

## Poetry.

### THE HOUR OF PRAYER.

BY REV. EDWARD C. JONES.

Thy heart is sad—corroding care  
Hath wrought its sternest workings there.  
As songs that die along the shore,  
Thy brightest joys are now no more;  
Yet, stricken one, retire awhile,  
From Earth's dark scenes of grief and gloom,  
And at the hour when sunlight's glow  
Is falling from the world below,  
Then bend Devotion's willing knee,  
And Peace, sweet Peace, will visit thee.

The hour of Prayer—how pure—how calm,  
It brings the Pilgrim spirit-halm,  
The halm which mollifies his woes,  
Arrests the tear-drop in its flow,  
And leads above the battling storm,  
The Halcyon's bright and lustrious form;  
Hope leaps exulting in the hour,  
When sense and sin forego their power,  
And while such precious moments last,  
We have, of Heaven, the attendant.

Yes, take the form so dear of old,  
In which thy Father's wants were told.  
The hallowed words which martyrs breathed,  
The legacy which Sages bequeathed,  
And breathe thy longings to his ear,  
Which stoop thy least complaint to hear;  
Thus, at the hour when sunlight's glow  
Is falling from the world below,  
If sweet Devotion's visit thee,  
Sweet Peace will devotion's knee.

[Original.]

### A CONVERSATION BETWEEN A COUNTRY PARSON AND ONE OF HIS FLOCK.

### SUPPOSED UNCHARITABLENESS INVOLVED IN PREACHING THE DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH.

I was one evening returning from a distant corner of my parish, and as I rode slowly along I could hardly repress a feeling of despondency, when reflecting upon the numberless forms of false doctrines, heresy, and schism which prevailed amongst us. There were scarcely two houses together, the inmates of which were of one mind in matters religious; and representatives of all shades of opinion could easily have been found from those who, though they refused to worship under the same roof, yet resolutely maintained that there was after all no difference between them to those who were heretically striving to corrupt and undermine some of the fundamental doctrines of our most holy faith. While occupied with these reflections I was overtaken by one of my parishioners, and, as we were journeying in the same direction, we naturally fell into conversation. He was a worthy man of very unformed opinions, who though he attended with some regularity upon the services of the Church, yet could hardly be called a Churchman. After some common-places remarks upon the weather and the crops, I observed, that "I was sorry to have missed him for several Sundays from church," and asked him "whether illness or absence from the parish had prevented his attendance?"

**Parishioner**—Well Sir, I wasn't sick, and I wasn't away from the township; and since you ask me why I haven't been to church as regular as I have been before, I'll just tell you right out what it was that kept me away.  
**Parson**—Nothing like straightforwardness, Mr. Birch. When I ask a plain answer, and if your absence has been occasioned by any offence or misapprehension, your stating it at once may very probably enable me to explain and remove it.  
**Parishioner**—Well Sir, the last Sunday or two that I was there, you were speaking greatly about the Church, and running down every one that didn't belong to it: I hope no offence, Sir, but that don't seem to me right, and I can't abide it.

**Parson**—I have no recollection of "running down," as you term it, any persons who differ with you. I spoke very distinctly upon the duty of our being one, as our blessed Lord prayed that we might be; and showed from Holy Scripture the great sinfulness of being divided one from another.  
**Parishioner**—I think myself, that we should get along better if folks were more united about these things. But then the church ought to be a place of peace and love; and it always seems to do me harm to hear the Dissenters condemned from the pulpit—it seems uncharitable-like.  
**Parson**—Don't you think it the duty of a clergyman to set plainly before his flock whatever truths he finds in Holy Scripture?

**Parishioner**—Of course he should do that—no doubt about it—but to attack and run down those who don't think the same as we do, don't seem very like the love and charity which the Bible speaks so much about.  
**Parson**—We will talk of that point afterwards. But, in the meantime, Mr. Birch, perhaps you will say what you think the best course for us to follow?  
**Parishioner**—Well Sir, I can't but think that if you were to preach Christ and him crucified, and let all these disputes alone, it would be a deal better. I say, let every man have his own opinion, and go where he seems to get most good. It won't be asked where we get to heaven whether we went to church or meeting. And then, beside not seeming Christian-like to speak against them, it can't do any good—it only sets people against the Church, and makes them stronger Dissenters. I'm sure if you keep on so, Sir, you'll empty the church. There's Tom Woodhouse says it hurts his feelings so, that he'll never go again; and Mrs. Black's terribly offended about it; and old Mr. Norwood, who, just before you came, was a Church-warden and a Class-leader at the same time, and who knows a great deal about the Scriptures, says it's nothing but Puseyism; and Dave Bigelow says he'd as soon go to mass. Depend upon it, Sir, it will never do.

