

Poetry.

KING CHARLES'S CHILD.

A daughter of Charles I. died when only four years old. When on her death bed she was desired by one of her attendants to pray: she said she could not say a long prayer, but would try to say a short one. "Lighten my darkness, O Lord God, and let me not sleep the sleep of death." Having said this, she expired.

It was within a monarch's palace hall, At midnight, when the trembling lamp grew pale, And yet it gleamed on glittering coronal, On robe of ermine, and on burnished mail, Oh! grand and festal—as the owners' fall! And pale attendants sat there, with sad eye Watching where they lay with a royal pall, England's young princess was laid down to die On couch with gems inlaid, and gold of Araby.

THE SYSTEM OF THE CHURCH.

(From the Christian Remembrancer.)

Men are endowed with faculties, feelings, and energies, which, all and each, have their own proper tendency and object. When they are directed towards that object they are in a state of health and strength, and advancing to their own perfection; when they are directed towards any other object, not their own, they are weakened, and, ere long, paralyzed. The Will influences and guides them all. Their true object is God. As they tend towards Him, i. e. to obedience to His Will, and working out His Ends, they become strong and perfect; when they are directed to any other object, they become weak in the proportion in which that object is distant from God.

The Church is the system which supplies the channels through which those feelings, and powers, and faculties, may be allowed to flow toward God, their true object. The Church herself offers no Object short of Him, who is her Head, at which those powers may stop; but, though sometimes she may seem to do so to the short-sighted, we look farther, and see it is but a pathway a little deeper in the shadow of the wood, still leading out to God, and never stopping till in Him, though sometimes darker, narrower, and more difficult, than that which he walks along it may exercise his faith, and gaze more intently. E. g. Men say the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, received in the higher sense, in which the Church, in her voice of purer days, would bid us hold and understand it, stops short of Christ, and makes itself the final object of our trustings, dependence and final perseverance. Yet is it so? Look deeper, and the Lord's Supper, lead on the feelings and powers of man to rest more entirely in Christ than the mere statement of Truth would convey Him, which some men consider the only sure way of leading men to Him? Does it not lead men to dwell more entirely in Him—to understand Him? She tells us His Real Presence is there—we believe it, and receive it. By her assurance we feel we are there. His disciples, the abode of His continual presence.—We there, of course, learn the bearing of His cross in the sight of His Broken Body; the preciousness of the Atonement in His shed blood; the lessons of charity and unity in receiving Him together; each man a Temple of Him, each a part of His own Temple.

Such means will, surely, lead men more certainly to Christ as the final Object: and does not the very need of entering into the force and intention of the Holy Eucharist lead men more safely and surely to that object, than the mere assertion of truths outwardly which touch the feelings, but scarcely arrest the attention? So the Church offers an immediate object for our feelings and powers—the Body of Christ, to whom, as the final Object, they lead. He is the Head; she is the Body; our Body may offer immediate objects for our attention; but all tend to the promotion of our existence. She offers the system through which we reach God. She brings the ordinance of God, and leads man to Him. Without systems which will find a channel suited to each feeling and power, they will make channels for themselves and waste; without a system whose End is God, they will not only waste, but work ends which are their own destruction.

Socialism, and other like systems, are of the former kind; affording channels, though scarcely to be called true ones, leading men to false ends. Dissent will be an instance of the latter, as striking out systems, and supplying the want of system by giving one of its own, which affords imperfect channels for the feelings and powers of our moral nature. Take the example just spoken of; schismatics reject the deep view of the Sacrament, and thus unconsciously make preaching a real way of approaching Christ than mere instruction; and so by arraying instruction in certain forms unconsciously to themselves, they give it a sacramental nature. Men say, that, in a perfect state, the feelings and powers will exhaust themselves on God without system. We do not know what may be the way devised by God, by which men shall serve Him here-system is needful to direct, guide, and discipline our powers in their search after God. It may be the accident of an imperfect state. But be it so; we are in an imperfect state.

