

Poetry.

PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH.

[From the poem of the Rev. S. Hanson Cox, before the Evangelical Society of Geneva College.]

Here in pastures ever green,
Shepherds and their flocks are seen;
Chief Shepherd true appear;
As breaks the hollow day,
The air, from Maine to Mexico doth ring
With chime of bells loud summoning to pray;
Anon Jehovah sees,
The Church upon her knees;
The sacrifice of stillness first ascends,
Acceptable to God;
Anon the peal of organ blends,
With choral praise, which heaven's high arches rends;
Blessed is the sound—the light,
And our blue waters roll in light.
Yet are there who oppose,
The Churchman crieth, "Spare!"
Disserter crieth "Fear;"
When before wise Solomon,
Claiming mothers' food,
The Mother yearn'd to 'twixt the child,
The false carol not for blood;
Sight of sword the spirit tried,
All the Mother wept—true nature cried.
"Send not the vestments of our blessed Lord,"
"Send not the sacred robe,"
So resounds the Churchman's heart,
He grieveth when he crieth,
The sound "Divide! Divide!"
"Thy they all may be one,"
Father thy will be done;
That all may well agree,
In love—in unity.
That saints on earth, and angels may behold,
One Shepherd, and one fold,
Lamps with oil the foolish virgins bore;
Oil without lamps is equal in vain;
But join in one the twain,
Then flames the taper bright,
And all is joy—for all is light.
A voice upon the waters, from the isles,
It soundeth,—there the garden smiles;
Soon the isles illumined o'er,
Shall wait as satellites upon the shore;
The music of their heart be blest,
With sounding praise from the Continent,
And the spirit of the Lord shall hover,
The tranquil waters o'er,
Lo where New Zealand lies,
The Messenger hath gone,
And all his armour on;
There the words of God doth dwell,
Flaps in the breeze the text of Israel,
And from many a soul long dumb,
Ascendeth fervent prayer. "Thy Kingdom come,"
Brothers in remotest isles,
Brothers of the heart, in faith,
Freely by Christ from error's ways,
The blessed kingdom of the Lord,
Omnipresent at his word,
Blessed all hearts together;
"Al! join in Christ, the vital head,
But one Communion make,
Angels, and living saints and dead."
Thus onward moves the Church of God,
'Tis wondrous in our eyes;
It flourisheth though scorn opposed,
As palm-trees press'd to die;
Ye young Cadets culled for the prize,
Upon whose brow is set the crown,
In the strength of God, arise;
Bearing ye the fruits of Academic lore,
Hasten with them your Lord to greet,
O throw your laurels at the Saviour's feet,
And be the Elect of God;
And we are marching now the desert through,
Fair Canaan's fields in view,
As Israel of yore,
Our Joshua before,
Strong heroes lead the van;
But true each heart each man;
O as ye move along,
For Christ and for his holy Church,
Let your young nerves be strong;
Let the red-cross banner wave,
Underneath its folds be brave;
Through might of Him the great "I AM"
Onward and wear the palm.
—Gospel Messenger.

KING CHARLES THE MARTYR.

[From a Sermon by Bishop Sherlock.]

No government was ever so perfectly formed as first, as to answer all occasions; the wisdom of man not reaching far enough to view all the possible variety of circumstances, that may require the mitigating, or increasing the severity of old laws; or the making new. Therefore it is necessary for the public good, that there should be a power lodged somewhere, to adapt old laws to the present circumstances, or those which may hereafter arise. Thus to change, is an act of lawful power; and therefore falls not within the charge of the text, Not to meddle with them that are given to change.
But then the most beneficial and necessary changes must be begun, promoted, and perfected by lawful authority; or else they lose their good quality, and like wholesome remedies unduly applied, prey upon the vitals of the government. For no change can be so beneficial in its consequence, as usurping upon lawful authority is destructive; and therefore it becomes a good subject to bear any inconvenience arising from the present constitution, rather than, by too precipitately throwing it off, to prevent the regular methods of alteration. To pretend public good, is common to all factions and parties; and therefore can excuse none; and where the pretence is real; yet to seek public good, in opposition to public authority, is like curing distempers by destroying the patient.
To view with pleasure the factions and disturbances of a kingdom; and like the lame and impotent at the pool of Bethesda, to long for the troubling of the waters, that we may first step in, and make some private advantage of the public calamities, is neither the part of a good man, or a good Christian.
To encourage the seditious principles and practices of others; though cunning men may do it without danger, yet they can never do it without guilt.
These practices need not be brought near, to be compared with the duty of obedience. They appear at first sight to have nothing less in them than honour and reverence, or obedience to the prince.
The authority of the prince is as much concerned in maintaining the honour and order of God's service, as of his own; and the noblest character that belongs to princes, is that of nursing fathers and mothers to the Church of Christ; the peace and order of which is at once the splendour and security of a government; and therefore the advice of the text, Not to meddle with them who are given to change, must be extended to the government of the Church, as well as of the State.
And the occasion of this solemnity gives but too much reason for this application; the alterations intended and practised upon the Church, influencing not a little in the barbarous reason which we this day lament.
There must in the Church, as in the State, be a power to change whatever, through use and experience, appears unfit for the end it was designed. To propose and procure amendments to the laws of the Church, when there is occasion for it, is their duty in whose hands the power is lodged; and changes so effected, can never be to the blemish or dishonour of the Church.
But when men dislike without reason, and obstinately condemn whatever has been settled by authority; when they disclaim the power and all the acts of the Church; either their ignorance must be invincible, or their guilt unpardonable.
The reason of all changes ought to be very plain and apparent; lest lightness and wantonness, in altering old laws, bring power and authority into contempt.—To change is the effect, and the sign of weakness; and therefore it is the character of the most perfect Being,

