

from this intercourse with an 'elder' of superior years and practical wisdom, sometimes also he would find in his host a scholar whose theological help would be a great benefit to him. In some parishes where a daily service has been held, the assistance of a deacon might prevent it from being given up during the temporary illness of the vicar, while other parochial institutions also might be kept afloat and not suffer much from the inability of their real president to superintend them.

It is suggested that *graduates* only be allowed to be student deacons. Those who have not had the great advantage of a University training stand in most need of a course of study at one of our theological colleges, and this ought to be considered indispensable for them. But graduates of three-and-twenty, who have sufficient means to pay for extra theological training, would be able to serve their apprenticeship (which is what the diaconate really ought to be) as deacons, gaining, in addition to sufficient and systematic study, various and very useful experience to fit them for the permanent cures to which they would be afterwards licensed at their ordination as priests.—A. M. W. in *Church Bells*.

REV. CHARLES WESLEY'S LETTER  
TO REV. THOS. BRADBURY CHANDLER—1785—  
AS TO METHODISM.

LONDON, April 28th, 1785.

*Reverend and Dear Sir:* As you are setting out for America, and I for a more distant country, I think it needful to leave with you some account of myself and my companions through life. At eight years old, in 1715, I was sent by my father, Rector of Epworth, to Westminster school, and placed under the care of my eldest brother, Samuel, a strict Churchman, who brought me up in his own principles. In 1727 I was elected student of Christ Church. My brother John was then fellow of Lincoln.

The first year at college I lost in diversions—the next I betook myself to study. Diligence led me into serious thinking. I went to the weekly Sacrament, and persuaded two or three young scholars to accompany me, and likewise to observe the *method* of study prescribed by the statutes of the University. This gained me the harmless name of *Methodist*. In half-a-year my brother left his curacy of Epworth, and came to our assistance. We then proceeded regularly in our studies, and in doing what good we could to the bodies and souls of men.

I took my degrees, and only thought of spending all my days at Oxford; but my brother, who always had the ascendant over me, persuaded me to accompany him and Mr. Oglethorpe to Georgia. I exceedingly dreaded entering into Holy Orders, but he overruled me here also, and I was ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Oxford, one Sunday, and the next, Priest, by the Bishop of London.

Our only design was to do all the good we could, as ministers of the Church of England, to which we were firmly attached, both by education and principle. My brother still acknowledges her the best national Church in the world.

In 1736 we arrived as missionaries in Georgia. My brother took charge of Savannah, and I of Fredericks, waiting for an opportunity of preaching to the Indians. I was in the meantime secretary to Mr. Oglethorpe, and also secretary of Indian Affairs.

The hardships of lying upon the ground, &c., soon threw me into a fever and dysentery, which forced me in half-a-year to return to England. My brother returned the next year. Still we had no plan but to serve God and the Church of England. The lost sheep of this fold were our principal care; not excluding any Christians of whatever denomination, we

were willing to add the power of Godliness to their own particular form.

Our eldest brother, Samuel, was alarmed at our going on, and strongly expressed his fears of its ending in a separation from the Church. All our enemies prophesied the same. This confirmed us the more in our resolution to continue in our calling, which we constantly avowed, both in public and private; by word, and preaching, and writing; exhorting all our hearers to follow our example.

My brother drew up the rules for our Society, one of which was, constantly to attend the Church Prayers and Sacrament. When we were no longer permitted to preach in the churches, we preached (but never in church hours) in houses or fields, and sent from thence, or rather carried, multitudes to church, who had never been there before.—Our Society in most places, made the bulk of the congregation, both at Prayers and Sacrament.

I never lost my dread of separation, or ceased to guard our Societies against it. I frequently told them, "I am your servant as long as you remain members of the Church of England, but no longer. Should you ever forsake her, you renounce me." Some of our lay preachers very early discovered an inclination to separate, which induced my brother to publish reasons against a separation. As often as it appeared, we beat down the schismatical spirit. If any did leave the Church, at the same time he left our Society. For fifty years we kept the sheep in the fold, and having fulfilled the number of our days, only waited to depart in peace.