**Parson**—Now, Mr. Birch, I suppose that you and I are quite agreed that to steal is a very great sin, and contrary to the commands of God: very well. Now then, let us imagine, for the sake of illustration, that even among professed Christians it had become fashionable to steal. Suppose this habit had become so general that people did not think there was anything very wrong in it—suppose that by some strange self-delusion, men had persuaded themselves that it was not contrary to Holy Scripture—imagine for a moment that Tom Woodhouse was always mistaking the property of some one else for his own—that Mrs. Black could never keep her fingers off anything she took a fancy to—that Mr. Norwood, though in every other respect a very estimable person, had a strange way of slipping whatever he thought would suit him into his pocket—and that Dave Bigelow was a great genius at lightening other people's purses. Now, what would be the duty of God's minister under such circumstances?

**Parishioner**—His duty, Sir? Why it would be his duty to tell them plump and plain that they were living in great sin and wickedness, and that unless they repented and left off their evil ways, they would ruin their souls for ever.  
**Parson**—But suppose that in all other respects, except their dishonesty, they were very good sort of people, attending to their religious duties, and every

thing of that kind, would it not seem harsh and uncharitable to speak to them in that sort of way?"

**Parishioner**—"Uncharitable!" Why Sir, would it be charity to let them go down the broad road that leads to destruction, without as much as telling them of their danger? Surely, if a minister wished to deliver his own soul, he would give them the strongest warnings.

**Parson**—Very true, Mr. Birch; but then consider the consequences. It might tend to empty the church. It would hurt the feelings of Tom Woodhouse so that he'd be a thief, that he would never come again; and Mrs. Black would be most desperately put out at being asked that she was habitually breaking God's commands; and Mr. Norwood would set it down very likely as Puseyism to be told that he was despising the Scriptures of which he spoke so much; and Dave Bigelow would as soon hear the Parson preach up the mass, as dwell upon the duty of honesty. I am afraid it wouldn't do.

**Parishioner**—Why Sir, you can't be serious, surely—indeed I'm sure you're not. Talk of offending them! Isn't it the very office of a minister to declare to his people the whole counsel of God, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, as the Scriptures say: "If God so willeth, you shall win all them; the truth, 'tis God they're offended with—not with you; and if they will not hear, then the blood of their souls will not be found on the skirts of your garments."

**Parson**—Your views are very just, Mr. Birch, very just indeed. But still, don't you think that under such circumstances as we have supposed, it would be better to content oneself with preaching Christ and him crucified, and not saying anything about these points which would be likely to give offence to those who had persuaded themselves that there was no great sin, we should get on much more quietly and peaceably together than if the Parson was always dining in their ears the great crime and awful consequences of dishonesty.

**Parishioner**—I see Sir, you are joking with me, for your grave face; and I see half a notion of what you're driving at. But surely if you could only have peace by keeping back the truth, you would far rather have contention—aye, and even a half-emptied church.

**Parson**—Very well, Mr. Birch, I see you are very strongly and very properly set against the crime of theft. Now, will you tell me why it is that a Christian most strongly opposes himself to this sin?

**Parishioner**—Why, of course, the first and principal reason is, that it is against the command of God.  
**Parson**—And for this reason, above all others, you think that God's ministers ought to bear continual testimony against it, and to warn his flock strongly, earnestly, yet kindly, of the terrible consequence of indulging in it, even at the risk of offending them, and of emptying his church?

**Parishioner**—To be sure I do, Sir: the commandment leaves him no choice in the matter, if he means to be a faithful minister.  
**Parson**—And if God's commandment, forbidding men to steal, leaves him no choice, will you be kind enough to tell me, Mr. Birch, in what position he is placed by God's multiplied commandments forbidding us to be divided one from another, and commanding us all to be one?

