Does thy beauty possess so magic a charm,
 That the heart, though cold, with a glance it can warm?
 Oh tell me, fair thing, why the tenderest name
 In the garden-bower, is linked with thy fame?

The fair flower blush'd till the purple burn'd
 Its modest cheek—and thus returned:
 As silent I rest in the spot where you've found me,
 With sisters so fair springing up all around me,
 Can I but be happy? The dew-drop I sip—
 With glory the sunbeams my bright petals dip;
 In the tiny form of the tender heart's-ease,
 Man happiness, joy, and contentment sees.

When the gliding winds touch my lowly bloom,
 Their invisible wings I load with perfume,—
 Thus God has ordain'd that mortals may find
 His mercy and love in the murmuring wind.

Thus—the sweet breath of the tender heart's-ease,
 God's mercy and care for him man ever sees.

The brightest most fade—to the minstrel sung:
 The sweetest he lost where its sweetness was flung.
 I droop, and my beauty for ever is gone;
 I fall, and my green leaves for ever are flown;
 For man, there's a world that is brighter I ween,
 Its flowers ever abiding—its fields ever green;
 In a man may find how much brighter his lot
 Than the flower that dies, then for aye is forgot.

—Nottingham Journal.

LABOURS OF THE EARLY MISSIONARIES IN AMERICA.

(From the *British Magazine*.)

[Continued from "The Church" of Nov. 29.]

GEORGIA.

The Colony of Georgia, projected with much political wisdom as a barrier for the southern states against the encroachments of the Spaniards, was established in the year 1733, and it was the last colony founded by Great Britain in America. The administration of it was committed, for a limited time, to a corporation of trustees; one of whom, General Oglethorpe, an active and enterprising man, went out with the first body of colonists, and immediately after his arrival, proceeded to lay the foundation of the city of Savannah.

The trustees rightly considered it a part of their duty to provide for the spiritual superintendence of their settlers, as well as for the instruction and conversion of the natives; and in looking out for clerical men duly qualified for the discharge of this important duty, their attention was naturally directed to the Rev. John Wesley and his companions at Oxford. These men had acquired celebrity without seeking it, by their self-denial, the regularity of their lives, and their charity to the suffering and the afflicted. Dr. Burton, at that time President of Corpus Christi College, was one of the trustees, and being well acquainted with Mr. Wesley, introduced him to General Oglethorpe, who at once proposed to him the mission to Georgia. Wesley at first declined the offer, partly on the ground that his acceptance of it would be a sore grief to his mother; but when, on the question being referred to her, that noble woman answered, "Had I twenty sons, I should rejoice that they were all so employed, though I should never see them more," his objections were overcome, and he consented to go. None of his biographers mention the circumstance of his having been formally proposed to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and approved by that Society, as a missionary to Georgia. Yet such was undoubtedly the case, as appears by the following entry in its journal of December 19, 1735:

"A memorial of the trustees for establishing the colony of Georgia in America was read, setting forth that the Rev. Mr. Samuel Quincy, to whom the Society had been pleased, upon their recommendation, to allow a salary of fifty pounds per annum, by letter certified to the said trustees, that he is desirous of leaving the colony of Georgia, and returning home to England in the month of March next, to which they have agreed; and the said trustees recommended the Rev. Mr. John Wesley to the Society, that they would allow to him the said fifty pounds per annum, from the time Mr. Quincy shall leave the said colony, in the same manner that Mr. Quincy had it."

Agreed, that the Society do approve of Mr. Wesley as a proper person to be a missionary at Georgia, and that fifty pounds per annum be allowed to Mr. Wesley from the time Mr. Quincy's salary shall cease.