that in him is no variableness, or shadow of turning.— Often to change, will always breed contempt; and therefore, in private life, wise men choose rather to bear some inconveniences arising from one course to another, than to shift from one course to another, and want of resolution. Much less should public bodies hazard their credit by unnecessary changes; and, for the sake of removing one unpolished stone, endanger the whole building; which how it will settle on a new foundation, the wisdom of man cannot foresee. Some inconveniences in the establishment of public societies, like some distempers in the body, are borne with less danger than they are cured.

To plead for alterations of seemingly greater purity and perfection, carries with it such an appearance of goodness and concern for the service of God, as will never fail to engage the favour of the multitude, who always make up in zeal what they want in knowledge; which is, and will be a temptation to men, who are incapable of a better, to take this way to raise themselves in the esteem of the people.

To press for alterations when most things in the present establishment are owned to be good, and all tolerable, is not the effect of much judgment. If want of perfection be a reason to change, it will be a reason for ever; for since all the laws of the Church are not of divine institution, they have too great a mixture of weakness in their original, ever to be perfect in themselves. And should all the changes desired be granted, let not men imagine that the next age will be so unlike this, as not to find fault with the orders of their superiors.

It is unaccountable in reason, that in matters of religious government, every man thinks himself judge of what is decent and convenient, and what fit to be obeyed; whereas in matters of civil government, whatever they act, they dare not pretend to the same discretionary power: as if the case were not the same in both; and obedience in all things lawful and honest, (further than which, no man's private judgment extends), in both of like necessity.

How the common people are led into the esteem of men thus acting, is not hard to say. To suffer for one's opinion, right or wrong, is in the eyes of the vulgar meritorious; and since some outward advantages are forfeited, by not complying with the present establishment; should men, even for worldly interest, and want of merit sufficient to rise in the lawful and regular way, strike out new paths for themselves; yet they shall be sure, among their followers, to have the character of honest men, men suffering for conscience sake. And though there be no suffering in the case; no punishment attending upon such practices; yet whilst rewards are open to the obedience of others, the partiality of men will make them after to repine at the distinction, than to be thankful for the impunity.

As long as men are weak enough to be misled; and the errors of some are profitable to others; there will be no end of dissensions: and should the restlessness and impertinency of men once break in upon the constitution, the event could only show where it would end.

To what extremes the humour of men once set on changing will run, the mournful occasion of this day's meeting is too sensible a proof. The actors in the late troubles thought of nothing less, when they began, than the event that succeeded. The good of the public, and of the King, was the pretence; and they never left seeking it, till they had ruined the public, and laid his royal head low. With the same good success, the purity of the Church was promoted; which ended in utter subversion, and the blood of a great prelate.

Great indeed in many respects; but he sunk under the iniquity of the times, by endeavouring to give life to the long-forgotten and neglected discipline of the Church; when the liberty and licentiousness of the age could bear nothing less. The Reformation had given such a turn to weak heads, that had not weight enough to poise themselves between the extremes of popery and fanaticism; that every thing older than yesterday was looked upon to be popish and anti-Christian; the meanest of the people aspired to the priesthood; and were readier to frame new laws for the Church, than obey the old. This led him to some acts of great severity, that he might create an authority and reverence for the laws, when it should appear they had not quite lost their edge. Thus he became too generally hated, and fall he must; for his faults were great, and, as the times went, unpardonable; he loved the Church and the King.

His case might deserve more to be lamented, did not that which followed bury all private injuries and resentments; in respect of which, the former cruelties were tender mercies. The thirst of blood was too great to be satisfied with the fall of private men; nor could the new schemes of confusion take place, till the fountain of lawful power and authority was dried up. Every man had a project of his own for a new government; and rather than be disappointed, they resolved to lay the foundation in royal blood.