After our having continued friends for above seventy years, and fellow-laborers for above fifty, can anything but death part us? I can scarcely yet believe that in his eighty-second year, my brother, my old, intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the Episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a Bishop, and sent him to ordain the lay preachers in America. I was then at Bristol, at his elbow, yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention. How was he surprised into so rash an action? He certainly persuaded himself that it was right.

Lord Mansfield told me last year that *ordination* was *separation*. This my brother does not, and will not see; or that he has renounced the principles and practices of his whole life; that he has acted contrary to all his declarations, protestations, and writings; robbed his friends of their boasting, realized the "Nag's Head" ordination, and left an indelible blot on his name as long as it shall be remembered.

Thus our partnership here is dissolved, but not our friendship. I have taken him for better, for worse, till death do us part, or rather reunite us in love inseparable. I have lived on earth a little too long, who have to see this evil day; but I shall very soon be taken from it, in steadfast faith that the Lord will maintain His own cause, and carry on His work, and fulfill His promise to His Church: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Permit me to subscribe myself, Reverend and Dear Sir, your faithful and obedient Servant and Brother,

CHARLES WESLEY.

P. S. What will become of those poor sheep in the wilderness,—the American Methodists? How have they been betrayed into a separation from the Church of England, which their preachers, and they, no more intended than the Methodists here? Had they had patience a little longer, they would have seen a *real* primitive Bishop in America, *duly consecrated* by three Scotch Bishops; who had their consecration from the English Bishops, and are acknowledged by them as the same with themselves. There is, therefore, not the least difference betwixt the members of Bishop Seabury's Church, and the members of the Church of England.

You know I had the happiness to converse

with that truly apostolical man, who is esteemed by all who know him, as much as by you and me. He told me he looked upon the Methodists in America, as sound members of the Church, and was ready to ordain of their preachers whom he should find duly qualified. His ordination would be indeed genuine, valid, and Episcopal. But what are you poor Methodists now? Only a new sect of Presbyterians. And after my brother's death, which is now so near, what will be their end? They will lose all their usefulness and importance; they will turn aside to vain janglings; they will settle again upon their lees, and like other sects of dissenters, come to nothing.

THE PURPOSE OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

The Sunday-school in its purpose and objects is not in conflict with the duties required of parents and sponsors, nor can the school exempt them from their responsibilities. But the purpose of the school is to assist in these duties; to use the leaven of religious instruction found in Church children to the benefit of those who have no home instruction; to reach out through the parish where neither minister nor home influence has ever shed Christian light on the children's minds, and gather them into the nursery of the Church. The purpose of the school is legitimate and practical, and though its scope may be and *should* be enlarged, the fact that it is a lay organization for instruction and Mission work will remain unchanged. To carry out this work to its fullest extent and best results demands for the school a high place in the Church's system and a more positive recognition of its importance than is customary to-day. Surely so valuable an adjunct to the ministerial, parental and mission work of the parish must commend itself to those who have the interests of the Church at heart, and demands the prayerful and moneyed support of all who are unable to engage in the duties of the school. There is no other work in the parish more essential to its welfare, no better medium for its mission work, no equal to it as a healthy stimulant to active Christian life, even though we take the school in its present condition of limited ability and power. There come up from the school annually many for confirmation whose first glimpse of the truth was obtained within its precincts; many whose home education has been neglected and whose young lives would, but for the school, have been lost in the vortex of the pleasures of this world; hundreds, aye thousands, who by the hand of a little child have been led into the courts of the house of God. Is such work of *little* importance? Rather is it not of the greatest importance?

In England, where the Sunday-school Institute has been in existence 45 years, there has surely been something learned of the work and importance of the school. And the question is being agitated more and more as the fact becomes daily more apparent that the school *must* have better facilities. Here is a suggestive sentence from a clergyman: "There never was a time when more depended upon Sunday-schools, or when more work for good was ready to be done in them."—*American Church S. S. School Magazine*, (Phila.), for August.

THE PURPOSE OF MIRACLES

Is sometimes imagined to be as evidence to compel belief. In support of this view may be mentioned the wonders wrought by Moses to compel Pharaoh to receive him as a messenger from God, and the appeal made by Christ to the people to believe Him for the works He wrought among them. But it may be remarked here that the use of miracles as the credentials of a messenger seems to have been at most a lower function of the miracle, a kind of concession to