Unlike many who, though at heart really devoted to their Great Master's service, have yet felt the full sacrifice they were making in leaving home and kindred, to preach the gospel in strange lands, Wesley regarded the mission to America as a favourable opportunity for withdrawing from the temptations of the world, and reducing his ascetic principles to practice. His reply to a scoffer, who taunted him with the Quixotism of his project, and the madness of leaving a good provision for life and the prospect of preferment for the purpose of converting savages in America, deserves a place in every history of missions: "Sir," he said, "if the bible be not true, I am as very a fool and madman as you can conceive; but if it be of God, I am sober-minded. For he has declared, 'There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.' (St. Luke, xviii, 29, 30.) His principal motive in undertaking the mission was, as he himself stated in writing to a friend, October 10, 1735, "the hope of saving his own soul." He hoped to learn the true sense of the gospel of Christ by preaching it to the heathen. "They have no comments," said he, "to construe away the text." Even his short experience, however, in America, sufficed to convince him of his error in supposing that he should find the Indians predisposed and ready to receive the truth. He, with his friends Delamotte and Ingham, embarked at Gravesend on the 14th of October, 1735. They submitted themselves to a singularly severe rule of life during the voyage, allotting each hour to its appropriate duty of public and private prayer, study, and the instruction and exhortation of the crew. After nearly four months so spent, they anchored in the Savannah River, on the 6th of February, 1736.

On the following morning they landed on a small uninhabited island, where Mr. Oglethorpe led them to a rising ground, and they all knelt and returned thanks to God for having arrived in safety. "No sooner had he entered on his missionary work, than he

found that the bad examples of his countrymen were a serious obstacle to the conversion of the natives. The fraud, violence, and drunkenness of professed Christians, were, as the poor heathen would judge, the fruits of Christianity; and it is no wonder, therefore, that they were prejudiced against it. With his European congregation, Wesley insisted on an exact compliance with the rubric, adopting all those practices which are popularly considered in our own day as savouring of Popery, or at the best as mere forms. Thus, he baptized children by immersion, allowed none but communicants to be sponsors, catechised the children after the second lesson in the afternoon, refused the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to Dis-senters, unless previously admitted into the Church, and would not read the funeral service over any who had not been duly baptized.

Along, however, with this strict discipline of the Church, Wesley introduced certain other supplementary practices, which seem rather to belong to the system which he afterwards established. He formed the more serious members of his flock into a little society, who agreed to meet once or twice during the week, for the purposes of mutual edification, and from these again, he selected a smaller number for closer spiritual communion.

In all this it will be seen, that he was acting as the minister of an English congregation, not as missionary to the heathen. In the latter capacity, he seems to have done literally nothing, and, indeed, to have wanted the patience and perseverance which are indispensably requisite to success. After, therefore, labouring with abundant zeal and devotion, but little of judgment and discretion, for about one year and nine months in Georgia, he embarked (December 22, 1737) on his return to his own country, in which he was destined to play a more conspicuous and successful part. During his stay, he had certainly exhibited many essential qualities of a missionary—remarkable self-denial, a readiness to endure hardness, "for he frequently slept on the ground, sometimes waded through swamps, or swam over rivers, and then travelled till his clothes were dry," and a rare disinterestedness. It appears from the records of the Society, that his first design "was to receive nothing of any man but food to eat and raiment to put on, and those in kind only, that he might avoid, as far as in him lay, worldly desires and worldly cares; but being afterwards convinced by his friends that he ought to consider the necessities of his flock as well as his own, he thankfully accepted that bounty of the Society which he needed not for his own personal subsistence."

It is a singular fact, that the ship which brought Wesley into the Downs passed one outward-bound, which had on board another remarkable man, just commencing his voyage, for the very mission which Wesley had abandoned. The latter, as soon as he knew that Whitfield was aboard the vessel which had just set sail, and "doubting whether his friend would be so usefully employed in America as in England," found means to send after him the following note:—"When I saw God by the wind which was carrying you out brought me in, I asked counsel of God, (by which is to be understood, that he referred the question to chance, and drew lots); His answer you have inclosed." It was on a slip of paper, in these words: "Let him return to London." But Whitfield was not a man to be diverted from his settled purpose by a mere fanciful superstition, and therefore proceeded on his voyage. As he was in no way connected with the Society, (though frequently mentioned in the correspondence of its missionaries), a very brief reference to his visits to America is all that can be expected in these Notices. On the first occasion, his stay was limited to a few months, for he arrived in May 1738, and was back in London again before the end of the year. For the short time he remained, however, it appears that he was indefatigable in the discharge of his professional duties,—saying prayers and preaching twice every week-day, and four times on Sunday.