Men imagine they can do without system, but believe their statement by immediately falling into it. The system mentioned above is an example; and we may take another. We are told by some that we may take an interpretation of Holy Scripture: they will teach and understand it for themselves, and by themselves. What is the result? Do they not at once fall into a system: a way of taking Holy Scripture,

under the rule of which they bring every word and statement, by which they receive this and condemn that? Have they not as complete a scheme of interpretation as the Catholic scheme of interpretation?—Is it not so rigid often as to stand alone and independently of Holy Scripture, so that men fearlessly reject a manifest meaning because it does not fit its place in their system of interpretation? Is not this as much bringing human interpretation and system to bear upon Holy Scripture, as the most devoted child of the Church could desire? The only difference between them is, the one seeks the system of ages—the Catholic Church of Christ; the other, the system of to-day, and of his own individual mind. Both are systems: the latter—in some respects more so than the former—often falling under the rigid rule laid down by some individual interpreter of his own day, as fully as we would fall under the guiding of the Church.

Men must fall under system. It is as impossible to do without it as to support the bodily frame without regular sustenance, or as untrue as to say, that an act of the will does not precede each moral action. It is the support of our moral nature: men unconsciously fall into it who are most violently opposed to it as a thing external to themselves. But this is not exactly the point; it is rather to show the futility of the objection which men raise to the Church under the notion of its being a system at all.

The final Object of systems with regard to our moral conduct is, of course, God, and subjection to Him. In the same degree in which they lead truly and surely to this End, in that degree, to short-sighted observers, they will seem not to do so. This mistake arises from the fact, that such schemes will present objects short of the Final one, yet resembling it, to revive the tired energies, and to lead on the weak powers of men in their road to God: the truth is, they more certainly lead to an end in Him. They become rests on the journey, securing the steps already taken, and applying their gain to make the remaining ones easier and lighter. Ends short of the Final one, in systems, will have the appearance, at first sight, of taking the place of the Final one; they will closely resemble it: they will take part of its nature; whereas the leading feelings and powers directly to God, without the intervention or aid of systems, has the appearance of greater devotion to Him, and of avoiding the difficulties supposed above, as no End short of Him presents itself for their aim. This is the feeling of men who have fallen into views in the present and past ages, which they call "spiritual," as distinguished from schemes which involve Form and auxiliary ends.

But what is, and must be, the consequence? Their feelings and powers are led to God. They keep His name and service in continual view; but with their eyes on Him, fail to reach Him with the step; they go to waste, become extravagant, unreal, and dissipated; keeping their eye as on the dawn in the horizon, become lost in the desert over which they go to reach it. They call this spirituality of mind and unity of purpose. It is, in truth, unreality. They imagine that they avoid Formalism, and, in doing so, lose the prop and support which Forms must give to enable their powers to reach their ends at all. They feel this at last, and fall into systems of their own, weak and insecure. We said, ends short of the Final one, partaking of its likeness and nature, are mistaken for it by some. E. g. the Holy Eucharist is an End, and short of Christ, yet leading to Christ by a sure road. Daily Prayer in Public Worship is an End which leads men to longings for continual support and beginnings afresh; yet it, of course, leads on these very feelings and longings to exhaust themselves on the repose of eternity. The traveller who sees the distant light which speaks of rest and shelter, must mind the path he takes to reach it. Better be in the right path to it, and his eyes off it, than his eyes on the light, and he in a road which finally leads away from his object.

The objections to systems at all, and to systems as leading men to stop short of the Final End, are, then, unreal. Men fall into them always, more or less; it is in their nature to do so; and so by the short-sighted, ends contained in a scheme of forms partaking of the likeness and nature of the Final one, are likely to be mistaken. The Church is the divinely-appointed system to lead man in his every part to God. It is the only one which surely and really does so. It takes each power and feeling of men, guides them to their own proper object in God's scheme, and through them leads them to God himself. She only, while she regulates, prevents their extravagance, corrects them while she guides them.