Could all the obligations of nature and religion have prevailed, the King might have lived to make his people happy; but the misfortune was, they had injured him too much to trust him even with his own life; nor could their consciences give them security for the mischief already done, but in going on still to add murder and perdition, and in destroying the power they had too much reason to fear. A barbarous cruelty! of which it is hard to say, whether the malice and wickedness, with which it was acted, were greater; or the patience and magnanimity with which it was borne. As if the contest had been, whether human nature were capable of greater degrees of virtue, or vice.

View the King from the throne to the scaffold; and he was in his life the pattern of a good prince; in his death, of a good Christian. He was a prince, who from the sweetness of his temper, the integrity of his intentions, and a kind and tender concern for the meanest of his subjects, might well have expected to make his name dear to this nation, and his memory glorious, upon a better account than the history of this day affords. He was formed by nature and grace to be an ornament of better times; and wanted nothing to make him great in the worst, those he lived in, but a just resentment of the indignities he suffered. The only prerogative his enemies had left him, was to forgive the injuries they did him; which he exercised to the last; and, in the heat of a merciless rebellion, could never forget his enemies were his subjects, when they had long since forgot him to be their King; which was too great a bias upon the minds of indifferent men, when they saw the only way to escape being punished, was to take the course that deserved it.

They, who consider the happy and envied condition of our government, in which are equally secured, the dignity of the prince, and liberty of the subject; the blessing of a Church established in primitive purity, wherein the honour of religion and God's service is maintained without superstition; obedience taught without blindness; can never sufficiently reverence the memory of a prince, who chose rather to lay down his crown and his life, than not deliver down these blessings invaluable to posterity. They, who remember him, without any partial affection, must allow him the character of a noble and generous prince, and father of his country. They, who think with envy, and speak with malice, of him, can say no worse, than, He was a man of the passions with us. And surely they forget themselves to be men, who would have our common infirmities remembered to his dishonour.

The case is hard, if princes have no right to the allowances made to all besides; harder, because, by their high station, they are more exposed to the view of the world; and few there are so modest, as not to think themselves well enough to judge of their actions. Private persons have their inclinations free from all checks and restraints, more than innocence and religion require; their rule is, to preserve integrity, and it will preserve them. But men of character have this further care, that their good be not evil spoken of; a lesson of hardier it is to please men than God.—To seek the good opinion of the people, is prudence in men of public characters; but in there a greater slavery under the sun, than to be obliged to live by the opinion of those, who are neither wise enough to judge, nor to let it alone?

The privilege that extends to the meanest cottage, to choose their own friends and companions, is not without murmuring allowed to kings; nor will it be permitted to the dignity of some characters, and majesty of others, to stoop even to the innocent and harmless enjoyments of life: as if princes and great ministers had no private cares; but were capable of the constant thoughts of public business and religion. Every step men take, by which they rise into the view of the world, is an abridgement of their innocent liberty, and binds them to a stricter and severer self-denial. For there is a natural envy in men, which loves to see the honour and dignity of great places qualified with trouble and anxiety.

But men who are distinguished by the advantages of birth and education, should be above the common prejudices and sordid passions of the vulgar; and think themselves obliged, in honour as well as duty, to pay a steady and regular obedience to the government. It is some excuse for the dishonour of the nation, in the late rebellion, that we can show so brave a list of nobility and gentry, who fell in defence of their King; and left the honour of their death, a nobler inheritance to their families than their lands and estates. The imitation of their virtue and obedience need not to be pressed in this audience; where the rules of duty and honour are better practised, than they can be taught. The noble families have examples of their own, to instruct them how they should behave themselves to their prince and their country: and in the history of their ancestors, may learn, that loyalty to the crown is the first and the noblest title of honour. And surely this much good we may expect from the evil of the late times; that men would learn at length to love the blessing of a good prince.

It is the goodness of God to us, that, after so many convulsions, we still enjoy our ancient government; that there is still life and vigour in the religion and liberty of England: a goodness that on our part requires the utmost returns of gratitude; which can no way be so acceptably shewn, as in the worthy use of the blessings we enjoy. We shall but ill perform the duty of this day, unless we amend in ourselves the errors we reprove in others. The crown and the virtues of the royal Martyr are once more joined together; let not then our reproach be renewed by the repeated want of obedience and affection. If, whilst our governors watch with care and solicitude, to make us easy and happy in ourselves; strong and secure against our enemies abroad; we labour to disturb the methods of our government at home; we must thank ourselves for the evils, which will always follow from the turbulent humours and distracted counsels of a nation. We have an enemy strong and cunning to deal with; an ancient rival of the power and honour of England; an enemy to the religion of Protestants, and the liberty of mankind; and if nothing else will, yet interest would prevail with us to unite for our mutual safety; and whilst our brave countrymen expose their lives to the hazard and fortune of war abroad, in defence of their prince and their country; methinks the least that can be expected of us, is to be quiet and peaceable at home. To save the sinking liberties of Europe is worthy a Queen of England; and if the spirit of our fathers be not degenerate in us, it will, it must rise to check the progress of an ambitious monarch; and it will ever be the choice of an Englishman, rather to die by his sword, than live by his law: but our lives and fortunes are safe in the conduct and prudence of our governors; we need only sacrifice our ill humours to the peace and security of our country, and be content to stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord. Let us at least be willing to be saved; and, for the sake and defence of our religion, submit to live by the rules of it. We have been long fighting and contending for our religion; it is now high time to practise it; and a better foundation we cannot lay than in the duties of the text, To fear the Lord, and the king, and not to meddle with them that are given to change.