He returned to Georgia in 1739, after a tour of preaching in the northern states, in which he created the most powerful sensation. Whitfield's great work in America was the foundation of an orphan house. A plot of ground, containing 500 acres, at the distance of ten miles from Savannah, had been selected for the purpose, of which Whitfield took formal possession on the 24th of January, 1740, and immediately commenced the building of his institution, to which he gave the name of Bethesda. The necessary funds he collected after sermons, which he preached in all parts of the states to immense congregations. The reports of the Society make mention of the "wild doings of enthusiasm" that, in consequence of the preaching of Whitfield and his followers, many illiterate persons pretended a call to exercise publicly their gifts of praying and preaching, inasmuch that tailors, shoemakers, and not only women, but boys and girls, had become, (as their term is) *exhorters*. And although, undoubtedly, much distraction must have arisen from the prevailing fanaticism, it is reported to have had the effect of directing the attention of the more serious to the Liturgy of the Church, and bringing many considerable families, especially at *Stratford*, within its pale.

On the petition of the trustees, the Rev. W. Morris was appointed missionary to Savannah in 1740, and the Rev. Mr. Bosworth to Frederica in 1743.

The latter states that the people had been too long as sheep without a shepherd, and driven to and fro with every wind of doctrine, and that he was using his best efforts to lay the foundations of the true faith by catechising the children. To encourage him in this course, the Society sent out to him a parcel of necessary books. He did not, however, remain long in the mission, but was succeeded in 1745 by the Rev. Mr. Zouberbugler, who, two years after his arrival, reported the number of inhabitants in Savannah at 602, and of communicants at fifty-seven. A schoolmaster, by name Otolenghi, "A very serious and devout convert from Judaism," was added to the mission in 1750; and the Rev. Jonathan Copp was sent out as missionary to Augusta.

In 1758, the Assembly passed an act for dividing the province into eight parishes, and recognizing the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.

It were little purpose to recite the names of the missionaries who were appointed in succession in Georgia. The Rev. Mr. Frink, in 1765, reports that the lower sort of people in Augusta had but little religion, and that public worship was kept up principally by a few gentlemen and their families; in 1767, he was removed to Savannah. Mr. Ellington, who succeeded him at Augusta, informed the Society that there was not one place of worship of any denomination within one hundred miles of him any way. That he did what he could to remedy this evil, generally setting out on a Monday and travelling thirty or forty miles, performing divine service at three different places, ten miles wild of each other, on the three following days, and returning home on Friday. Within a short time after his arrival at his mission, he had baptized 178 children and two adults.

Just before his death, in 1771, Mr. Frink sent to the Society the following ecclesiastical returns of Savannah:—

Church of England	1185
Lutherans	193
Presbyterians and Independents	499
Jews	49
Negroes	40
Infidels	30—1996

* Moore's Life of Wesley, vol. i. p. 307.
 † Journal of S. P. G., vol. vii. p. 261.
 ‡ Phillip's Life of Whitfield.
 § Abstract of Proceedings, 1742.

In the last half-year he had baptized eighty-three infants, and added ten communicants. And however slight the record which we may have of their labours, it is to be remembered that the Missionaries in their several stations throughout America, were in like manner daily ministering God's holy Word and Sacraments, and sowing everywhere, under much discouragement, that seed of the Church which has since sprung up and borne fruit abundantly.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IN ITS EPISCOPACY.

CHAPTER IX.—PART III. IGNAZIUS.

Clear and decisive extracts from his Epistles in favour of Episcopacy.—Bishops were known when Ignatius wrote, proved from Catholic testimony.—The heresies only of his age noted by him.—The gifts of grace then vouchsafed to the Church.—Imitates the writings of St. Paul, as being best known to the Asian Churches.

What then saith the Holy Ignatius on behalf of Episcopal Government, and of those three Orders in the Ministry which our book of Common Prayer in the Preface to the Ordination Services of the Church, states to have been observed in the primitive ages of Christianity?