Take the feelings of Reverence, and those which are called out to the awful and sublime; God is their final Object, in some way or other; but there must be means of drawing them out towards Him; ends short of Him which receive the feelings, they must find, and have their own proper object in some scheme and system; or finding none provided for them, will find unfit ones for themselves, or run to waste. The Church offers her mode of administering the Holy Sacraments, especially the Eucharist. She shows a mystery about it; rather draws out the mysteriousness there is in it, and convinces men of it: her way of administering it creates and keeps up mystery; she makes it part of her system. The object of feelings of Reverence receives the feelings, and guides them on to God: takes of God, and gives Him to our feelings; she asserts and teaches the Real Presence after the mysterious sense: other systems explain it away or deny it. She only admits True Believers even to see it. She places while the unconfirmed leave her Temple, ever leading them to expect it as the last step of their preparatory life: a holy thing, to be looked for with hope and fear and earnest dread: not to be even seen till received: not to be received till duly fitted for it. Who shall say what are the mingled feelings that a child's mind has when leaving the hush of the Church, on the day of its administration, when he sees the prepared altar, hiding from his sight the holy "Creatures"—the mixture of awe and wonder with which he leaves the threshold? The Church gives a home to his feeling of Reverence. And in the case of the recipient, too: the blessed symbols to be all consumed ere the Priest leaves the Altar: the leaving not a crumb to fall again which has been gathered up from our Master's table: all is part of her system, finding Objects for Reverence. Other systems find them not; fear them; and leave feelings of Reverence to waste where they will. Surely they must have their home on earth,—their resting-place in God's earthly system: surely they were not for nothing,—they were for God.

Again, her consecrated places of worship. Here she offers objects for feelings of Reverence: she attaches awe to place. She leads our feelings up to God, through scenery in which He teaches us that He resides and moves. Our natural Reverence is called out, and is satisfied with this: systems which afford no such objects for such feelings, lose the value of them. They will go somewhere; and the consequence is that they dwindle into Superstition of the worst kind. Superstition is the feeling of Reverence going after false objects in a wrong manner. Reverence becomes Superstition when it has no fit object offered for it. The Church, by the objects she presents, prevents the abuse, while she loses nothing of the use of such feelings. It is another point in her system, that she not only offers objects, but full, satisfactory objects. Some systems offer objects, but only slight ones, not receiving and engrossing the whole feeling, to which it is presented. Then, too, Reverence dwindles into Superstition.

These feelings, finding nothing on which to exhaust themselves, are thrown back on their subject, and produce a strange deformity of character, by injuring the growth and development of other feelings and principles. In some they produce morosity; in others constant dissatisfaction. They roll back like a flood on the advancing moral character, and draw back parts of it in their own receding tide, or they fix themselves on some trifling object, whose importance they magnify. In either of these two cases, the repression or false use of these feelings produce narrowness of mind. Any feeling without its due object will have the same effect. So it is that we find dissenters so often narrow-minded. They have no objects for feelings. The Church, in her systems, expands the mind, and leads the feelings to God. She does this by adopting the course the very contrary of the one just supposed.—She does it by finding views and laying hold of feelings and enlisting them fully in her service. Her objects are natural ones: the voice within seems always to have led men to attach awe to place and mystery to rites: it is the vent suggested by her without adverting to certain feelings. Who can contemplate without admiration the Church's vast machinery, by storied window and rounded shaft, arrest Reverence wherever we turn: the hoary hue of ages on her walls and towers, the deep meaning of her slightest carving, the silence of her mysteries, the footstep, oft returning, of her holy-days, independent of our fancy, and always the same, however we may change: the calm monotony of her daily prayers, though we are ever altering: the certainty with which she carries on her work, whether men will heed her or no. These are all parts of her system which offer full food for Reverence; fit, satisfying objects for our deepest feelings—objects which no other system has pretended to find, and many have indignantly rejected.