**Parishioner**—Why, surely Sir, you don't mean to say that it is as bad to be divided from one another as it is to steal?  
**Parson**—I don't feel disposed to take upon me to judge as to the comparative degrees of guilt that is brought upon our souls by different sins. I read in Holy Scripture that "the soul that sinneth it is the law" of God, and that "the soul that sinneth it is the law," and since division into various religious shall die," and since division "is a transgression of His law," which commands us to be one, it is consequently "a sin;" and I think you are of opinion that God's ministers are bound to denounce and warn their people against all sin, whether it be great or small.

**Parishioner**—They ought to warn them against sin, to be sure; but where can be the sin of every one belonging to his own small matters: they are one in spirit, you know Sir, and that is what the Scripture means when it speaks against divisions, and says we ought to be one.  
**Parson**—You mean to say, Mr. Birch, that that is your interpretation of those precepts? You may have examined the subject, or you may not, but one thing I can say, that I have read, and thought, and prayed over the point, and have been brought to an entirely different conclusion. I see many passages of Holy Scripture referring to unity which can be interpreted of ONE OUTWARD VISIBLE CHURCH ALONE. I find this interpretation supported by the most learned and holy men of the present day, by the great Theologians of the 17th century, by the Bishops and Martyrs of the Reformation and by the fathers and confessors of the primitive Church. I am therefore convinced in my inmost soul that there always has been—and that there still is—and there will ever continue one, and only one true visible Church, and that when we are divided from it, we transgress the law which commands us to be one with it, and consequently fall into sin.

**Parishioner**—And do you really mean to say, Sir, that out of all the different kinds of Churches in the world, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, and I can't tell how many more, that only one out of them all is right and all the rest wrong?  
**Parson**—Holy Scripture assures us that there is but one Church which is Christ's body and consequently we cannot acknowledge the religious communities you have mentioned as different "Churches," which is impossible since there is but one Church, but regard them as sects cut off or divided from it.

**Parishioner**—Why, Sir, there isn't one in ten thousand but thinks the one Church which the Bible speaks about, means nothing else but the body or true believers, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and as I believe that there's good and bad in all sects, I believe it will be made up of good people out of them all, and I hope no offence, Sir, but I think it desperate uncharitable to look at it in any other way.  
**Parson**—As for your idea, Mr. Birch, of the one Church being spoken of in Holy Scripture being made up of persons holding opposite views and refusing to hold communion with each other, I have already said that I see overwhelming reasons for coming to a totally different opinion, and even in these days when every man sets up for a professor of theology, I hope I shall not be thought presumptuous in supposing myself as able to form an opinion upon these subjects as my parishioners. I will let this subject pass for the time, however, merely referring you to some of the excellent books in our Church Library for further information upon it. I am anxious, however, to set you right as to the supposed uncharitableness of urging upon those committed to my care the opinions which you think so objectionable.

**Parishioner**—If you are going to try to make me think about it as you do, Sir, I'm afraid you'll have a most uncommon hard job.  
**Parson**—And yet I won't despair, Mr. Birch, for I think that at bottom you are a fair judging man. Now I would ask you whether you ever heard me or any other clergyman of the Church charge the dissenters, popish or protestant, with being, without exception, a set of ungodly or hypocritical men, or with being a mass of fools and blockheads, or did you ever hear any of us publicly turn their worship into ridicule?

**Parishioner**—No, Sir, that I didn't; for though you hit them pretty hard, I will say that you're always ready to allow that there's a great deal of good folks among them, and that some of them are just as good and conscientious in thinking their own ways right as you are.  
**Parson**—Exactly so, Mr. Birch, now I am sure you will admit, after what you have just said, that I never "run down" as you call it the persons who profess the principles of dissent, but against the principles of dissent itself I wage, and on fitting occasions ever shall wage the most vigorous warfare, because I am in my heart convinced that these principles are contrary to Holy Scripture, dishonouring to God, and injurious to the souls of men.  
**Parishioner**—Well, Sir, I can't, for the life of me, see that it's as bad as all that comes to.  
**Parson**—Perhaps not, Mr. Birch, such views are usually the result of time, reading and reflection, but if on reading Holy Scripture, I am seriously convicted that I find therein numberless commands to be all united in one outward and visible Church, and endless warnings against the sin of division from it, and if on looking up from my Bible, I see men in general breaking these commands and despising these warnings, am I not, (if convinced of this) as much bound to admonish and warn them of these things, as I am bound to do to those who are negligent concerning the duty of honesty, and his warnings against the crime of theft. I cannot see how it can be more uncharitable to do one than the other.