It is very natural that in proportion to the progress of her success in Britain, her attention and sanguine expectations should be turned towards another ancient and independent Church—that of our beloved IRLAND. The energetic and efficient help which the Irish Bishops had given their brethren of the British Church in resisting her encroachments in that country, was sufficient to apprise her what a formidable antagonist she had here to contend with, but Rome, not readily intimidated or easily disheartened, had fixed a longing eye upon the Irish Church, determined never to forego her pretensions or abandon her expectations until she should accomplish its entire subjugation. Part of a letter preserved by Bede, in the 4th chapter of the 2d book of his Ecclesiastical History, presents us with a fair specimen of the sort of feelings with which our Bishops regarded the Pontiff's claims to a universal headship. It was written by Laurentius, Augustine's successor in the See of Canterbury, complaining that his commission from what he calls the Apostolic See, was treated with such contempt by the Irish, as well as the British, that Bishop Dagan going over from Ireland "not only refused to eat with him, but even to take his repast in the same house in which he was entertained." If we were now thus to treat one of the Pope's more modern representatives in this country, he he priest or bishop, what a cry of indignation would be raised against us, though in so doing we should be only following the example of one of the god Bishops of our Church at a time when our modern Romish adversaries would have the world believe that she was subject to the jurisdiction of said Pontiff. How little notion had those who did act so of their Church having ever been in any such subjection, or of her having ever derived her origin from that intruding Church to which they, by such demonstrations, manifested a resolution never to submit. It is true, that though not amongst the original planters, yet amongst the early and most successful cultivators of their national vineyard, they numbered a PATRICK, now by too many vainly imagined to have had his mission from the Bishop of Rome; but the fact of even the very name of that saint being entirely passed over by Bede, is a strong corroboration of other more direct testimonies that he had not received his mission from that quarter. Cf. Palladius, who, a few years before Patrick, was sent by the very pontiff (Celestine), from whom the latter also is asserted to have come, Bede does make mention though his mission was wholly unsuccessful; of Patrick, with all his acknowledged success, he says nothing, an omission of which so devoted a servant of the See of Rome would, most certainly, not have been guilty had he regarded Ireland's saint as a missionary from that See. If Patrick had come to our island in that character, what appeals, also, to his authority and practice should we find abounding in the arguments, made use of by the Romish Bishops of the English Church in their controversies with the Irish Bishops, as recorded by the same historian!

It was very natural that in proportion to the progress of her success in Britain, her attention and sanguine expectations should be turned towards another ancient and independent Church—that of our beloved IRLAND. The energetic and efficient help which the Irish Bishops had given their brethren of the British Church in resisting her encroachments in that country, was sufficient to apprise her what a formidable antagonist she had here to contend with, but Rome, not readily intimidated or easily disheartened, had fixed a longing eye upon the Irish Church, determined never to forego her pretensions or abandon her expectations until she should accomplish its entire subjugation. Part of a letter preserved by Bede, in the 4th chapter of the 2d book of his Ecclesiastical History, presents us with a fair specimen of the sort of feelings with which our Bishops regarded the Pontiff's claims to a universal headship. It was written by Laurentius, Augustine's successor in the See of Canterbury, complaining that his commission from what he calls the Apostolic See, was treated with such contempt by the Irish, as well as the British, that Bishop Dagan going over from Ireland "not only refused to eat with him, but even to take his repast in the same house in which he was entertained." If we were now thus to treat one of the Pope's more modern representatives in this country, he he priest or bishop, what a cry of indignation would be raised against us, though in so doing we should be only following the example of one of the god Bishops of our Church at a time when our modern Romish adversaries would have the world believe that she was subject to the jurisdiction of said Pontiff. How little notion had those who did act so of their Church having ever been in any such subjection, or of her having ever derived her origin from that intruding Church to which they, by such demonstrations, manifested a resolution never to submit. It is true, that though not amongst the original planters, yet amongst the early and most successful cultivators of their national vineyard, they numbered a PATRICK, now by too many vainly imagined to have had his mission from the Bishop of Rome; but the fact of even the very name of that saint being entirely passed over by Bede, is a strong corroboration of other more direct testimonies that he had not received his mission from that quarter. Cf. Palladius, who, a few years before Patrick, was sent by the very pontiff (Celestine), from whom the latter also is asserted to have come, Bede does make mention though his mission was wholly unsuccessful; of Patrick, with all his acknowledged success, he says nothing, an omission of which so devoted a servant of the See of Rome would, most certainly, not have been guilty had he regarded Ireland's saint as a missionary from that See. If Patrick had come to our island in that character, what appeals, also, to his authority and practice should we find abounding in the arguments, made use of by the Romish Bishops of the English Church in their controversies with the Irish Bishops, as recorded by the same historian!