The consequence has been, that she has retained in her bosom her own children, while other systems have lost many, who have gone to seek in other homes objects to satisfy feelings which will have their way.—She has caught in her grasp every thing which was passing in the world's scenery, and made them her own,—antiquity, symbolism, sublimity, and mystery. She has declared them sacred, and has consecrated feelings of Reverence by consecrating them. She saw they were what satisfied men, and seizing them, engraving them into her system: through them she leads us to God. If we may say it before she was a system, they had arrested those feelings in us, and she, by taking them, has made herself the master of the deepest things of nature. Standing in this position, she draws on the philosopher to see to what final point his own systems and principles lead: how much he agrees with her; and she argues that he should do so totally, while with the schismatic she argues on the imperfection and inability of his objective system—the perfection of her own.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IN ITS EPISCOPACY.

CHAPTER V.

Presbyters and bishops.—What is a presbyter?—No presbyter ever acted as a bishop.—Consecration of Matthias.—How the presbytery aided St. Paul.—The manner of this in the early Church.—They acted in conjunction with bishops.—The terms bishop and presbyter the same.—What the presbytery did who called bishops.—Meaning of the terms "Coadjutors," "Counselors," &c., in the early Church.—The Church under formation.—Bishops, priests, and deacons.—The Church of Ephesus.—The Apostles call themselves presbyters.—St. Paul means not to describe himself as only a presbyter.—No church without a bishop.—It would not be right or advisable now to lodge Episcopal duties in the hands of presbyters.—Apostolic attempt at community of goods.

PRESBYTERS, or priests, or elders, are of older institution than bishops, excepting the first bishop and ordainer of presbyters, Jesus Christ. The word presbyter seems to denote the superintendence of a congregation, and is the minister who is ordained and licensed by the bishop to preach, administer the sacraments, and attend to the weekly duty of the pastoral office. A presbyter cannot exercise authority over other presbyters, because all presbyters, as described in the Scriptures, are equal. Our Lord ordained seventy presbyters, for we will not say that He ordained eighty-two, though in view fact He did so; because, as though with a main to ulterior elevation, the Twelve were always mentioned as distinct from the Seventy, and had some peculiar privileges, not so much of office, as from proximity to our Lord's person. But as soon as "the Twelve" were consecrated bishops, then "the Seventy" remained alone as inferior ministers; and it is of these and their successors that we have now to speak according to what is related of them in the New Testament.

None of the presbyters ever exercised the same authority as the Apostles or bishops, until one of them was formally consecrated to be a bishop in the room of Judas Iscariot, and the lot fell upon Matthias. There is not in the Scriptures any instance of Ordination by presbyters alone; but we have an instance of the presbyters assisting a bishop at an Ordination. St. Paul writes to Timothy, Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, (1 Tim. iv. 14.) Surely, this is a plain statement that the presbytery had some share in the Ordination of Timothy, and hence must have assisted St. Paul as that Apostle writes, Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands, (2 Timothy, 16.) Although St. Paul seems to have ordained Timothy without presbyterial assistance, yet in the case of Timothy it was not so; as must appear from the above texts, which, if taken in this way together, will present no contradiction in the Apostles' epistles. This assistance on the part of presbyters seems also to have been permitted in the early Church. From the authentic records of the ancient Christians we learn what was the manner of such an Ordination. The bishop had his seat on high in the Church, above all those who were present: this being doubtless significant of his spiritual and ecclesiastical, but not of his worldly, dignity. On the presentation of a candidate, at the proper time, the presbyters then assisted in the laying of hands, and thus became, before all the people, in a manner coadjutors or fellow-helpers with the bishop; and they were called in early times, the counsellors and assistants of the bishops, and frequently went by the name of co-presbyters. Now, these several names, as describing several persons aiding one another, together with the manner of performing such a duty, plainly show that they acted in conjunction with bishops, but never solely as bishops. In vain will any one search Scripture or the historical annals of the early Church for any instance of Ordination being performed by presbyters only.

