

FEAR NOT TO DIE.

Fear not to die! thought in the great strength of youth and power, and bloom...

Fear not to die! I may be shown in the light of a martyr...

THE FLEET IN THE BLACK SEA.

It is pleasing to think of the amount of religious knowledge, which is to be met with among our soldiers and sailors...

I shipped from Melbourne in a vessel going to Ceylon, and there I joined another that was going to England...

I shall ever feel a lively recollection of all your kindness towards me while on board the ship, and likewise the kindness of Mrs. ...

GOOD HUMOR.

Keep in good humor. It is not great calamities that embitter existence: it is the petty vexations, the small jealousies...

No man does his best except when he is cheerful. A light heart makes nimble hands, and keeps the mind free and alert...

ORIGIN OF PREACHING FROM TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

About the year 1203 began the custom of preaching from a text, but the Sages and Seniors of the University would by no means conform to this new method...

If we refer to Sacred Scripture, we shall find that the practice of preaching from particular texts may be traced as far back as the time of Ezra...

The custom of text preaching was interrupted for some time in the dark ages, and the Nicomachian Ethics of Aristotle were read in many churches, even on Sundays and feast days.

PRAYER BEFORE DIVINE SERVICE.

There is a custom so prevalent in English churches as to be almost universal, and a very excellent custom too, namely, that of offering up a private prayer immediately upon assuming our place in the church...

MENTAL CULTURE.

The first step, we think, to be taken by commercial young men, is to rid themselves of the erroneous notion, that it is not necessary for them to know much—that, as commercial individuals, a moderate degree of mental culture will suffice...

I would say then, Christian read it, when you come into God's House for public worship, remember that you have a difficult task to perform, difficult at least if it is to be performed well...

THE MARTYR D. BOY.

In the reign of "Bloody Mary," of England, when the good bishop Hooper was about to be burned to death, a blind boy, by much importunity, prevailed on the guard to bring him to the bishop...

A STAMPEDE OF LADIES.

At Boulogne, a fine reception of her Majesty, a number of English ladies, in their anxiety to see everything, pressed with such force against the soldiers who were keeping the line, that the latter were, in some instances, obliged to give way...

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND RECORD FOR VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.

A monthly publication, under the above title for the Diocese of Victoria, has lately been commenced, with every good prospect of success and usefulness...

DR. LUSHINGTON'S JUDGEMENT.

From the London Guardian. We were enabled last week to give some account of the judgment, by Dr. Lushington, in the Consistory Court, on the day of our publication...

In setting out, the learned Judge explained the nature of the inquiry and the principles he thought ought to govern it. "I am bound to ascertain, in the best of my ability, what the law is which rules the questions discussed at the bar, and by that law I am bound to decide them."

It is not to be denied that the law is not to be ascertained by abstractedly right or wrong—convenient or inconvenient; but I am to ascertain, if practicable, what the law of the land enjoins, and obey it. If, indeed, it should happen that the law has said there shall be no inflexible rule on any particular subject, but that the Court may exercise its discretion with respect thereto, I must still remember that the discretion conferred on me is a judicial discretion, to be exercised according to authority and practice...

Having recited the pleadings, with which our readers are already familiar, Dr. Lushington said he had made a personal inspection of the churches, and proceeded to advert to the evidence in the case. "There is an affidavit sworn by the petitioners, signed by eight persons, from their rank and station in life of the first respectability; they object to the use of the articles mentioned as inconsistent with the simplicity of the Protestant Church, and they say that they themselves, being residents in the district, are in consequence driven to abstain from frequenting the church, and they believe many others are similarly situated."

Dr. Lushington could not ascribe much weight to the argument that the Bishops by consecration had given the weight of their authority to things placed in churches prior to their consecration. "Unless the Bishop at the time of the consecration had present to his mind all the matters which are now in dispute, the mere act of consecration would be no evidence of approbation; for approbation can be founded only on knowledge and intention. Considering the duty the Bishop is performing, it cannot reasonably be supposed that, unless his attention was specially called thereto, he would bestow his consideration on things of this description."