It is very natural that in proportion to the progress of her success in Britain, her attention and sanguine expectations should be turned towards another ancient and independent Church—that of our beloved IRLAND. The energetic and efficient help which the Irish Bishops had given their brethren of the British Church in resisting her encroachments in that country, was sufficient to apprise her what a formidable antagonist she had here to contend with, but Rome, not readily intimidated or easily disheartened, had fixed a longing eye upon the Irish Church, determined never to forego her pretensions or abandon her expectations until she should accomplish its entire subjugation. Part of a letter preserved by Bede, in the 4th chapter of the 2d book of his Ecclesiastical History, presents us with a fair specimen of the sort of feelings with which our Bishops regarded the Pontiff's claims to a universal headship. It was written by Laurentius, Augustine's successor in the See of Canterbury, complaining that his commission from what he calls the Apostolic See, was treated with such contempt by the Irish, as well as the British, that Bishop Dagan going over from Ireland "not only refused to eat with him, but even to take his repast in the same house in which he was entertained." If we were now thus to treat one of the Pope's more modern representatives in this country, he he priest or bishop, what a cry of indignation would be raised against us, though in so doing we should be only following the example of one of the god Bishops of our Church at a time when our modern Romish adversaries would have the world believe that she was subject to the jurisdiction of said Pontiff. How little notion had those who did act so of their Church having ever been in any such subjection, or of her having ever derived her origin from that intruding Church to which they, by such demonstrations, manifested a resolution never to submit. It is true, that though not amongst the original planters, yet amongst the early and most successful cultivators of their national vineyard, they numbered a PATRICK, now by too many vainly imagined to have had his mission from the Bishop of Rome; but the fact of even the very name of that saint being entirely passed over by Bede, is a strong corroboration of other more direct testimonies that he had not received his mission from that quarter. Cf. Palladius, who, a few years before Patrick, was sent by the very pontiff (Celestine), from whom the latter also is asserted to have come, Bede does make mention though his mission was wholly unsuccessful; of Patrick, with all his acknowledged success, he says nothing, an omission of which so devoted a servant of the See of Rome would, most certainly, not have been guilty had he regarded Ireland's saint as a missionary from that See. If Patrick had come to our island in that character, what appeals, also, to his authority and practice should we find abounding in the arguments, made use of by the Romish Bishops of the English Church in their controversies with the Irish Bishops, as recorded by the same historian!

It is very natural that in proportion to the progress of her success in Britain, her attention and sanguine expectations should be turned towards another ancient and independent Church—that of our beloved IRLAND. The energetic and efficient help which the Irish Bishops had given their brethren of the British Church in resisting her encroachments in that country, was sufficient to apprise her what a formidable antagonist she had here to contend with, but Rome, not readily intimidated or easily disheartened, had fixed a longing eye upon the Irish Church, determined never to forego her pretensions or abandon her expectations until she should accomplish its entire subjugation. Part of a letter preserved by Bede, in the 4th chapter of the 2d book of his Ecclesiastical History, presents us with a fair specimen of the sort of feelings with which our Bishops regarded the Pontiff's claims to a universal headship. It was written by Laurentius, Augustine's successor in the See of Canterbury, complaining that his commission from what he calls the Apostolic See, was treated with such contempt by the Irish, as well as the British, that Bishop Dagan going over from Ireland "not only refused to eat with him, but even to take his repast in the same house in which he was entertained." If we were now thus to treat one of the Pope's more modern representatives in this country, he he priest or bishop, what a cry of indignation would be raised against us, though in so doing we should be only following the example of one of the god Bishops of our Church at a time when our modern Romish adversaries would have the world believe that she was subject to the jurisdiction of said Pontiff. How little notion had those who did act so of their Church having ever been in any such subjection, or of her having ever derived her origin from that intruding Church to which they, by such demonstrations, manifested a resolution never to submit. It is true, that though not amongst the original planters, yet amongst the early and most successful cultivators of their national vineyard, they numbered a PATRICK, now by too many vainly imagined to have had his mission from the Bishop of Rome; but the fact of even the very name of that saint being entirely passed over by Bede, is a strong corroboration of other more direct testimonies that he had not received his mission from that quarter. Cf. Palladius, who, a few years before Patrick, was sent by the very pontiff (Celestine), from whom the latter also is asserted to have come, Bede does make mention though his mission was wholly unsuccessful; of Patrick, with all his acknowledged success, he says nothing, an omission of which so devoted a servant of the See of Rome would, most certainly, not have been guilty had he regarded Ireland's saint as a missionary from that See. If Patrick had come to our island in that character, what appeals, also, to his authority and practice should we find abounding in the arguments, made use of by the Romish Bishops of the English Church in their controversies with the Irish Bishops, as recorded by the same historian!