It may be true, that before the order of the Church was finally settled, and while the Apostles were acting as bishops in the Church, the term of "Bishop," and "presbyter," and "elder," was synonymous; that these were convertible terms, that is, that each term signified one and the same thing. We say it may be true, because this point is not conceded, only it is very much that leads us to suppose it to be true. For the sake of argument, then, we will grant that the terms "bishop" and "presbyter," were used in such particular time to signify one and the same person. Let us suppose that the presbyters of Ephesus and Philippi were called bishops.—St. Paul addresses the Philippians thus: Paul and Timothy, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ

Jesus with the bishops and deacons, (Phil., i. 1.) Here there is at once a distinction drawn between the congregation and the ministers; but such ministers as were presbyters only are designated bishops. The ministers of the Church of Ephesus are also in Acts xx. 17, called "elders," when at verse 28 of the same chapter, they are called "overseers," or according to the original language (ἐπισκοπους) bishops. But, in either case, these ministers then called bishops had but the oversight of their respective congregations, and never over the ministers of those congregations; and the idea of this, unless Scripture pointed out the portion of the presbytery so commanded, would involve the absurdity of each one sitting in judgment on his own or his brother minister's conduct. They never exercised such episcopal authority as no did St. Paul, or Timothy, or Titus.

As orders as to Timothy, and Titus, and their successors were ever given by the Apostles to these presbyters or bishops: and there is no instance recorded of their ever having assumed or used such episcopal power. If they had been bishops, why need a governor over them? For, it plainly appears that St. Paul exercised authority over them. It seems that he took maintenance of the Philippians at the very time that epistle was written, (Philippians, iv. 14—18; iv. 29—30; 2 Cor. ix. 10.) from which circumstance, as well as from his writings to them, we may reasonably conclude that they were under his government. Again, his authority over presbyters is proved by his summoning them to Miletus to appear before him at a distance of fifty miles from their stations, and by his appointing Timothy in his place with the fullest authority to ordain and rebuke elders when he departed, having before told the presbyters (Acts, xx. 30) that after his departing there would arise up among their own selves men speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them, and creating confusion. And it was plain that there all are equal, none can command; and then, difference of opinion leads to dissent, and dissent to open separation, and thus the unity and communion of a Church (an evidence of Christianity to the world, John, xvii. 21) is destroyed; an evil to be much averted by appointing a bishop, as at Jerusalem, to be mainly resident among them.

At this time the Church was clearly under formation and in a state of growth, and the meaning of the word "bishop" in its full extent was not defined, or appropriated to that order of ministers to whom it was afterwards limited. The Church of Ephesus was certainly complete in reality if not in name; because, as shown by the Scriptures, it was a congregation of Christians planted and protected by the hands of St. Paul himself, and possessing a three-fold ministry, viz. the deacons looking forward to a higher office (1 Tim. iii. 18), the presbyters labouring in the word and doctrine, (1 Tim. v. 17,) and the bishop, in the person of Timothy, superintending all and exercising control in matters both of faith and doctrine; of course wherever he had reason to put in practice the authority delegated to him by St. Paul, (1 Tim. v. 17, 20, 22.) The Church of Philippi was equally complete also, having St. Paul as its bishop, and presbyters (called bishops, but without the power of bishops) and deacons, as mentioned in the first verse of the first chapter of the epistle to the Philippians.

To show how little strength can be placed on the fact, or supposition as it may be, that the terms of "bishop and presbyter" denoted one and the same office, we find the Apostles, who were so clearly superior authority in the Church, and exercising episcopal power in its highest degree, calling themselves presbyters—not that others called them so—and they did so rightly without any derogation of the superior office, for every bishop is a presbyter; and he might on many occasions address them as a general will address his officers or privates as "fellow soldiers," "fellow comrades," &c., or any governor or magistrate address his fellow creatures as "fellow citizens." And St. Paul might with greater propriety thus address the co-presbyters who acted with him when he exercised the fullest episcopal power in the Ordination of Timothy. Nothing can be clearer than that St. Paul was a superior presbyter, in other words a bishop (Acts, xx. 17; Rom. i. 5, 15; also throughout Epistles to Tim. and Titus); and if his calling of himself by an inferior name would tie him down to the duties only attached to that name, he would belie his whole life of episcopal action and speech. And in every Church (Acts, xiv. 23.) as well as that of Ephesus, the Apostles exercised the superior office of a bishop, until it became universally affirmed throughout the Christian world that there could be no Church without a bishop.