In his Epistles to the Ephesians, the people of that Church "most deservedly happy," and by him, "much beloved in God"—after beseeching them to love, by Jesus Christ, their Bishop Onesimus, and all to strive to be like unto him—for "blessed be God who has granted unto you, who are so worthy of him, to enjoy such an excellent bishop"—he proceeds to write to them concerning their Deacon Burrhus (whom he afterwards to the Smyrnaeans calls "a pattern of the ministry of God," in these remarkable words, in which the three Orders of Bishop, Priest and Deacon, are plainly made manifest:

"For what concerns my fellow-servant, Burrhus, and your most blessed deacon in things pertaining to God, I entreat you that he may tarry longer, both for yours and for your bishop's honour. And Crocus also, worthy both of our God and you, whom I have received as the pattern of your love, has in all things refreshed me as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ shall also refresh him; together with Onesimus and Burrhus, and Euplus, and Fronto, in whom I have, as to your charity, seen all of you. And may I always have joy of you, if I shall be worthy of it. It is, therefore, fitting that you should by all means glorify Jesus Christ who hath glorified you, that by a uniform obedience ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, and may all speak the same things concerning every thing; and that being subject to your bishop and the presbytery, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified." (Epist. to the Ephes. Sect. 2.) Again: "It will become you to run together according to the will of your bishop, as also ye do. For your famous presbytery (worthy of God) is fitted as exactly to the bishop as the strings are to the harp." (Sect. 4.) And again he speaks to the same people of "Obeying your bishop and the presbytery with an entire affection;" and tells them, "It is evident we ought to look upon the bishop even as we would do upon the Lord himself." (Sect. 6—20.)

To the Magnesians he writes: "Seeing then I have been judged worthy to see you by Damas your most excellent bishop, and by your very worthy presbyters, Bassus and Apollonius, and by my fellow-servant Sotio the deacon, in whom I rejoice, forasmuch as he is subject unto his bishop as to the grace of God, and to the presbytery as to the law of Jesus Christ, I determined to write unto you." (Sect. 2.)

Again: "Forasmuch, therefore, as I have in the persons before mentioned seen all of you in faith and charity, I exhort you that ye study to do all things in a divine concord; your bishop presiding in the place of God; your presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles; and your deacons, most dear to me, being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before all ages, and appeared in the end to us." (Sect. 6.)

And again: "Study, therefore, to be confirmed in the doctrine of our Lord and of His Apostles, that so whatsoever ye do ye may prosper both in body and spirit; in faith and charity; in the Son and in the Father and in the Holy Spirit; in the beginning and in the end; together with your most worthy bishop and the well-wrought spiritual crown of your presbytery, and your deacons which are according to God. Be subject to your bishop and to one another, as Jesus Christ to the Father according to the flesh, and the Apostles both to Christ and to the Father, and to the Holy Ghost; that so ye may be united both in body and spirit." (Sect. 13.)

To the Trallians he writes: "For whereas ye are subject to your bishop as to Jesus Christ, ye appear to me to live not after the manner of men, but according to Jesus Christ, who died for us, that so, believing in his death, ye might escape death. It is, therefore, necessary that, as ye do, so without your bishop you should do nothing; also be ye subject to your presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our hope, in whom, if we walk, we shall be found in him. The deacons also, as being the ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, must by all means please all; for they are not the ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of God; whereas they must avoid all offences, as they would do fire." (Sect. 2.)

"In like manner let all reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ; and the bishop as the Father; and the presbyters as the Sanhedrin of God, and college of the Apostles. Without these there is no Church; concerning all which I am persuaded that ye think after the very same manner; for I have received, and even now have with me, the pattern of your love in your bishop; whose very look is instructive; and whose mildness powerful: whom I am persuaded the very atheists themselves cannot but reverence." (Sect. 3.)

Again: "Wherefore guard yourselves against such persons: and that you will do if you are not puffed up; but continue inseparable from Jesus Christ our God, and from your bishop, and from the commands of the Apostles. He that is within the altar is pure; but he that is without, that is, that does any thing without the bishop, and presbyters, and deacons, is not pure in his conscience." (Sect. 7.)