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

[From a Charge by the Ven. R. J. Wilberforce, M.A., Archbishop of the East Indies.]

What is public worship? The very name of our formularies teaches—we call them the Liturgy. Now Liturgy means, in its original intention, Service, and is applied especially to those prayers and actions by which we participate in the Holy Communion of our Lord's body and blood, and in a wider sense, to that whole range of public addresses which the people, and the priest on their behalf, offer up to God. The Liturgy then is as plainly a sacrifice, as any portion of the ancient ritual. It is as such a tribute rendered to the Lord of Hosts, as the bulls and goats of Jewish worship; it is the collective offering of the Christian Israel, the earthly declaration of man's allegiance, the Church's public act and natural occupation. Its use is founded on the precedents of the ancient temple; and on the practice and precepts of the Apostles. The Jewish Liturgy indeed was presented in the visible form of a carnal offering, but its meaning was expounded by David—"Let my prayers be set forth as the incense, and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice." Its Christian meaning was predicted by Malachi, in words the former part whereof refer to our whole Liturgy, even if we confine the closing expression to the more distinctive service of the Holy Communion. "My name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering." (Malachi, i. 2.) And this incense which was to supply the place of that which was offered morning and evening in the ancient temple, is by St. John (Rev. v. 8, viii. 3) explained to mean the prayers of all saints. You will not suppose that I can detract from the necessity of private supplication; but since no prayer can be effectual, save that of Christians, and it is by participating in the public character of the Christian Church that we are entitled to its blessings, what significance has private prayer, excepting it be relative to public worship?

Time only prevents me from dwelling further on the meaning and purpose which the very name of our Liturgy implies. I cannot omit, however, to observe, that since the object of man's creation is God's glory, and this glory is especially set forth in His Church, therefore when we offer up this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, we are in truth discharging the highest function for which man was made, and rendering to Almighty God that homage for which he spares this whole world of rebellious creatures. And ennobling as is such an office to sinful man, it is even more so when we consider the companions of our exalted service. Do men leave us to minister with careless and infrequent comrades, yet do the holy angels in whose presence we stand, afford the noblest of all companies of fellow worshippers, while with the self-same order, and often, as we are assured by Him for whom heaven's door stood open, in the self-same words, they ascribe blessing, and honour, and thanksgiving, and praise, saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory.—(Revelations, iv. 8.)

Now the conduct appropriate to public worship, must obviously be regulated by its nature. Its principle is, that each member of the Church should have somewhat to offer, yet that the collective prayers of all should be presented as one single tribute to the Minister of God. For this is what preserves to the Church the real attribute of an individual nature, while it maintains the sacred doctrine of the inward life of each man's spirit. We mean by a Being, that which has a separate nature and peculiar identity, a life, consciousness, and energy of its own; something which is not merely the creature of our imagination, formed by abstraction out of various elements, as ready to resolve themselves into any other shape—but which in itself exists, irrespective of our conceptions, and by its works and doings asserts its place in the actual world. Since the Church therefore is declared in Scripture to have an individual being and personal existence to be Christ's body, his mystic Bride; since it is declared to be erected for the setting forth of God's glory, so that its very life must be in prayer and praise, therefore those who compose it are not merely a congeries of unconnected essences, brought by accidental juxtaposition within a common precinct, but by a divine order and mystical harmony, are in truth built up into a living body and consubstantial whole. As the public voice of this collective being, does the minister, by God's ordinance, stand forth, and presents the commingled adoration of many hearts, blended together into the awful solemnity of one Christian

sacrifice. For no less a thing is it than this to offer public service. To its sacredness the Apostle of the Gentiles bears witness, when he calls himself the "Liturgist of Christ towards the Gentiles, exercising a Priest's office in the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." Nor is the people's share in this service less momentous. For does not another Apostle assure them that they are hereby "built up into a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ?" While the Minister then kneels before them, to offer and direct their prayers, their office is suggested by the words of Holy David: "O, come, let us worship and fall down, and kneel before the Lord our Maker." And accordingly the Church orders them all to take part in her every supplication. "All manner of persons then present," says the eighteenth Canon, "shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general confession, Litany, and other prayers are used; saying in their due places, audibly, with the Minister, the confession, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, and making such other answers to the public prayers as are appointed." For since this service answers to that of the ancient covenant, must not every man bring his victim? Must not his individual gift be melted into the mighty tide of supplication? Is not prayer, the life of the Church, consecutive, though distinct, from the life of all its members? And does not St. Paul teach to supply in this manner the place of the ancient ritual, when he bids us "offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name!"

