

thus becomes in fact a priest praying *for* the people, and not a minister praying *with* them.

Some attempt should be made, we think, to give interest and liveliness to this part of Divine worship. What shall it be? Shall we revive the Liturgy and Service Book of John Knox or of John Calvin? Shall we re-enact the ordinance of the eighth General Assembly holden in Edinburgh, June 25th 1564, "that every minister exhorter and reader shall have one of the Psalm-books lately printed in Edinburgh and use the order therein contained in *prayers*, marriage and ministration of Sacraments in the Book of Common Order." What an agitation the revival of such a decree as this would create! Lest this question should be forced upon us, we would do well to set our house in order and have some regard to the devotional necessities of the people.

Now it cannot be said that as a general rule our prayers are too long. The objection generally made to them is, not that they contain too much, but too much at one stretch. The Church of England prayers are, as a whole, much longer than ours, yet the people do not generally complain of their being tedious; and the reason of this is partly their higher conception of worship, and partly because the prayers are broken up into brief petitions upon definite subjects. Now this is just what we want. In the *first* place, a higher conception of worship, and in the *second*, a regard to the infirmities of the worshipper as to the manner of prayer. For this latter, we do not need to curtail the whole time occupied by us in devotional services,—of this there can be no just complaint—but we need in some way to *individualise* somewhat definitely the subjects of prayer and to break them into parts by some intervening exercise. For example, we see no reason why the form of the "Directory" should not be revived, which requires that the minister "after solemn calling on them (the people) to the worshipping of the great name of God, is to *begin with prayer*;"—a prayer (as may be seen by the directions) of *invocation and praise*, very short and to the point. (Can any one tell us when and why the practise fell out of use?) This might be considered as standing in the place of our usual introduction of praise in the first prayer. The first prayer might then begin with confession as in the Directory, and go on to supplication and thanksgiving. Again, the prayer "before sermon" might we think, as is sometimes done, be suitably divided into two parts. The first pertaining to the direct worship of Father, Son and Holy Ghost; such as praise, confession, pleadings for mercy and forgiveness, union to Christ, increase of grace, sanctification and the influence of the Holy Spirit, with thanksgiving. Let this occupy 10 or 15 minutes at most. Then let the second Psalm be sung. After which might follow the second part containing special supplications for the Church, the world, all ranks and degrees of men, the sick, and the sorrowful; for a blessing on the word to be preached and for all special blessings, concluding with the Lord's prayer. All to occupy not more than at most other 15 minutes. By this distribution of subjects, the prayer after sermon would only require to be a brief supplication for the Divine blessing on the past services. In this way, tediousness would be avoided and prayer would not be straitened.

Another point of reform which we would urge is, that the minister should follow a distinct and generally uniform order in the subjects of his prayer. Order in this matter is we believe a necessary condition of the intelligent public service of God: it is the law of heavenly things of which the Lord's prayer is a beautiful example. And further much liveliness would be imparted to the prayer were the minister to note in some pointed and emphatic way the transition from one subject to another. Were the subjects, in botanical phrase, to be *articulated* with a clear *dissepiment* between the parts, a child might follow the prayer