**Parishioner**—Why, Sir, there might be something in that to be sure, if one could only be certain that these passages of Scripture that speak about our all being one church meant that there should only be one church.  
**Parson**—There can be no doubt about the matter. But supposing there could be, if I am convinced that this is the case, and that the doctrine of the unity of the Church is really a part of the Gospel, should I not be much to blame if I kept back that which I believed to be true, if I kept back from the people a part of that eternal truth the whole of which I have solemnly vowed to the best of my ability to declare?

**Parishioner**—Why, there's no denying it, Sir, but I didn't look upon it quite in this way before.  
**Parson**—And now you will admit, I should suppose, that I do not act uncharitably when I warn the people against what I am convinced is opposed to God's Holy Word, and hurtful to their own souls?

**Parishioner**—Well, I must admit that, of course, but most people will think it uncharitable.  
**Parson**—That is because they cannot separate between conscientious opposition to erroneous principles and unkind attacks upon well-meaning persons who hold those principles. Now I oppose the principles of dissent and shew from Holy Scripture their error and unsoundness, but I ever strive (as you can bear me witness) to speak and act in a kindly and neighbourly way with reference to the persons professing those principles. When they say anything against the church, however, you will almost invariably observe, that it is against her principles that they exclaim.—They do not doubt the Scripturalty or authority of her ministry, the general soundness of her doctrines, or the validity of her Sacraments, but they direct their attacks against the character of certain of her members or ministers. Now I don't wish to say anything but what is strictly true and therefore I will shew you what I consider uncharitableness by giving you an instance or two of their usual mode of opposition which have come within my own knowledge. One of my dissenting neighbours who is a great admirer of the law, in allowing every one to hold any manner of religious error, no matter how dangerous, without warning or remonstrance, told me one day that he did not believe there was one Churchman in the whole parish who had the least vestige of religion, and that there was not one among them who would not lie or fight, drink or swear, if they had the opportunity.

**Parishioner**—Do you tell me that you heard that with your own ears?  
**Parson**—I did indeed hear it, for it was addressed to myself. There were several other dissenters standing by, and they all seemed to be of the same mind, except one individual who said that perhaps there might be one member of the Church in the parish who would not do such things—for that, however, I was assured no thanks were due to me, for after they told me that I knew nothing about religion myself, they kindly advised me to pray to God to convert me—very good advice if it had been offered in a better spirit;—another who was present and who professed to be a super-eminent religious man told me the circumstances of his own conversion, and then after informing me that I was a blind leader of the blind, added very charitably that I taught erroneous opinions not because I believed them to be true, but because I was paid a large salary to do so.

**Parishioner**—Well, Sir, unless you told me that you heard this yourself I wouldn't believe it.  
**Parson**—You may believe it, however, for it is perfectly true. Another influential dissenter who has before now said to me that he rejoiced in the preaching of the Gospel, and in the prosperity of "all churches" bestowed a very flattering character upon us by saying with that charity for which they are so remarkable, that "no one went to church but blockheads and jacksasses."

**Parishioner**—That was bad enough, but still it is nothing so bad as the other man's speech.  
**Parson**—One of their most eminent preachers, when holding forth in one of the meeting houses within this township attacked the Church.—Now for this I would never blame him if he had endeavoured by sober argument to prove that her principles were wrong, but his effort consisted of a miserable and irrelevant attempt to turn her solemn prayers addressed to Almighty God through Jesus Christ our Lord into unseemly and almost blasphemous ridicule, "Ah," said he, "what are the Church prayers, but the same old story over and over again."

Matthew, Mark, Luke and John,  
One shoe off, one shoe on!  
that's the tune of the Church prayers."

