

words ought to be ordered, that our petitions ought to be agreeable to the views we entertain of the Almighty, and not incongruous to those views. There is to us a glorious mystery in the ever blessed Trinity: the Father, Son, and Spirit are revealed to us as three distinct personages, and these three are also revealed to us as but one. A query sometimes arises as to the propriety of praying to the Son and the Spirit. Passages of Scripture, however, sanction the acts of prayer to both. It is evident, I think, that prayer should be addressed chiefly to the Father. The Scriptures which sanction and enjoin this are so familiar, that to quote them is needless.

As finite minds cannot comprehend infinity, there must be something represented to us that we can think and conceive of. We can reflect on the attributes of the Deity, but we cannot comprehend their extent. We can think of Father, Son, and Spirit, apart; but we have not so clear a perception of their unity, though we as firmly believe that they are one, as that they are three. They are represented in the scheme of mercy in respective offices; the Spirit convinces, the Son gives his life a sacrifice, and the Father justifies and pardons, through that sacrifice. It, then, must be improper to ascribe to one what peculiarly belongs to another. Our petitions should be in keeping with the respective offices of the Father, Son, and Spirit in the work of redemption. We are instructed to pray with the aid of the Spirit, through the merits of the Son, to the Father. It is not agreeable to scripture, to our own views, or to reason, to address the Father as *dying* for our sins. When this is done our ideas of the divisibility of the Trinity are confounded, and we lose the spirit of devotion; at least I find it so. I have frequently been pained on hearing, both in the sanctuary and in

social prayer meetings, petitions addressed to the Father that ought to have been to the Son, and *vice versa*. I have heard some like the following—"O God thou hast so loved us as to give thine only begotten Son,"..... "thou hast given thyself a sacrifice for us," &c. And while addressing the blessed Redeemer, conclude and say, "for Jesus Christ's sake," &c. It is particularly painful to hear these irregularities from the *ministers* of the Gospel, and some of them *able* ministers. In addition to the confusion occasioned by these evils to pious minds, they no doubt furnish materials to the enemies of religion to wound it. Hoping that you or some of your correspondents will take up the subject, I shall close by subscribing myself

Your's sincerely,

SEMAJ.

C.....g, Aug. 18, 1838.

*To the Editor.*

Upper Canada, Aug. 14, 1838.

MY DEAR SIR,—As a reader of your excellent Miscellany, I could not notice without indignation or pity, the extract you have given from a letter to the London *Times* newspaper, as reprinted in the Cobourg *Church* a few weeks ago. Mr. Stewart, the Episcopal Missionary, has not been sufficiently informed to write any thing for the guidance of the public mind on this difficult question. I have travelled in every district of the province, and know a little of politics, and ten times more about the Baptist churches in it, than he does; and so I ought to have some idea of the amount of respect due to his remarks. Every individual of intelligence in the province, so far as his mind is not biassed by early education or prejudice, must know that the cause of the out-break widely differs from that which he assigns. If the Episcopalian clergy