The articles complained of he divided into two parts—ornaments, and such as were not. Following Sir Herbert Jenner, he held that the order in the Book of Common Prayer immediately preceding the Morning Service, that such ornaments of the church should be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., originally this direction was confined to the ornaments of the minister, and was subsequently extended to the ornaments of the church.

Next came questions on which, unfortunately, said Dr. Lushington, he had no authority to guide him. He began with that of the crosses, which he described. "The facts appear to be, as they relate to St. Paul's, that the altar has a cross about two feet high, erected thereon. With respect to St. Barnabas, there are what appears to be a roof screen, according to every definition that I can find of that term; it is a wooden screen, with a large cross of carved wood thereon. The screen has brazen gates, and

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND RECORD FOR VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.

A monthly publication, under the above title for the Diocese of Victoria, has lately been commenced, with every good prospect of success and usefulness. We have received it, and find it to be a most interesting and well-written work.

It is not to be denied that the law is not to be ascertained by abstractedly right or wrong—convenient or inconvenient; but I am to ascertain, if practicable, what the law of the land enjoins, and obey it. If, indeed, it should happen that the law has said there shall be no inflexible rule on any particular subject, but that the Court may exercise its discretion with respect thereto, I must still remember that the discretion conferred on me is a judicial discretion, to be exercised according to authority and practice...

Having recited the pleadings, with which our readers are already familiar, Dr. Lushington said he had made a personal inspection of the churches, and proceeded to advert to the evidence in the case. "There is an affidavit sworn by the petitioners, signed by eight persons, from their rank and station in life of the first respectability; they object to the use of the articles mentioned as inconsistent with the simplicity of the Protestant Church, and they say that they themselves, being residents in the district, are in consequence driven to abstain from frequenting the church, and they believe many others are similarly situated."

Dr. Lushington could not ascribe much weight to the argument that the Bishops by consecration had given the weight of their authority to things placed in churches prior to their consecration. "Unless the Bishop at the time of the consecration had present to his mind all the matters which are now in dispute, the mere act of consecration would be no evidence of approbation; for approbation can be founded only on knowledge and intention. Considering the duty the Bishop is performing, it cannot reasonably be supposed that, unless his attention was specially called thereto, he would bestow his consideration on things of this description."

The articles complained of he divided into two parts—ornaments, and such as were not. Following Sir Herbert Jenner, he held that the order in the Book of Common Prayer immediately preceding the Morning Service, that such ornaments of the church should be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., originally this direction was confined to the ornaments of the minister, and was subsequently extended to the ornaments of the church.

Next came questions on which, unfortunately, said Dr. Lushington, he had no authority to guide him. He began with that of the crosses, which he described. "The facts appear to be, as they relate to St. Paul's, that the altar has a cross about two feet high, erected thereon. With respect to St. Barnabas, there are what appears to be a roof screen, according to every definition that I can find of that term; it is a wooden screen, with a large cross of carved wood thereon. The screen has brazen gates, and

At Boulogne, a fine reception of her Majesty, a number of English ladies, in their anxiety to see everything, pressed with such force against the soldiers who were keeping the line, that the latter were, in some instances, obliged to give way, and generally were obliged to use the expression of our policemen, "impeded in the execution of their duty."

At the first sound from the parchment, the English ladies took to flight. If they had been French, says a Parisian journal, they would have remained to a woman.

Within five minutes eleven Post-masters have been appointed in Ohio for the year. New Orleans has had the epidemic of yellow fever, and a death in eight years.

DR. LUSHINGTON'S JUDGEMENT.

From the London Guardian. We were enabled last week to give some account of the judgment, by Dr. Lushington, in the Consistory Court, on the day of our publication, sufficient to indicate the substance of the learned Judge's conclusions upon the cases of Westerton and Beal v. Liddell and others, in the matter of St. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Piccadilly. We now proceed to put our readers in possession of the judgment at length. The court, we need hardly say, was crowded, a large proportion of clergymen being present, including the Bishop of Rochester.

It is not to be denied that the law is not to be ascertained by abstractedly right or wrong—convenient or inconvenient; but I am to ascertain, if practicable, what the law of the land enjoins, and obey it. If, indeed, it should happen that the law has said there shall be no inflexible rule on any particular subject, but that the Court may exercise its discretion with respect thereto, I must still remember that the discretion conferred on me is a judicial discretion, to be exercised according to authority and practice...