**Parishioner**—And are you sure that's true, Sir? You couldn't not have heard that yourself.  
**Parson**—I did not hear it myself as you rightly suppose, but I know those who did hear it, and I know them to be persons who would not vary from the truth. I often hear many other charges of a like nature, but I can truly and sincerely say that they never even annoy me, for if I do not smile at their absurdity, I pity their ignorance or anger from which they spring. I very seldom speak of them or think of them, but in these days when they talk so much about the duty of being charitable and of our sins against charity in condemning the principles of their societies from the pulpit I thought it as well to point out that in their anxiety to pull the mote of the Church's eye, they have altogether forgotten the fact that there is a beam in their own.

**Parishioner**—Well, Sir, it's a bad thing that there should be so much jarring and difference among men who call themselves followers of Christ.  
**Parson**—It is indeed, Mr. Birch, a very evil and sinful thing but as one sin generally leads to another, so the first sin of division has led to innumerable others, and to none more conspicuously or more naturally than this evil of speaking and heart-burning. It is to me always a matter of astonishment that men think our separation into different denominations can be inno-

cent when they perceive to what great sins and iniquities it inevitably leads. Earnestly ought we to pray and diligently ought we all to labour through good report and evil report that the day may come when we shall all keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace which is God's Church.  
**Parishioner**—Our road divides here, Sir, but before I bid you good night, I must say that the talk I've had with you makes me feel that it is right that we should examine both sides of a question before we come to make up our minds. I shall get some of the books from the library that you mentioned and look more closely into the matter.  
**Parson**—Good night, Mr. Birch, and ere we part let me assure you that my respect for you is increased by your straight-forward way of stating your opinions, and if you do as you have said, I have no doubt as to the result, all we ask is calm investigation into the reasons and ground of our views.

**THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH.**  
(From an American Paper.)

"Our Blessed Lord did not say, 'Pray that the name of your Heavenly Father may be sanctified, or that your sins may be forgiven,' but say, 'Hallowed be Thy Name, &c., so that He prescribes this prayer, not in 'mass material,' but in 'forma verborum,' not in a confused heap of matter, but in exact compass of words; so that if for the direction of what things we are to ask, but also 'pro forma orationis,' for a set form of prayer,"—Bishop of Doan and Conner.

To a Churchman no manual of devotion is so precious as the Liturgy of his own Church, and there are fringes when he is tempted to believe that the men who framed it must have been endowed with more than an ordinary inspiration—when they rendered it so complete in all its parts,—so comprehensive in its construction—so pure in its language—so true in the Scripture; but it is not upon these points that we subscribe to the Liturgy as a Form of Prayer. We value it for its antiquity;—we admire it for its eloquence—we love it for its purity—we approve of it for its suitability,—but it is the warrant of Scripture which is paramount,—which makes it acceptable, and is our ground for its use; the belief that it is the best means by which in one individual body we can "pray with the spirit, and pray with the understanding also"—the only intelligent manner by which "with one mind and one mouth we may glorify God,"—in this belief we are confirmed by the custom of the Jews, and the consentient testimony of the Christian Church in all ages. In the Scriptures of the Old Testament there are several Forms of Prayer preserved; many of which were used in the synagogues to which our Blessed Lord continually resorted, and which services He is said to have joined;—but if all this proof were wanting, there would still be enough to establish its lawfulness in the construction of the Lord's Prayer, and the command that we should use its prescript form of words. (Luke xi. 12.) The existence of ancient Liturgies prove to us that in the primitive Church a common prayer was made the public service of the sanctuary, and at the very time when the gift of plenary inspiration enabled men to "ask aright," we may infer that "the spirit of the prophets was subject to the prophets," as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, where the disciples are said to have "lifted up their voices with one accord." We therefore reasonably conclude that this, which has been the inviolable custom of the Church,—which has been practised by Apostles and commanded by the Lord, must not only lawful, but expedient, and with this, we may meet all argument against Forms of Prayer; the formality of which does not consist in the exactness with which Prayers are composed, but in the indifference with which they are uttered; and while a contrite spirit will put fire into premeditated words, a hard and unpenitent heart might render the unprepared cry of the cherubim and seraphim an unmeaning and spiritless form.

"The following is an Indian's idea of the Trinity.— He had been to hear a missionary.— "When I went home," said he, "I thought and studied long on what my white brother told me. I was dark! very dark! I could not understand how one should be three and three should be one. At last looking around me, I saw water, ice, and snow. I called the Father water, the Son ice, and the Holy Ghost snow. There I could see all three in one—all water, yet distinctly three forms. I then understood the words of my white brother, and the Great Spirit he worshipped.—Banner of the Cross.

