RELIGIOUS SERVICES.

Contrary to anticipation, the severity of the weather yesterday did not deter the public, particularly the church-going portion of it, from attending the services of those denominations towards which, by conviction or otherwise, they are most affected. The sacred edifices of the metropolis and its surrounding cities were well filled both morning and evening, and the sermons generally were above the average in style and matter. Below we give notices of some of the proceedings had yesterday in our churches, &c.

Opening of the Church of St. Rose of Lima—Sermon by Archbishop McCloskey.

The temporary edifice on Cannon street, near Delancey, which is but the precursor of a grand structure to be erected by and to stand as a monument to the enterprise and energy of the Rev. Father McKenna, was formally opened yesterday morning and dedicated to the service of Almighty God in accordance with the rites of the Catholic Church.

At eleven o'clock the services of dedication commenced with the ceremony of the mass, performed by the Very Rev. Father Starrs, Vicar General, assisted by the Rev. Father Trainor, of the Transfiguration church, as deacon, and the Rev. Father Healey, of St. Peter's, as sub-deacon, and the indispensable Rev. Father McInenny as master of ceremonies. In the sanctuary were the Rev. Fathers Conron, of Staten Island; Clowrey, of St. Gabriel's church, and Larkin, of the Church of the Holy Innocents. It is almost needless to say that the edifice, capable of accommodating some five or six hundred persons, was crowded in every part. The popularity of the pastor, aside from the number of devotees belonging to the district, would have insured such a result.

At the appropriate part of the mass Archbishop McCloskey ascended the altar steps and read from the Apocalypse, chapter 21, verse 3—"And I heard a great voice from the throne saying: Behold the Tabernacle of God with men; and He will dwell with them; and they shall be His people; and God himself with them shall be their God." The reverend and venerable prelate then addressed the congregation as follows:—More than forty years ago, beloved brethren, I, as a youth, knelt before the altar of old St. Mary's church, in Sheriff street, then one of the three churches which were the only Catholic churches in this great city. All these three churches—St. Peter's, St. Patrick's and St. Mary's—are no longer to be seen in the form and character which they then had. The venerable brick pile in Barclay street has yielded to the majestic and solid granite structure which now stands on its site. St. Patrick's church became very much enlarged and beautified and recently, as you know, destroyed almost entirely by fire, has assumed a new character and also new beauty in the renovated style in which it now stands. St. Mary's, in Sheriff street, true, was consumed by fire, and St. Mary's, at the corner of Grand and Ridge streets, now takes its place. Old St. Mary's claimed as limits nearly all that portion of the city lying east of the Bowery. These ample limits were first curtailed by the Church of St. James, afterwards by St. Bridget's, then by St. Teresa's and now by St. Rose's. St. Mary's, then, has been a fruitful and generous mother, and has already seen a numerous offspring of churches spring up around her, looking to her with the love and veneration that children should bear to their parents, and she in turn regarding her offspring with interest and love.

