

Poetry.

THE CHILD'S LAST SONG.

Twas night;—a weeping mother hung,
With tender prayers upon her tongue,
Over her dying child;

THE BISHOP'S DAUGHTER.

(From a Correspondent of The Church.)

[UNQUOTE FROM OUR LAST.]

Having now given a sketch of the life of our noble-minded heroine, we proceed, according to our promise, to give a few of the interesting anecdotes with which this book abounds. The incidents respecting the Rev. Waldo Sibthorpe will be read with peculiar interest from the unenviable notoriety lately gained for himself by this unhappy gentleman.

re-cast, during the Friday and Saturday immediately preceding—days invariably passed in privacy, on which no infringement was allowed—with an earnestness and ardour as though the subject had never been approached by him before. This accounted, perhaps, for the vigour and freshness of his addresses. The line of argument might be the same—the process by which the argument was wrought out might be the same—but the illustrations—the imagery—the appeals—the application, would be the fruit of his latest and most matured impressions. Such diligence must tell—

Mr. H.—I shall be glad to hear what he said. Mr. C.—I will endeavour to state to you how he met your arguments, as well as I can. He said, first, that the promise of the Lord, mentioned by you as the foundation of this doctrine, and to be found in Matt. xxviii. 20, belongs not to any particular body or succession of men, but to the whole Church of Christ. When I mentioned to him, that I thought that the context confined it to the Apostles, and those commissioned by them, inasmuch as it was made to those who were by him charged with the duty of "preaching the Gospel to every creature, teaching them" &c.,—that as all Christians were not called upon to preach, certainly not to baptize, so they could not justly claim a promise made for the encouragement and benefit of such as were so commissioned; he said that I was certainly wrong. He argued that the commission given in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, was a commission to preach the Gospel, and not to ordain others,—and that when that commission was given, there were present the two disciples who had walked to Emmaus, and others also. I must say, Sir, that I did not know how to answer these things.

by it as to repay you, in some measure at least, for the great trouble you purpose taking in the matter. Mr. H.—The outline which I have marked out for myself is certainly an extensive one, and, if well filled up, will present a pretty thorough discussion of the question. Mr. C.—There are, however, two points, on which you do not appear to intend touching: that is,—what was the form of ministry instituted by the Saviour or his inspired apostles; and the channel, through which this succession has been kept up. Mr. H.—Why really, my friend, I think that we shall find the discussion of the subject, even within the limits to which I have confined it, quite extended enough, without treating of those other questions. And besides, I think that the more you can separate any question, complete in itself, from all extraneous matter, the more clearly and satisfactorily can you treat of that subject: though I shall by no means be able, in the treatment of the "Apostolical Succession," to avoid declaring the medium, through which that Succession has been handed down from the days of the apostles to the present times.

much lamentable sophistry in his book, and some particularly concerning this point. See especially the paragraph numbered 6, p. 48. It is buffonery scarcely veiled. But if we may judge from certain letters lately published by the papal priests, buffonery is part of the Romish system. The Romish system knows that it is from high church principles his cause has most to fear; high churchmen are therefore the object of their greatest dislike. It is against these principles that they are now directing all their forces; it is to refute Anglicanism, not Protestantism, that Romish tracts are circulated. And the Romish who still remain among us, only remaining to add to our confusions, are most contemptuous against Anglicanism, and most bitter against honest Anglicans.

If the heavenly principle of love be not invited back, not only our own pure faith as it is taught in the English Church, but Christianity itself must fall before the enemies of the Cross. Everything is conspiring to give strength to Infidelity. The triumph of Romanism, wherever it supplants a purer faith, is a step to the triumph of Infidelity. Wherever Romanism is dominant, there Infidelity abounds; as superstition must destroy true religion, and no man can innocently add to divine truth even one false tenet however inconsiderable, any more than he can, without loss to his spiritual condition, cut off one article from the Catholic faith. In Italy, in France, and Spain, it is notorious, that while the lower classes are encouraged in practices bordering on idolatry, the middle classes are for the most part idolatrous. Some higher and more subtle minds, capable of explaining away what is obnoxious to the common sense of mankind, and the plain teaching of Scripture, may possibly keep themselves in a purer atmosphere, and suffer less harm from entertaining errors which have less practical effect upon their conduct; but even these are unconsciously aiding the cause of infidelity by the defence of such errors. The object of all the apologists of the Romish system is to show, by exaggerated statements of Protestant false doctrine, that there is no medium between avowed infidelity, and all that the Church of Rome requires to be believed and practised. You must, in short, accept Popery with all its concomitants, or you must be an Infidel. Can any one be surprised, if such a mode of argument is found to drive men to infidelity? The powerful intellect and learning of Mr. Newman has not protected him from the enchantment of this fallacy; and it is a strange and alarming symptom, which meets us at every turn in his late work, how credulity and scepticism are bleaded together. Who can divine for what further developments a mind that has so often shifted its ground may yet be ripening?

* Rev. Mr. Cheever's Lecture in Broadway Tabernacle, New York, on "No Church without a Bishop," April 23rd, 1844.