Having recited the pleadings, with which our readers are already familiar, Dr. Lushington said he had made a personal inspection of the churches, and proceeded to advert to the evidence in the case. "There is an affidavit sworn by the petitioners, signed by eight persons, from their rank and station in life of the first respectability; they object to the use of the articles mentioned as inconsistent with the simplicity of the Protestant Church, and they say that they themselves, being residents in the district, are in consequence driven to abstain from frequenting the church, and they believe many others are similarly situated."

Dr. Lushington could not ascribe much weight to the argument that the Bishops by consecration had given the weight of their authority to things placed in churches prior to their consecration. "Unless the Bishop at the time of the consecration had present to his mind all the matters which are now in dispute, the mere act of consecration would be no evidence of approbation; for approbation can be founded only on knowledge and intention. Considering the duty the Bishop is performing, it cannot reasonably be supposed that, unless his attention was specially called thereto, he would bestow his consideration on things of this description."

The articles complained of he divided into two parts—ornaments, and such as were not. Following Sir Herbert Jenner, he held that the order in the Book of Common Prayer immediately preceding the Morning Service, that such ornaments of the church should be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., originally this direction was confined to the ornaments of the minister, and was subsequently extended to the ornaments of the church.

Next came questions on which, unfortunately, said Dr. Lushington, he had no authority to guide him. He began with that of the crosses, which he described. "The facts appear to be, as they relate to St. Paul's, that the altar has a cross about two feet high, erected thereon. With respect to St. Barnabas, there are what appears to be a roof screen, according to every definition that I can find of that term; it is a wooden screen, with a large cross of carved wood thereon. The screen has brazen gates, and

At Boulogne, a fine reception of her Majesty, a number of English ladies, in their anxiety to see everything, pressed with such force against the soldiers who were keeping the line, that the latter were, in some instances, obliged to give way, and generally were obliged to use the expression of our policemen, "impeded in the execution of their duty."

At the first sound from the parchment, the English ladies took to flight. If they had been French, says a Parisian journal, they would have remained to a woman.

Within five minutes eleven Post-masters have been appointed in Ohio for the year. New Orleans has had the epidemic of yellow fever, and a death in eight years.

DR. LUSHINGTON'S JUDGEMENT.

From the London Guardian. We were enabled last week to give some account of the judgment, by Dr. Lushington, in the Consistory Court, on the day of our publication, sufficient to indicate the substance of the learned Judge's conclusions upon the cases of Westerton and Beal v. Liddell and others, in the matter of St. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Piccadilly. We now proceed to put our readers in possession of the judgment at length. The court, we need hardly say, was crowded, a large proportion of clergymen being present, including the Bishop of Rochester.

It is not to be denied that the law is not to be ascertained by abstractedly right or wrong—convenient or inconvenient; but I am to ascertain, if practicable, what the law of the land enjoins, and obey it. If, indeed, it should happen that the law has said there shall be no inflexible rule on any particular subject, but that the Court may exercise its discretion with respect thereto, I must still remember that the discretion conferred on me is a judicial discretion, to be exercised according to authority and practice...

Having recited the pleadings, with which our readers are already familiar, Dr. Lushington said he had made a personal inspection of the churches, and proceeded to advert to the evidence in the case. "There is an affidavit sworn by the petitioners, signed by eight persons, from their rank and station in life of the first respectability; they object to the use of the articles mentioned as inconsistent with the simplicity of the Protestant Church, and they say that they themselves, being residents in the district, are in consequence driven to abstain from frequenting the church, and they believe many others are similarly situated."

Dr. Lushington could not ascribe much weight to the argument that the Bishops by consecration had given the weight of their authority to things placed in churches prior to their consecration. "Unless the Bishop at the time of the consecration had present to his mind all the matters which are now in dispute, the mere act of consecration would be no evidence of approbation; for approbation can be founded only on knowledge and intention. Considering the duty the Bishop is performing, it cannot reasonably be supposed that, unless his attention was specially called thereto, he would bestow his consideration on things of this description."