In the Epistle to the Romans we have mention only of a bishop. The martyr says, "Wherefore ye cannot do me a greater kindness than to suffer me to be sacrificed unto God, now that the altar is already prepared; that when ye shall be gathered together in love, ye may give thanks to the Father through Jesus Christ, that he has vouchsafed to bring a Bishop of Syria unto you, being called from the East unto the West." (Sect. 2.)

Again: "Remember in your prayers the Church of Syria, which now enjoys God by His Shepherd instead of me: let Jesus Christ only preside over it as bishop." (Sect. 9.)

Like this passage better, says an able writer in an eminent publication,* because it affirms nothing, but leaves every thing to be inferred; and several things very material to our present purpose may be inferred from it. First, in the beginning of the second century, a city like Antioch must have had many presbyters, but the province of Syria many more. Secondly, in the absence of Ignatius, the Church of Syria had no bishop but God. Thirdly, had Ignatius been only a presiding presbyter, any of his brethren might have supplied his place while absent. Fourthly, Pastor, in the Latin language, and ποιμήν (a shepherd) in the

Greek, are always used by the early Fathers to denote what we mean by the word bishop, though *επισκοπος* is frequently used in another sense; but *επισκοπος* in this place is plainly synonymous with ποιμήν. Fifthly, the same office of supreme bishop is here in direct terms ascribed to the Father and the Son. In the apprehension of Ignatius, therefore, they were one.

To the Smyrnaeans, he writes, "See that ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father; and the presbytery, as the Apostles; and reverence the deacons, as the command of God. Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the Church separately from the bishop. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the bishop, or by him to whom the bishop has given his consent. Whosoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." (Sect. 8.)

Again, "I salute you very worthy bishop, and your venerable presbytery, and your deacons, my fellow-servants, and all of you in general, and every one in particular, in the name of Jesus Christ, and in his flesh and blood; in his passion and resurrection, both fleshly and spiritually, and in the unity of God with you. Grace be with you, and patience, for evermore." (Sect. 12.)

In the beginning of his Epistle to the Philadelphians, he says, that "He knew their bishop to be promoted to his public office in the Church, neither by himself, nor by men, nor through ambition; but by the love of God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." Then having cautioned them against divisions, he adds: "Whoever belongs to God and Jesus Christ, is with the bishop; and they who repent, and return to the unity of the Church, shall be God's, that they may live according to Jesus Christ. Be not deceived, my brethren: if any man follows one who divides the Church, he shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

"Wherefore, let it be your endeavour to partake all of the same Holy Eucharist: for there is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup, in the unity of his blood: one altar: as also there is one bishop, together with his presbytery, and the deacons, my fellow-servants: that so whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of God." (Sect. 1, 3, 4.)

Again, "For although some would have deceived me according to the flesh, yet the spirit, being from God, is not deceived; for it knows both whence it comes, and whither it goes, and reproves the secrets of the heart. I cried whilst I was among you, I spoke with a loud voice: attend to the bishop, and to the presbytery, and to the deacons. Now some supposed that I spoke thus as foreseeing the division that should come among you. But he is my witness for whose sake I am in bonds, that I knew nothing from any man: but the Spirit spake, saying in this wise, 'do nothing without the bishop: keep your bodies as the temples of God: love unity: flee divisions: be the followers of Christ, as he was of his Father.'"

To St. Polycarp he writes, after exhorting him to "make it his endeavour to preserve unity." "Hearken unto the bishop, that God also may hearken unto you. My soul be security for them that submit to their bishop with their presbyters and deacons; and may my portion be together with theirs in God. Labour with one another: contend together, run together, suffer together; sleep together, and rise together: as the stewards, and assessors, and ministers of God." (Sect. 6.)

And with this exhortation to perfect unity and labours in the cause of Christ, we close our extracts from that St. Ignatius who died cheerfully for the Lord Jesus. No one can read his Epistles without observing that Episcopacy is plainly declared; but not more plainly declared than is the doctrine of the Trinity, of Christian love, and of all things being done only through Jesus Christ. This plainness must necessarily startle those religionists who reject Episcopacy, but for they are themselves responsible, and we decline to judge any man's motives.