Such then is the worship required of us, and such the principles out of which it has been developed. And now turn to the contrast which experience too often presents. Of those who enter God's temple, how many drop in needlessly upon the commenced service, thereby losing that opportunity of confession, and that declaration of God's forgiveness, which our Church has substituted in place of the Priests private dealing with each single penitent. Why is this but because men forget that Divine service is an organized whole, that it expresses the Church's personal life and federal duty, that it is a single act, which is mutilated by the excision of one constituent member, and not a mere compound of isolated supplications. But suppose men present. What is their behaviour? Can these be Christian worshippers—who sit silent and unmoved amidst every alteration of the sacred office? We take up our psalm, saying, Praise ye the Lord. But what voices answer, "The Lord's name be praised?" Again does the minister exclaim in the words of the Psalmist, "O, come, let us sing unto the Lord, let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation." But no consentient burst of praise gives response to his exhortation. I speak not of all, nor of every place, but your own experience witnesses how prevalent is the defect. Yet can this be public worship? Is it to have communion with all saints? Is it to be fellow Liturgists with the Holy Angels, and to participate in the adoration of the universal Church—this dull, careless, unthankful observation of the prayers of others? For this is not to partake, but to be spectators of public worship. How can we suppose that those take part in prayer who give no symptoms of co-operation? True, the lips may utter more than the heart witnesses, but when even this easier service is wanting, what ground have we to expect that which is more difficult, or that the heart is given to prayer in which the very lips refuse to participate.

Yet would it be uncharitable to doubt that many fall into this error without observing its full effect. Men cannot really believe, as their conduct seems to indicate, that the Priest and clerk are the only worshippers. They do not mean that the setting forth of God's glory is to be confined to the Minister and his hired assistant. They know well enough that we have all mercies for which we thank God, and petitions to address to him. They acknowledge that all have immortal souls, which must be saved or lost. The evil is the result of a bad habit, which long use has rendered inveterate. Men have grown accustomed to the notion that in public worship they have but to sit and listen. They have forgotten that all Christians are members of the Church. They have come to look upon the clerk and Minister as a species of performers to whose doings they are to be attentive. And this has been both cause and consequence of the comparatively undue estimate attached to the ordinance of preaching—an ordinance which, however important and indispensable, yet ought not to be exalted at the expense of other portions of Divine service. Abstractedly indeed it may surprise us that the sermon, which is the word of man, should be so much more esteemed than the lessons, which are the word of God. The reason appears to be that men judge of public worship not as a duty paid to God, nor yet by its ultimate effect upon their own lives, but by the test of present feeling. Now to enter with present interest into the prayers, demands of course a renewed taste and spiritual discernment, whereas the novelty and excitement of an eloquent discourse addresses itself to that intellectual faculty which is in a measure possessed by all. And the cure, therefore, must be sought, not in any ungrounded depreciation of the value of preaching, but in bringing men to a more spiritual mind, and in such augmentation of their faith as may open to them the real nature of that public tribute which the Church renders to Almighty God. It is possible indeed that our excellent translation of the Holy Scriptures may in this particular have given some opening to misconception. To preach the Gospel was no doubt the main function of the Apostles, but then the meaning of that phrase was to make known the Gospel to the untaught, as is done among us by catechising; whereas the addressing sermons to those who are already Christians, was rendered in the original Greek by a different word, and was not the chief office of the earliest Evangelists. But though the error in question may be countenanced by this ambiguity, yet its root is not a mistake in words, but a mistake in conduct. It is based upon the modern habit of judging every thing by immediate effect, aided perhaps by the natural reaction against Romish spread. Nor can there be better proof of its wide-spread influence than the following complaint of a pious and learned Lutheran, Professor Olshausen. "Although the Gospel," he says, "teaches us to worship God in the spirit, it yet requires an external form of worship. For the Redeemer came to found a visible Church, with which a visible worship is essentially connected. Thenceforth worship existed in the Christian Church, not merely for the sake of the weak, but also for the sake of the spiritual. The worship of the Church is an ever-during sacrifice of thanks, which for His ever-during sacrifice of atonement is offered to our Lord. To this element of prayer the Romish Church had unduly given an exclusive predominance; the Lutheran Church as unduly, has made it subordinate to the personal acts of the preacher, and to his sermon.—Whereas the Minister ought not to be considered merely as a preacher, but also as a real Liturgist, i. e. as the organ through which the devotion of the congregation is conveyed. Public worship accordingly consists of two quite different parts; the preaching of the Gospel, whether to convert the unbeliever, or instruct the Christian, and the service of supplication, the crowning act whereof is the holy Eucharist, the Church's great thanks-offering, in which Christ's sacrifice of mediation is symbolically shown forth."