**THE REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR'S VISIT TO ROME.**  
(From the Athenaeum.)

The great ceremonies of Rome and their objectionable features, at least in the eyes of Protestants, have been too often described to need repetition. On the Bambino—which may be less familiarly known—we shall touch briefly. The Bambino is a wooden doll said to have been carved by a Franciscan monk in Jerusalem to colour the image, he had recourse to prayer; and having spent a night in devotion, he found in the morning that the little image had miraculously become the colour of flesh. This effigy is exposed for adoration, in a presbytery prepared for it in the convent of the Ara Coeli from the feast of the Nativity to that of the Epiphany. It is, besides, a sovereign preventative against all danger of childbirth, and its presence determines the issue of every doubtful disease.

"It is a common saying among the people of Rome that the Bambino receives more and better fees from the sick than all the medical men combined. It is certain at least that it is brought to visit its patients in a grander style, for a state coach is kept for it—a coach quite as fine in its way as those of the Cardinals or Pope. In this the Bambino is deposited, accompanied by some priests in full canonicals; and onward they move, stately and slow, as a rapid movement is thought inconsistent with the dignity of the image; and then as it passes every head is uncovered and every knee is bent in the street through which it moves. The Pope may pass and be saluted as he passes; the image of the Virgin Mary may pass and many a head is bowed before it; the consecrated Host may pass and some may kneel and some may salute;—but if the Bambino passes every head is uncovered, and all the lower classes, let the weather be ever so wet and dirty, are prostrate in worship before it."

But this is not all. On the feast of the Epiphany the Bambino is brought out to give "its holy benediction" to the multitude assembled around the Ara Coeli. It is taken in solemn procession from the sanctuary to the steps of the Church just at the summit of the capitol, commanding a wide view of the ascending slope and the adjacent streets. Then, at a signal given by a crash of military music, it is raised above the head of the officiating High Priest, while every knee is bent and every head uncovered before it. We agree with Mr. Seymour that this is palpable idolatry; it is acknowledged to be such by the most enlightened ecclesiastics in Rome.

On the annual ceremony of blessing the horses, &c., on St. Anthony's-day, Mr. Seymour observes:—"The ludicrous part of the scene was, when some luckless wight had to conduct some obstinate mule or sulky ass to the priest; the crowd made it their business to shout and halloo so as to terrify the animal, and then, when he started, they would all rush before him. Then they jested and jeered with untiring assiduity, till the mule or ass, plunging violently would sometimes fling the rider to the ground; and, sometimes, when brought almost within reach, and the priest would raise his brush to sprinkle the water, the animal would dart away, seated at the sight of his robes, the raising of his arm, and the lifting of his brush. It was at such times that the mirth and merriment of the crowding people would become uproarious. The priest at times fell in good-naturedly with this humour of the people, and would intentionally give such a flourish of his brush and arm as was sure to scare the animal. And then hats were waved and hands were clapped, and the cheer went round and round again, till the frightened animals became wholly unmanageable, and were obliged to be brought sometimes by main force within reach of the holy water.—At times asses were dragged by main force applied to their tails, going backwards with no very graceful step to receive the blessing of St. Anthony. It seemed to a stranger as if the evil of all others most dreaded by the unwilling and unbelieving animals was the participation in the blessing of the saint. Altogether, it was a strange and comical scene, and such a scene as could only be witnessed among a laughter-loving and superstitious people."

### Eccelesiastical Intelligence.

#### ENGLAND.

CONSUMPTION HOSPITAL.—SERMON BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, delivered at St. George's Church, Hanover-square, on behalf of the Hospital for Consumption and Diseases of the Chest at Brompton. The collection amounted to £137 13s. 7d.

MISSIONARIES AND COLONIAL CHAPLAINS WANTED.—The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts have been requested to recommend to Her Majesty's Government a well-qualified Clergyman for a vacant Chaplaincy in Van Diemen's Land, and also one for the settlement on the Gold Coast. Additional missionaries are also wanted for stations in Canada, Australia, and the Cape of Good Hope.