And surely in this our day it would not be advisable, to say nothing of its being unscriptural, to lodge episcopal power in the hands of the presbyters or priests. For, if at any time there was the establishment of a superintending presbytery for the partial government of the Church of Ephesus (a matter we cannot ascertain and have no right to suppose) before St. Paul placed Timothy there with authority over presbyters, we see that it did not succeed, or Timothy's appointment would never have taken place. Why then seek to re-establish a system without apostolic personal guidance, which, under such direct apostolic guidance appears to have signally failed; for there was either a signal and decided failure after trial, or the presbyterial system never had existence.

We know that the apostolic trial of holding all goods and property in common, quickly failed. If there was any failure in the Church of Ephesus, the cause of such failure was in the schism of its own officers (Acts xx.) and the plan of community of goods failed, perhaps in part through the falsehood of two of the society (Acts v. 1.); and thus both systems fell by the hands of their own members. How then are we to revise these plans after any such signal examples of failure, such awful warnings that the attempted schemes could not succeed? Surely the improved state of Church government, as introduced probably from Jerusalem to Ephesus, should be preferred by us; and in the other case also, if the Apostles could not conduct the system of community of goods, how can we hope to succeed?

Our adversaries, in order to gain their point, ought to show that the dignities and duties now attached to the name of bishops, were granted also to those called bishops in St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians and Timothy. They ought to show how, if presbyterial government was established in all or any of the churches planted by the Apostles, the change to the episcopal pattern was so quietly brought about as to be noticed by no historian, affirmed by no witness, and the memory of such a state wholly extinct; especially when, as some argue, the change was effected forty years after the deaths of the Apostles, when several excellent and worthy writers existed; and yet no notice what would have been so great a fact. Neither do any future historians, though giving lengthened details on any matter affecting Church government or custom, a matter in the smallest points always raising jealousies and commotions among the primitive Christians, ever allude to such a change, or mark any time or manner of its accomplishment. In fact, no change of this kind could have been made, or it would have been on record, and triumphantly appealed to; a change that in civil matters would be as important as the adoption of a mixed monarchy after a mere republic. And if the change had taken place, the question would then be why did it take place? For changes are the result of dissatisfaction with former kinds of government; changes promise

amelioration; and if it was felt that the tyranny of the many was intolerable, (for how much easier in cases of oppression is it to shame, or control, or overthrow one man, than to contend against a council, a junta, or a committee,) why should we return to a system abandoned, as it must have been, under very holy and approved action in those days?

THE SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP.

(From a Sermon preached on the death of the Rev. E. G. Prescott, by the Right Rev. Bishop Doane.)