It must be recollected that Ignatius was waited upon in his journey to martyrdom by deputations of bishops, priests, and deacons; and it is a fact that the bishops mentioned by him, are known by other historical evidences to have been bishops at that time of the several places mentioned. That any impostor could have inserted such passages is before all things improbable and impossible; for the very internal evidence from the context manifests any thing but the language of such a character; if such could have been found, he must have been a hypocrite in the superlative degree, and such a man would never have cared about the Holy Epistles of Ignatius, much less have so endeavoured to give such condemning Epistles to his craft a paramount importance.

The above testimonies are clear and decisive, and no man should venture to doubt the genuineness of the seven Epistles of St. Ignatius, before he has read diligently Bishop Pearson's conclusive work on the subject. Bishop Hoadley remarks that Bishop Pearson has proved the case entirely to the satisfaction of impartial judges; and the late Dr. Burton, one of the most eminent divines of modern times, has said, that this learned man has exhausted all the argument in the matter, that nothing more is left to be said; and whether his reasonings be conclusive or not, let the candid and intelligent reader judge. The Bishop (not a bishop when he wrote the work) in an admirable spirit of the deepest research, adduces outward arguments from testimony such as Polycarp, Irenæus, and a multitude of others, who mention and quote from his Epistles; and inward arguments from the arguments of his adversaries from the testimonies they attempted to adduce, until they are compelled to make such concessions, and to appear so fully convicted of unfairness and narrowness in their investigations, as at once to shew the shallowness of their objections.

He proves that no other Epistles than these could have been understood by St. Polycarp; brings forward Irenæus, Chrysostom and others, shewing how many authors within two centuries give testimony to St. Ignatius's views and writings; and he defends the testimony of Eusebius, overthrowing at once the assertions that they were not known to Tertullian, Caius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Julius Africanus, Lactantius, Dionysius Alexandrinus; and entirely refutes the negative argument. From internal evidence he collects that they were written about A.D. 107; and to shew how the adversaries differ, and from what unstable sources they derive their varied opinions, it may be well to state that while a modern anti-episcopalian writer makes them to be no older than the fourth or fifth century, the more learned adversaries agree in placing them two or three centuries earlier. Blondet dates them at the end of the second century: and Salmassius at least fifty years before.

But from Pearson it clearly appears that the material of the Epistles agrees exactly with the age in which Ignatius lived: and that there is nothing in them which concerns a later age, especially the age in which Daille would place them; there is nothing concerning the heresies in that or any other wrongly imputed age; nothing concerning the manners and institutions of Christianity then greatly changed; nothing concerning the new customs first begun after the death of Ignatius; nothing concerning the practice of the Church which after his age first obtained; for all things notwithstanding Ignatius are clearly at variance with these, while they are entirely agreeable to the times nearest to the Apostolic age. They in no wise savour of an impostor of the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century; exhibit no indications of imposture; they regard no rite of the Church which arose after the death of the martyr, none of the heresies, teach no

doctrine diverse to the minds of the Apostles, adduce nothing of any foreign nature or from the Platonic school in which others afterwards erred; but preserve a primitive and purely evangelical simplicity in all things correspondent closely with the character of this Apostolic and illustrious man and martyr, as every where given; and paint in vivid colours the proofs of large gifts of the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to one who had for a long time been a bishop, and who had received and extended the Christian religion in a spirit purely Christian, at a time and in places where few of the learned Heathens had become converted to Christianity.

As regards our question in particular, the question of Episcopacy, no Christian and Catholic writer has ever said that there were less than three degrees in the ministry of the Church in any part of the second century, that century in which Ignatius lived. Beyond all controversy there were Bishops in Asia when Ignatius hastened to his martyrdom; and Ignatius himself grants to the bishop the bare name of his office or order, giving him no more superior title than such as of "High Priest," "Ruler," &c. as those who came after him commonly did. He barely and simply distinguishes ecclesiastical offices by their names and functions; he acknowledges only three sacred Orders, omitting any mention of Ordination, Election, or Succession. No prerogative of any Episcopalian See is depicted, no application given to any Church in preference to others, no obedience exacted than that which is necessary for the avoidance of schism and the conservation of the unity of the Church. He grants to each Order its own honour and dignity, never derogating from one that he may serve another, and thus never depressing the order of presbyters whom he always joins with the bishop, but zealously defends their dignity and authority; while, at the end of the third, or the beginning of the fourth century, as the opposites confess, the authority of the presbyters became much diminished. If we look over all the writings of those ages, we find nothing so honourably spoken of them. These writings of Ignatius, then, are not consistent with the treatment of a later age, and he would be insane who should bring forward these Epistles to confirm Episcopal encroachment, or to do other than restate and restore the afterward diminished dignity and statutes of the presbyters.