SEAFARERS SOCIETY FOR THE RELIEF OF THE WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF THE CLERGY.—At the last annual meeting of the members of this Society, Archdeacon Holdson in the chair, the sum of £400 was voted to be applied, but in several cases the usual grants were obliged to be reduced, in consequence of death and removal of many of the subscribers.

THE ARMENIAN TRANSLATION OF THE ENGLISH LITURGY.—The following communication, addressed to the committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, has been received from Bishop Southgate, the American Bishop at Constantinople, in reference to the Armenian translation of our Liturgy:—"I had some very favourable opinions of the work, both from Clergy and laity. A beautiful copy has been presented by me to the Armenian Patriarch, who received it very kindly, and suggested that a copy be given to each of the recent seceders from his Church, who have formed themselves into a congregational sect. He says, and I have no doubt truly, that they are entirely unaware of the existence of such a Church among the English; and that the book is admirable; he had no idea of a Church of so apostolic a character existing in the West, and he is rejoiced to find in the book the ancient doctrine of Christianity. I have hope, great hope, of much good from it, both in imparting correct information, and in preserving a pure specimen of Christianity."

CELESTIAL AID SOCIETY.—The following appeal has been made by this Society for additional support:—"The parochial Clergy are again most earnestly requested to bring the wants of this Society, which is still compelled to leave upwards of sixty most urgent cases unattended, before their parishioners, especially as those wants are greatly increased by the prospect of the withdrawal of all the terminable grants, forty-six in number, at Easter next, unless the Society's income be immediately augmented. Another source of difficulty under which

might be mistaken; those who anticipated nothing but peace and harmony from a measure of conciliation, might be in the right; theirs was the more "charitable," and therefore the more amiable and preferable view. But the Duke and Sir Robert were told something more. They were told that the Romish Church is an anti-christian, an idolatrous Church; that to grant to the creed of that Church one iota beyond bare toleration, is a great national sin—a making ourselves partakers of the guilt, and with the guilt, of the course of Rome. It was pointed out to them that not only the legal constitution of this kingdom, but the whole of our social edifice, the nation's whole history, and life, and character, are bound up with a pure faith in Christ; that above their earthly and temporal Sovereign, the people of this land had hitherto recognized "another King, one Jesus;" that to incorporate with the institutions of the land, and to admit to its counsels, a creed which dishonours Christ, and deceives the souls of men by a blasphemous mimicry of His truth and ordinances, could be nothing short of high treason against Him who is—and by the people of this land has ever been so acknowledged—"King of kings, and Lord of lords."

All this they were told; and not the Duke and Sir Robert only, but—let us be just—the whole nation heinous and—as it was justly feared it would turn out—irrevocably a misdeed. But England was then in the pride of her glory, and she thought herself sitting as a Queen, who should never see any evil befalling her. And because the majority of the nation were deaf to the voice of warning, because they stigmatized those who warned them as fanatics and bigots, because they defied the God of heaven by bigots, because they fellowshiped with the Anti-Christ-making fellowship and agreement with the Anti-Christ-making creed of Rome—therefore it is that the nation's sin now weighs so heavily upon the nation's destinies.

We thought to avoid civil war and discord by slighting the Almighty, and we have reaped the just reward of that wicked and unholy imagination. We shall have to fight out that civil war from which we shrank with a sense of humanity laudible in itself, but utterly mistaken when placed in competition with our duty elsewhere; but we shall have to fight it out against an enemy who not only has acquired strength in the same proportion as he has discovered our weakness, but whose chief advantage over us is this, that he has lost moral respect for us, and worse than even this, that we have lost moral respect for ourselves.

We do not make this assertion merely for the sake of a strong statement. Our words are deliberately uttered. Would a nation not lost to self-respect allow itself to be trifled with as the Papists have trifled and paltered with the British Crown and Parliament ever since the passing of the fatal Emancipation Act? Would it go on trucking to the foe who openly assails, and no less openly derides it? Have the Papists, we ask, thought it worth their while of late to disguise their ultimate design to bring back Popish ascendancy to this land? Do they restrain the insolence of their still hope—prematre triumph? Let the Irish edition prints, let the manifestoes of St. Jarlath's wife, let the Tablet answer the question.