The articles complained of he divided into two parts—ornaments, and such as were not. Following Sir Herbert Jenner, he held that the order in the Book of Common Prayer immediately preceding the Morning Service, that such ornaments of the church should be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., originally this direction was confined to the ornaments of the minister, and was subsequently extended to the ornaments of the church.

Next came questions on which, unfortunately, said Dr. Lushington, he had no authority to guide him. He began with that of the crosses, which he described. "The facts appear to be, as they relate to St. Paul's, that the altar has a cross about two feet high, erected thereon. With respect to St. Barnabas, there are what appears to be a roof screen, according to every definition that I can find of that term; it is a wooden screen, with a large cross of carved wood thereon. The screen has brazen gates, and

At Boulogne, a fine reception of her Majesty, a number of English ladies, in their anxiety to see everything, pressed with such force against the soldiers who were keeping the line, that the latter were, in some instances, obliged to give way, and generally were obliged to use the expression of our policemen, "impeded in the execution of their duty."

At the first sound from the parchment, the English ladies took to flight. If they had been French, says a Parisian journal, they would have remained to a woman.

Within five minutes eleven Post-masters have been appointed in Ohio for the year. New Orleans has had the epidemic of yellow fever, and a death in eight years.

DR. LUSHINGTON'S JUDGEMENT.

From the London Guardian. We were enabled last week to give some account of the judgment, by Dr. Lushington, in the Consistory Court, on the day of our publication, sufficient to indicate the substance of the learned Judge's conclusions upon the cases of Westerton and Beal v. Liddell and others, in the matter of St. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Piccadilly. We now proceed to put our readers in possession of the judgment at length. The court, we need hardly say, was crowded, a large proportion of clergymen being present, including the Bishop of Rochester.

It is not to be denied that the law is not to be ascertained by abstractedly right or wrong—convenient or inconvenient; but I am to ascertain, if practicable, what the law of the land enjoins, and obey it. If, indeed, it should happen that the law has said there shall be no inflexible rule on any particular subject, but that the Court may exercise its discretion with respect thereto, I must still remember that the discretion conferred on me is a judicial discretion, to be exercised according to authority and practice...

Having recited the pleadings, with which our readers are already familiar, Dr. Lushington said he had made a personal inspection of the churches, and proceeded to advert to the evidence in the case. "There is an affidavit sworn by the petitioners, signed by eight persons, from their rank and station in life of the first respectability; they object to the use of the articles mentioned as inconsistent with the simplicity of the Protestant Church, and they say that they themselves, being residents in the district, are in consequence driven to abstain from frequenting the church, and they believe many others are similarly situated."

Dr. Lushington could not ascribe much weight to the argument that the Bishops by consecration had given the weight of their authority to things placed in churches prior to their consecration. "Unless the Bishop at the time of the consecration had present to his mind all the matters which are now in dispute, the mere act of consecration would be no evidence of approbation; for approbation can be founded only on knowledge and intention. Considering the duty the Bishop is performing, it cannot reasonably be supposed that, unless his attention was specially called thereto, he would bestow his consideration on things of this description."

The articles complained of he divided into two parts—ornaments, and such as were not. Following Sir Herbert Jenner, he held that the order in the Book of Common Prayer immediately preceding the Morning Service, that such ornaments of the church should be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., originally this direction was confined to the ornaments of the minister, and was subsequently extended to the ornaments of the church.

Next came questions on which, unfortunately, said Dr. Lushington, he had no authority to guide him. He began with that of the crosses, which he described. "The facts appear to be, as they relate to St. Paul's, that the altar has a cross about two feet high, erected thereon. With respect to St. Barnabas, there are what appears to be a roof screen, according to every definition that I can find of that term; it is a wooden screen, with a large cross of carved wood thereon. The screen has brazen gates, and

At Boulogne, a fine reception of her Majesty, a number of English ladies, in their anxiety to see everything, pressed with such force against the soldiers who were keeping the line, that the latter were, in some instances, obliged to give way, and generally were obliged to use the expression of our policemen, "impeded in the execution of their duty."

At the first sound from the parchment, the English ladies took to flight. If they had been French, says a Parisian journal, they would have remained to a woman.

Within five minutes eleven Post-masters have been appointed in Ohio for the year. New Orleans has had the epidemic of yellow fever, and a death in eight years.