The leading trait in Christ's delineation of the shepherd of the sheep is the intimate relation between him and them. They are "his own sheep." A world of meaning in this little word, "his own." Who has not felt it, in the Prayer Book version of that inimitable Psalm, the hundred and third, "Yea, like as a father pitieth his own children, even so is the Lord merciful unto them that fear him?" Who has not lived upon it, in the intercourse of heart with heart, as the endearing thought filled up the measure of his bliss, mine dearing thought filled up the measure of his bliss, mine dearing, all mine? "He calleth his own sheep by name." And again, "when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them." This is a most important aspect of the pastoral relation. Rather, it is of the first necessity, for comfort and usefulness, his own from God, his own for life, his own for death, his own for immortality. It is because he has the care of souls that this is so; and because he has to answer, with his own soul, for his care of them. The teacher of a school, the captain of a ship, whatever other office society creates or owns, may hold its tenure upon time. The pastoral office, like the conjugal relation, is for life, as it knits souls together, that must be answerable to and for each other, in eternity. I grieve to say, that this consideration is too much lost sight of. I grieve to say, that there are many who regard the pastoral relation as one of mere convenience. The Pastor, till he finds a larger, or less arduous, or more profitable charge, the flock, till he can find a more attractive, or, perhaps, a clearer Pastor. How entirely such loose sight of the instructions of the Saviour! It is because they are "his own sheep," that he "calleth them by name," and "leadeth them out." It is because they are "his own sheep," that they "hear his voice." It is because they are "his own sheep," that they "know his voice, and follow him." Nay, the very reason that the hireling, when he sees the wolf, "leaveth the sheep, and fleeth," is because the sheep are "not his own." Nothing can be more true to nature. There is no bond of hearts without a mutual interest. And, without a bond of hearts, there can be no security for love or duty. What, but the certainty that it must hold for life, would make the marriage tie of strength sufficient to endure life's stern vicissitudes? What else would for a moment stand against the strain of temper, or the storm of passion? What besides this would serve as surety for the training up of children, with its countless trials, its wear and tear of life, its risk of final disappointment? How much more must this be needed in the pastoral care? With opportunities so far inferior for mutual acquaintance and interest, with exposure so much greater to interference and alienation, with a load so infinitely heavier of moral and immortal accountability? As there can be but one adequate and worthy motive to undertake "the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man," the love of Him who died for it; so there can be but one adequate and worthy tenure of it, its reference simply and unreservedly to His most holy will, as sought and ascertained through the authentic medium of His Church. Fearfully do they tempt providence, who, whether it be for filthy lucre, or from self indulgence, or as matter of convenience or of taste, encounter such an enterprise. Fearfully do they tempt their own frail nature, who venture on the care of any portion of Christ's flock, until some more desirable position can be found; or leave the place where God has set them, by his Church, for lighter duty, or for larger salary, or for that worst of all delusions, greater usefulness. How do they know that they shall ever live to have another charge?—And, if they should not, what a bed of death, and what a day of judgment! A single soul, for whom Christ died, lost, while he who had the charge of it from God, was seeking higher things! What right has he, who, at the holy altar, gave himself, his soul, and body, to the service of the Cross, a fellow soldier with the radiant martyr host, to shrink from danger, or withdraw from duty; as if he could do more than die upon his post, and as if that were not the very terms of his enlistment, and his highest trophy. With what propriety does he stand out for higher wages, and refuse to work, unless his pay is sure, who serves a Master, who, when He was rich, as God is rich, for our sakes, became poorer than the merest mendicant, that has a hovel for his head. And, as for greater usefulness, who but the enemy of souls could whisper such a thought? What had Paul to do but plant?—What had Apollos to do but water? If they did this to the utmost, and yet failed of usefulness, it was because the Lord withheld the increase.—There is no word about our usefulness, my reverend brethren, in all the word of God, nor in all the Church's ordinal; but many burning words of service and of duty. What we have to do is to be diligent and watchful; to watch and work, as if for life; to watch and work, as knowing that each day may be our last; to watch and work, as certain that the eye of God is on us.—When this is so, there will be little question as to where our duty lies. Every where it will overtake our strength. When this is so, we shall have no desire to serve ourselves. Our utmost service will be all too little for our sense of saving mercy. When this is so, however great their meanness and their sin, who stint God's altar, and leave its ministry to starve, there will be little carelessness for what we are to eat, or where-withal we shall be clothed. Every where we can find "food and raiment," and with that the great apostrophe was content. Well and wisely is the practice of this diocese so ordered as to further to the utmost these high views of pastoral relation. It admits no priest to the full measure of its privileges, who has the opportunity, and fails to act upon it, of a permanent connection with his parish, ratified and solemnized by his chief minister, with the highest offices of our religion.\* Cases there have been where a tenure but from year to year has been continued through life, in confidence and usefulness; while the most express engagements, with the holiest sanctions have scarcely lasted out their anniversary. But these are small exceptions to the general rule. Nature and truth, the Church's custom and the word of God, lean all the other way. If it were not the usage of the diocese, people and pastors should alike desire to have it so, as knitting them together in the hands of a confiding love; the Pastor with his own sheep, the sheep with their own Pastor under Christ. Seeing that it is, a loyal Churchmanship comes in, in aid of Christ's intentions, and the reason of the case, to take away all doubtfulness. What can be thought of more enduring than the pastoral bond, woven with the heart of generation after generation! What can be more impressive than the venerable aspect of the priest of God, who blessed the parents, as they knelt together at the altar's foot, and now receives the children's children, at the sacred font! What can be happier for the Church, what for the institutions of the country more