Again, Ignatius notices only the heresies which we well know to have obtained in that age in which we believe he lived and wrote. "These were the two grand ones respecting the nature of Christ—the one of the Docete, destructive of the human nature in Christ; the other of the Ebionites, denying the divine nature and eternal generation of the Son, and urging the ceremonies of the law. Ancient writers recognise these heresies of the first age, both arising in St. John's time, and all confess that they flourished too vigorously in the time of Ignatius and especially in Asia. The proof of this is extensive, and can be relied on, and extracts given from Theodoret, Dionysius, Epiphanius, &c. Eusebius described and copied the Epistles of Ignatius with so great care and labour, because to him they seemed to preserve the Apostolic tradition—tradition which Ignatius, as a contemporary of the Apostles, and receiving evangelical doctrine from them, would consign to his writings, and wish the Church earnestly to receive; but still asserts that his Epistles are not to be regarded as a store-house of unwritten traditions, for that he delivers to us no oral tradition, whether truly or falsely called Apostolic, in his undoubtedly genuine Epistles. There is nothing in them concerning Festivals, nor stated seasons of Fasting, nothing in the manner of celebrating the Paschal Feast, nothing of the observance of the Sabbath nor Pentecost, nothing of any rite, the antiquity of which could be called in question: and no one can credit the idea that an impostor of the third century would have abstained from all the commonly received usages of his own age; and therefore we perceive that these writings suit none but the times in which Ignatius lived; nothing destroying the authenticity and genuineness of a writer and his productions more than the detection of anachronisms.

Again, Ignatius makes mention of the gifts of grace at that period vouchsafed to the Church, and of the Holy Spirit speaking to himself, which later writers are not accustomed to do. In his salutation to the Smyrnaeans, he supposes this extraordinary gift to be in others, and in his Epistle to the Philadelphians (Sect. 7), as we have already seen, he intimates that it was in himself, as also in his Epistle to the Trallians. St. Clement is strong upon this point, as well as Justin Martyr, one of the most ancient writers after him. It is observed also that he makes use sparingly of the testimonies of the Sacred Scriptures, usually imitating the writings of St. Paul, which from the beginning were the most received in all the Churches. He sparingly quotes the Gospels which were received in later times, and distinguished from the spurious writings; and which the writers at the end of the second and of the third century make most frequent use of.

CONSEQUENCES OF SETTING PREACHING ABOVE PRAYING.

(By the Rev. F. W. Fowler, Perpetual Curate of Amesbury, Wiltshire.)

The distinguishing character of the house of God is, that it is the house of prayer. But Christians of the present day make the house of God much more an house of preaching than of prayer. Am I asked for a proof of this assertion? Look at the difference in number, in the congregations everywhere, when there is a sermon, and when there are only the prayers of the church. Every person who duly looked upon the house of God as the house of prayer—that his chief business was to pray—would come there for that purpose; and the circumstance, whether or not there were a sermon, would not affect his attendance. This is one undeniable evidence to what I was saying—that in the present day, our churches are considered more as houses of preaching than of prayer. Listen to the common language of Christians on the subject, in their conversation with one another: they talk of the preacher they are going to hear, not of the church they are going to pray in. The sermon seems to be everything—the prayers nothing. The same fact is confirmed by the very expression, commonly made use of, "sittings in a church"—such a church is calculated to contain so many sittings—and a still more striking corroboration is afforded, by the most unbecoming and erroneous procedure—that in some of our modern churches no room has been allowed for kneeling. And surely this is a pretty strong confirmation of what I am saying—that the houses of God, in our time, are generally considered rather as houses of preaching than of prayer; and therefore, that we do not regard them in the same estimation in which our blessed Lord and the prophet held them; for they pronounced them to be houses of prayer, not of preaching.