But what, then, are we to do? First let us see what we are not to do. We are not to persevere in the cowardly, unprincipled conciliation-policy, which has made us untrue to our God and to our own conscience, and a scorn to our enemies. We are, like honest men, honestly to repent of the wrong which we have done, and arise and amend our ways. On the very stage which has witnessed our sin, Providence has in mercy reserved for us an opportunity of retrieving our fault. There is still remaining in Ireland a Protestant, who has been for many years an inmate of the Papist's house, and who has seen the Papist's beating in Ireland thousands of Protestant hearts, as loyal to their Queen as they are true to their God.—Let us hold out to them the hand which we have long withdrawn from them, because we dreaded the Popish scowl against Protestant connexion. The hour of danger, and with it our last hour of trial as a nation, in this matter, is rapidly advancing. The Papists themselves are clamorous to have the question that convulses Ireland brought to an issue. Let us at once, and boldly cast aside every policy but one in the approaching struggle: let us enter that struggle as a Protestant and God-fearing people—and let us not doubt that if girded to the battle with truth and righteousness, God and the right will surely prevail!

Our rubric enjoins kneeling during the supplicatory portions of the service; and fast and far are our congregations departing from that command. Yet no man can have the face to assert that the bodily exercise of kneeling is not enjoined or implied as a duty throughout the New Testament; enforced, too, by the example of the Lord Jesus Christ himself. I do not know, because I have never tried, but I trust in God I shall never be induced to try, what degree of devotional feeling accompanies a sitting position, during the worship of his heavenly King; but I very much question the advantages of such demeanor. While we remain in the body, we cannot discover the intimate connexion subsisting between the outward act and inward thought; and it does appear an odd way of obeying the apostolic exhortation, "glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are His," to attempt such disjunction of mind and matter, just where we are admonished specially to unite them in the service, and surely in the worship of God. To deny, or indeed to curtail the homage of the body, in order to exalt that of the soul, is going against universal experience, and against the tenor of His injunctions, who knows better what is in man than man himself does.

To me, I confess, it is a very delightful moment of realization, in regard to the privileges of Church-membership, when brethren and sisters with one accord, do outward homage to the name of Him, who, in taking their nature upon Him, never ceased to be God over all, blessed for ever. It is very meet that flesh, which he deigned to take into communion with Deity, should with lowly and external reverence, hail God manifest in the flesh. "Jesus Christ our Lord," are words of mighty, of immeasurable import. The Saviour, the Anointed, our Saviour, our God, the Captain of our salvation, the Head of His body the Church, which body (at least in profession) are we. It was He who wore our form, who bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows; who walked our earth a persecuted, afflicted man; who hung on the cross to atone for our sins; descended into the grave, that it might become the gate of life to us; and now, in the majesty of His eternal glory, visits our temples, and hearkens to our prayers. Let those who can, deny Him the poor tribute of grateful reverence; so long as I have power to bend a muscle, my knee shall bow, in deep and willing adoration, at the glorious and beloved NAME OF JESUS CHRIST MY LORD.

### THEY THAT SOW THE WIND SHALL REAP THE WHIRLWIND.

(From The John Bull)

When twenty years ago the Duke of Wellington, for once in his life, and Sir Robert Peel, once out of their tents unnumbered, turned short round upon their own principles, and determined upon carrying the "Catholic Emancipation," they were told loudly enough what would happen, but they refused to listen. They were vainly informed that with Popery there cannot be any more than with the kingdom below, any covenant or agreement; that to concede to Papists power, in the hope of averting civil war, is simply to adjourn the period. They were told that the only effect of their measure would be to render the Papist more dangerous by the fact of the concession made, and more dangerous to the power conceded to him. All this they were told in vain. So fat they might be excused. The question was one of opinion; those who argued ill of the result of admitting Papists to political power,

the following is an Indian's idea of the Trinity.— He had been to hear a missionary.— "When I went home," said he, "I thought and studied long on what my white brother told me. I was dark! very dark! I could not understand how one should be three and three should be one. At last looking around me, I saw water, ice, and snow. I called the Father water, the Son ice, and the Holy Ghost snow. There I could see all three in one—all water, yet distinctly three forms. I then understood the words of my white brother, and the Great Spirit he worshipped.—Banner of the Cross.

**THE REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR'S VISIT TO ROME.**  
(From the Athenaeum.)