\* Every Presbyter, who has been duly instituted Rector of any Church in the diocese, and every Presbyter, who has been duly appointed a Missionary to the vacant parishes of the same, shall be a member ex-officio.—Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New Jersey, article iv.

benign and blessed, than the stability, which should be so knit in, with nature's holiest bond, and sanctified with prayer! Beautiful fulfillment of that sweetest pastoral picture, when the shepherd of the sheep goes out before them, and they follow his familiar voice, to where the stillest waters have the greenest pastures, and find rest and comfort in his watchful care! Blessed assurance of that enchanting vision of the Saviour, when all pastors and all flocks shall be attracted by one gracious voice, shall own the guidance of one kindly eye, shall seek the shelter of one holy arm, and one Almighty Shepherd gather all in one eternal fold!

It naturally follows, from the shepherd's feeling that the sheep are his, that he devotes himself entirely to their welfare. What else has he to think of? What else has he to care for? They are all his; and they are his all. He is continually among them. He is forever going before them. He watches for their safety. He labours for their comfort. He gives himself wholly up, to guide, protect, and feed them. If they are in danger, he risks himself to shelter them. If need be, he gives his life to save them. You will not hear, of such a shepherd of the sheep, that he is neglectful of his studies. You will not hear, of such a shepherd of the sheep, that he repeats to weariness his few stale sermons. You will not hear, of such a shepherd of the sheep, that he is much among the folds of other men, while other men are left to feed his sheep. By such a pastor, every portion of his flock will be regarded. He will be with them, from house to house. He will instruct them, as they sit by the fireside, and as they walk by the way. He will be concerned in all their concerns. He will be interested in all their interests. He will be influential with the rich, to care for the poor; with the poor, to be contented with their condition. He will be tender of the sick, gentle with the aged. He will weep with them that weep, and rejoice with them that rejoice. He will take the infants in his arms, lay his hands upon them, and bless them; he will pursue with gentle assiduity the wayward feet of youth, to win them, in due time, for the good gift of confirmation; he will never cease his labour, his care and his diligence, while there are any who come not, or come carelessly, to be partakers of the banquet of that most heavenly food, which Jesus gives us, in His body and His blood. He will be present, with the word of comfort, and the prayer of faith, by the bed-side of pain and sickness. And when death has done his worst, he will not leave the temple, where a soul has worshipped God, till it is garnered in the grave, and consecrated by the triple sprinkling of the sacred dust, with words of piety and comfort, to a joyful resurrection, through the purchase of the Cross of Jesus Christ.

To such a shepherd of the sheep there is a sure reward. He finds his pleasure in his duty. The habit of doing his own work lightens and sweetens it. The wisdom to win souls grows by his exercise. His earnestness becomes contagious. He has his way with them. He knows his sheep, and they know him. He calls them by their names, and they come to him. They know his voice. They follow where he leads. They feel his heart. They give him theirs. He finds even here the overpayment of his toil, his care, his pain. He looks hereafter to the souls, for whom his life was spent, to be his glory and his joy, in the presence of our Lord, when he shall come. And when He appears, he shall receive a crown of glory that fadeeth not away.

English Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

(From Woolner's Exeter Gazette.)

A complaint having been made to the Lord Bishop of Exeter, on the part of the family of the late Mr. B. H. Lyne, of Liskeard, that the Rev. J. F. Todd, vicar of that parish, in reading the funeral service of the deceased, at the parish church of Liskeard, had omitted part of one of the prayers of the service, a commission was issued by his Lordship, directed to the Very Rev. M. G. Martin (then Chancellor of the diocese), the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J. M. Stephens (Archdeacon of Exeter), the Ven. Dr. G. Barnes (Archdeacon of Barnstaple), and the Rev. A. Athorby; on which the five commissionees met in the Chapter-house on the 22nd inst. preceding day, and agreed to the provisions of the following order:—That the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, the Ven. J.