Now, then, let us see what are some of the consequences of thus exalting preaching above prayer. The first and most awful one is, that we do not pray. I mean, that the greater proportion of our congregations are not actuated by a spirit of prayer: we are not praying people generally: it cannot be said of us, in the sense in which the Lord himself spoke of the converted Paul—"Behold, he prayeth" (Acts, ix. 11). Many pray not at all; bear no part in the service, make no response; say not to themselves the prayers which the minister offers up aloud for himself and the people, nor so much as utter their "amen" at the end of them. And if these persons do not come to pray, they come either to hear the sermon or as a mere mat-

ter of form, because, for very shame's sake, they do not like always to stay away. Does any one ask for a proof of this assertion, too—that the congregation generally do not pray when they come to church? Take that which I have already given. If they come to the house of God to pray, why do they not come when there is the service of the church without the sermon? and, with respect to those who do not so come, it is a fair assumption that, when they come, they do not pray. Another evidence—to my mind a very convincing one—that people, generally, do not pray, is, that so few of them kneel. I know that some persons cannot do so from illness, or some infirmity, and that others cannot from want of room in their pews: to these, of course, my present remarks do not apply; they best know their own hindrances, and will, if properly impressed on the subject, agree in opinion with me, and feel it to be a real and no trifling source of regret to them, that they are not able to carry out their principle in their practice. Some persons, too, consider standing to be an attitude of prayer. We hear of the Pharisee and the publican both standing, when the one professed to be, and the other really was, praying (Luke xviii. 11, 13). And, certainly, standing is not such a graceless and prayerless attitude for the supplicating sinner as sitting; but how a strong, healthy person, who can go about his business, or his pleasure, or any of the active concerns of life, during the six days of the week, can sit and pray in the house of God on the seventh, I cannot comprehend. I am sure this is not the way in which a man would pray for his life: I am sure this is not the way in which a father would pray for a son condemned to death: I am sure this is not the way in which a man would pray to God, if he prayed at all, for a sick child, or some sick friend whom he loved as his own soul: I am sure this is not the way in which our Saviour said they were to pray, who would obtain power over unclean and evil spirits (Matt. xvii. 14, 21). We know that this was not the way in which that Saviour himself prayed, when he was in an agony in the garden, praying for the souls of others; for we are told that he "fell on his face, and prayed" (Matt. xxvi. 39). I am sure that none, who are in earnest when they pray, will pray sitting, unless they have not the power of praying otherwise. There is, in all passages, a sympathy between the external motions of the body and the internal emotions of the soul. It would be easy to point out instances of this which every one would immediately understand and acknowledge; but it would call me off too much from the direct object of my present remarks: suffice it to say, that the mind instantly and involuntarily admits the close affinity that subsists between certain affections of the mind and the corresponding inclinations of the body. To make this intelligible to every one—Saul, who wasted the Church of Christ, was suddenly arrested, as he was journeying to Damascus, by a miraculous manifestation of that Jesus whom he persecuted. "He fell to the earth," "trembling and astonished;" "he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias;" and the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and enquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for, behold, he prayeth." (Acts ix. 3—11). Now suppose a painter, wishing to represent this striking subject, were to select the moment when Saul, under deep conviction of sin and the agony of an awakened conscience, was earnestly pouring forth his soul unto God in prayer; and suppose that, when this picture was shown to us, we were to see this same Saul, instead of kneeling, sitting on a chair or a bench—would not the most thoughtful and uninformed exclaim at the absurdity of the painter, and declare that nothing else could have been so contrary to nature and common sense? Yes, every one would say so; and, in so doing, he would be speaking the language of nature and common sense. Every person who is joining in the prayers of the Church, ought to consider that he is praying, as Saul was, for the forgiveness of his sins, the grace and the mercy of God, and the salvation of his soul; and nature and common sense will say, that no man can really be under such an impression, and yet be sitting carelessly and unconcerned on his seat. And I would be content to take the honest answer of one of these careless sitters to this simple question—Can you say, before God and your conscience