

| nature of prayer. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| gan his beautiful conference by sayngthat although sacrifice was the mostperfect | ${ }_{\text {he }}^{\text {he }}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| fidential intercourse with the Creator,That intercourse was prayer, which |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ladder by which the heart of man God. Two questions suggested them |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| benefit. <br> Was man wrong in believing that |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| denied the personality of God, eitherby confounding it with nature, or inresolving it into a mere ideal, were |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| logical in rejecting prayer ; for prayer |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { was an appeal to liberality, and conse- } \\ & \text { quently to the Divine liberty. Yes, } \\ & \text { they were logical, but their logic } \\ & \text { brought condemnation upon them for } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| brought condemnation upon them for it put them in contact with the mos |  |  |
|  |  | pend Out of Doors |
|  | Father Riving |  |
| clas the peronality and the liberalityin theof Goo, but who, not withsanding,opposed the principle of prayer as in |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| of the Divine Being and the universal character of providential government. |  |  |
| The preacher at this point dwelt at length on the subject tostiow that God, |  |  |
| in hearing the prayers of His creaturee,had not to remould the order of nature had not to remould the order of natureand the designs of His Providence. |  |  |
|  |  | No. |
| Whatever difficulty there was in com- |  |  |
| case of prayer. There was a far greater mystery in the relation which |  |  |
| existed between the free-will of the creature and the fore-knowledge and |  |  |
|  | d |  |
|  |  | A FOOD |
|  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { prayer was brought, not against its } \\ & \text { impossibility, but against the useless- } \\ & \text { ness of it. What necessity could there } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Was no necessity of Giving but prayerof our wants to God, bun to turn toprompted and impelled man to |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | io in the sitcent |  |
| the in exations of the creature, he would no longer have an interest in |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { putting himself in communication with } \\ & \text { God. Worship itself would remain } \\ & \text { nothing more than a mere duty ; that } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| nothing more than a mere duty ; that is to say, it would be universally neg- |  |  |
| lected. Prayer, which, in a legitimateway, had interest also attached to it,a roused the thourhts of man, and |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Sperial Sotier to Consumers. |  |
| of its aspirations. Ye notie spirits |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | STAIRODGUSS |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| as she the heavy burdens of trials, and from which only prayer can afford her from wh relief? | er |  |
| The objections, then, of philosophersagainst prayer are without proper |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { wills it, nothing can prevent it frem } \\ & \text { being efficacious. But doesGod will it, } \\ & \text { and, if so, under what conditions? In } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{\text {In a }}$ ny form, forverat prepat, one or |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Chiono- photogripls |  |
| attention, was fumished by untversaltradition. Everywhere and in all |  |  |
|  | ARt studies |  |
|  | D. RICHIE \& CO. |  |
|  |  |  |
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