After paying a glowing tribute to the well known charity which has long distinguished the members of St. Mary's congregation, his Grace went on to say that while the churches which have sprung up had reflected honor on the mother he trusted that this, the youngest born, would not be behind the rest in manifesting from the beginning to the end those virtues and that character which distinguished them as members of St. Mary's, now that they were under the patronage of a virgin who loved to honor St. Mary, and whose heart was as pure, and who was the first flower of the church, or, at least, the first saint enrolled on the annals of the Church claiming America for her birthplace—St. Rose of Lima. You, beloved brethren, he said, have reason to rejoice not only in the reminiscences of the past, but in what you see before you. Your simple, humble edifice, dedicated to the honor and worship of Almighty God, cheers you not alone with what it gives and affords in the present, but with the promises which it holds out for the future. This is but the beginning—the seedling from which shall grow up a grander, more spacious and more noble edifice in the course of time. You rejoice in it, and even of those not in your district many are here to-day to mingle their rejoicings with yours; and I rejoice now or whenever a new altar is raised on which the adorable sacrifice is to be offered to Almighty God; whenever a new gate is opened to His holy sanctuary; whenever a new point of contact is made between this sinful world and the glorious heaven above; whenever a new strain is added to the glorious chorus of harmony which from the altars of the Christian Church in all parts of the world is continually swelling up and singing praises and thanksgivings to the Author of all good; whenever a new tabernacle is given to men where God shall dwell with them, where He shall be their God and they shall be his people. Although, as I said, here, for the present, you cannot boast or enjoy as beautiful an edifice as others are permitted to enjoy, still you look forward to the day when it shall come. Here in this humble little church you are as rich in all the great essential sources of grace and blessings as any other. The altar is the same; the faith is the same; the priesthood is the same; the sources from which grace and benedictions flow are the same here as elsewhere. I have said the faith is the same. It is the same faith as was first delivered to the apostles. It is the faith which is ever ancient, yet ever new. The faith which the apostles taught, for which martyrs shed their blood and for which confessors nobly suffered. It is the same faith which an Augustine preached; which a Cyprian, an Ambrose or a Leo preached through all generations. The same faith which the holy and glorious councils of the Church have defended and professed from the time of the first council held at Jerusalem under the presidency of St. Peter, to the last one held at Trent, under the presidency of the successor of St. Peter, the Pontiff of Rome. That faith comes to us by hearing—hearing from the word of God, issued from the lips of the Son of God, who stood on earth a man like us and God also; the living, spoken voice from doubly inspired lips; our divine author, and by virtue of the commission which He received from His eternal father when He came to be the saviour and teacher of men. The voice as it came from His lips has been handed down, and the life-giving word has sent forth echoes and sounds to the uttermost parts of the earth for all nations to hear it and for all hearts to be moved by the grace of God to hear it. It was a spoken word and not a written word; a living voice which was to remain forever. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass. But when Christ went away from earth He ceased to be seen or to be heard by men. How was the word to be heard, preserved and perpetuated for all times? Faith comes by hearing. How shall we hear unless there are teachers? How shall they teach unless they are sent? Christ had a mission to teach on earth, and that mission he transferred to his apostles when he said, "As my Father sent me, so also do I send you." The same mission which I received from my Father I give to you—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." The word then given was to endure forever, as the commission was to endure forever. The body to which the commission was given was immortal and to exist forever; and as the promise was given by Christ, "I am with you all days," not only was the promise His, but the teaching was His. The apostles and their successors it was who received the commission and promise; but in teaching they were not alone, for Christ was with them and the Holy Ghost was with them, in accordance with the promise of Christ—"I will send the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, to abide with you." Therefore, being teachers, they were to preach the word of God to all nations, and the order was given to those who were not teachers that they were to believe; they were not to question; not to criticise; not to set themselves up as judges of the word of God, but to listen and to bow down to the teachings of faith. "He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth Him that sent me." The written word was not given by Christ, but by his apostles and disciples under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. It was but the record of events which they had witnessed or the record of what they had heard. The written word was, as far as it went, and only as far as it went, a transcript of the words spoken by the apostles or by the lips of Christ. It could not contains, because it was simply the record of the word. If doubts of the interpretation of the word should arise, the living word was always ready to interpret and explain it. The written word was entrusted to those who were to teach as its guardians and its interpreters. It received its authority from them; there was no certainty that it was authorized or inspired except by the authority of the teachers to whom it was entrusted. If it ever was intended that the written word should supersede the teaching of the divine ly constituted body, it was a radical, fundamental change in the constitution of the Church as Christ first established it. "Go, teach all nations," was the order first establishing the Church by the infallible teacher. If the written word was to supersede that order it was of importance that Christ should prepare his followers for this fundamental change, and for the apostles to warn their followers to take care what they should teach, as there was a written word by which they were to be adjudged and by which their teachings were to be tested. The apostles would have given notice that their commission had been changed to "teach for a while, then write your book;" but there was no authority nor record of such a change in the constitution of the Church. The reverend prelate then went on to give a glowing and beautiful picture of the workings and benefits of the sacraments, of the glory of the Catholic Church and of the tenderness with which she cares for her children, closing with an exhortation to his hearers to make some return for the many blessings which she bestows, to give freely of their portion of this world's goods to erect a fitting tabernacle to God and to beautify God's altar, and that by so doing they would draw down upon themselves God's special blessing in this life, and that in the next He would make them happy about His throne in grand and glorious temples of heaven for ever and ever.

At the conclusion of the mass the Archbishop pronounced the Episcopal benediction, and the large congregation quietly dispersed.

In the evening grand vesper service was held, at which the Rev. Father Quinn, the popular pastor of St. Peter's, delivered a touching and appropriate address, eulogizing the enterprise of the pastor, Father McKenna, and the devotion of the members of the parish; exhorting them to be faithful to one another, and by their combined exertions to erect to the service of God a temple which should be not only an ornament to the city, but a lasting monument of their faith.