complaint not to be suggested by any private or local view of things, to which some might otherwise attribute it. With you, indeed, my Reverend Brethren, who, like myself, know no authority but Holy Scripture and the standard of our Church, who neither give nor admit party names, who repudiate all sectional attachments, I have no fear of such imputations. You will not suppose that the ordinance of preaching is undervalued, because a due place is challenged for the other portions of public worship. But it is useful to use more caution respecting others, whose very language shows their ignorance in this department of Gospel truth. For does not men's ordinary language testify to their thoughts? How common is it to hear those places where Almighty God is to be solemnly worshipped, described only by the name of the man whose wisdom or eloquence renders them notorious. This may be flattering, perhaps to human conceit, and the pride of earthly reason may be gratified. But is it not to exalt earthly things above heavenly? Did not our Lord declare that His house should be called of all nations the house of prayer, and shall we know it only as the house of preaching?

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF EXECUTING WILLS IN THE SEASON OF HEALTH.

[By A. R. Sanderson, M.D.]

There is a subject which I purpose briefly to notice in the present article; and, though it is one that seldom comes before the public, and though it only relates to our temporariness, yet it claims a much greater attention than I am able to give it here—I refer to those testamentary arrangements which every Christian man ought, so far as it can be done, to make in the season of health. We ought never to lose sight of the fact, that we are only stewards of the worldly goods which we possess, and hence are responsible for the right distribution of them by will. When the Christian reflects how many domestic animosities and family separations have been, and are yet constantly produced, by the neglect of the heads of families in not having their wills duly and promptly executed; when he considers that, from the want of a proper specification and appropriation of property by will, it may go into the most unworthy hands, to be lavished away by prodigal heirs, who were never intended by the testator to have full possession of it—may, even when their having any control over it would perhaps have been his last wish; when also he remembers that so great is the uncertainty of human life, that "in the midst of life we are in death," not even knowing what the next day or hour may bring forth, how clearly and how forcibly must it appear to his mind, as if inscribed there with the distinctness of a sunbeam, that one of the most urgent and important of his earthly obligations is that of "setting his house in order" before sickness and death come suddenly upon him. How often do we hear of persons in perfect health, with scarcely a moment's notice, falling apoplectic to the ground; others thrown from a horse or carriage, and killed on the spot; others again lost in the ocean, or taken from us by some accidental or violent death, which gave them no time for preparing for their sudden and unexpected departure to that country whence no traveller returns!

Among the various causes which unhappily lead to the neglect of this most important duty, may be mentioned the following: a want of due consideration of its importance; a natural dislike which man has to dwell upon the subject of death, or any thing which reminds him of his departure from this life; a superstitious dread which prevails in some minds regarding the execution or signing of a will, as if the simple act of fixing a signature to such a document would actually hasten the death of the testator; and, lastly, that powerful principle of procrastination implanted in our nature, which is one of the greatest antagonists against which the Christian has to contend in pressing on in his heavenward course.

So great is the importance which the Society of Friends affix to this duty, that they make it a special subject of consideration to be impressed upon the members individually, at stated periods; and it would be well if Christians in general would in this instance follow their example, by attending more frequently and seriously to a matter of such magnitude—a matter which is so intimately connected with the present comfort and peace of the head of a family, (especially in his last moments), and also with the credit and respect of his family after he is removed from them; inasmuch as the future union and good feeling subsisting among them must depend in a great measure on the neglect or performance of this obligation, so deeply binding on every parent or any other person who has the disposal of property. Those who postpone executing their testamentary arrangements, from the superstitious apprehension that such an act would prove the immediate precursor of death, are little aware of the unfounded nature of these fears, and of the very converse of the effects they so much dread being the facts of the case. A pious and judicious writer has most justly remarked, with reference to this subject, that "it would be well for persons influenced by such fears, to inquire whether delay in the execution of their wills may not be, under some circumstances, the very means of accelerating the termination of life. In cases of severe and sudden illness, it is often most important for the mind to be kept free from anxiety. It is, however, the duty of a medical man, when doubtful as to the issue of disease, to ask if the afflicted person has completed his testamentary arrangements. The very inquiry agitates every member of the weeping family, and no one is willing to put the question to the poor sufferer. "Have you made your will?" is a question which will speak volumes to him. It will disturb every power of his soul. The very mention of the subject may be the feather in the scale which will turn the balance of death." Often have I seen a once happy and united family thrown into the greatest distress and confusion, when placed under the grievous circumstances above stated. No preparations have been made in the disposal of the worldly affairs of the sufferer. The disorder is rapidly advancing to its termination; delirium and insensibility are approaching; death is at hand. Those who are the parties concerned in the matter are perhaps children bending over the dying couch of a tender and affectionate parent. What