A Response to Dr. Tyng—Sermon by Rev. R. S. Howland, D. D.

Under the auspices of the American Church Union, an association lately established for the maintenance of law and order, and for the promulgation of the principles of the Episcopal Church, the Rev. R. S. Howland, D. D., preached a sermon yesterday evening, at Trinity church, entitled, "A Justification of the Principle Involved in the Canon on Parish Boundaries." It having been generally understood among the religious community that it was the intention of the reverend gentleman to excoriate his brother Tyng for his recent insubordination in violating the church canons, a large congregation assembled, the members of which seemed much edified at the sly pokes and playful insuendoes bestowed on the absent and reverend transgressor.

Rev. Dr. Howland selected for his text, First Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, fourth chapter, and part of the eleventh verse—"Study to be quiet, and to do your own business." There are two questions, said he, which suggest themselves in respect to the canon on parish boundaries, lately under consideration. First, whether the canon was violated; and second, whether it is a righteous and judicious law. Upon the first point I shall not dwell, as I do not wish to pass judgment on cases which come before their own proper tribunals. Allow me to say in starting, to remove misapprehension, that nothing is said in the canon about the places of worship of any of our fellow Christians. It is simply a question of discipline, and whether the act took place in a Methodist church or a Romish church, in a city court house or in the open air, it does not affect the interpretation of the canon. It is not a law which teaches our relations with the religious community. It treats only of the harmony that should exist between the clergy of one and the same Church and the order of limitation under which they should exercise their functions. As there may be differences of doctrinal opinion and personal preferences, so it is left with the Church of God to decide whom they will choose, what shall be the character of their teachings, and under what aspect the Church of which they are members shall be represented in that locality. There are to be no wranglings between rival divines, no array of altar against altar, pulpit against pulpit, and there shall be no opportunity afforded for mischief making or egotistical display on the part of self-introduced preachers. St. Paul was aroused by the intrusion of unauthorized ministers, and some of his strongest expressions are in denunciation of the evils resulting from it. He complains of "false brethren brought in," &c. He inveighs against those "who, desiring to be teachers, crept into houses and led captive silly women." He goes so far as to say to the Galatians, "I would that they were even cut off that trouble us." He calls upon the brethren at Rome "to mark them." He tells Titus that "there are many vain tatlers whose mouths should be stopped." The idea of the canon, then, is one which logically proceeds from these representations of Scripture, viz., that as the Church has the responsibility for the teaching within its own communion, so it must have control over its preaching. Our Church claims, merely in establishing boundaries, no control over the teachers of other religious societies or jurisdiction over their members. Our Church does not, as the apostle tells us, "undertake to judge them who are without," but it does, as every church must, maintain discipline, order and peace within its own limits. Our Church does not forbid those "who cast out devils in Christ's name, though they follow not us," but it does require that those who do follow us shall obey its common law. The Church, which sends out her ministers to preach the Gospel, must not be charged with censuring her clergy for preaching the Gospel, when she merely arraigns them for overpassing restrictions imposed upon them when she gave them authority to preach as her messengers. When Adam tasted of the fruit of the tree of life he was punished, not for the innocent desire of securing that which would make him wise, but for disobedience. If an enthusiastic believer in Dr. Cummings were in a court of justic to proclaim the advent he would be punished, not for preaching the coming of Christ, but for interrupting the business of the court. If a laymen were to rise in his place in church and denounce the doctrine of his minister and to instruct the people in the Gospel as he understood it, you would condemn him, not for preaching the Gospel, but for the disturbance of public worship. If a man insist on entering into your parlor day after day and preaching the Gospel to you, you would shut your door upon him, not because he sought to preach the gospel, but because your own sense of wrong required you to do so. Even so here, the whole question is one of obedience or disobedience. Look at the canon in another point of view and you will find that the practical question is, in most instances, not whether the Gospel shall be preached, but where it is to be preached; whether is is to be preached in a congregation whereunto the minister is lawfully appointed, or unto strangers over whom he has no pastoral charge, and for whose views and religious instruction he is not responsible. Let us suppose the case of a church closed in the heat of summer, and the pour who cannot leave the city wandering in search of the bread of life, while the minister who is cure in this city is away, not needing or seeking rest, but putting into execution some peculiar church theory of his own; and, in order to do so, preaching for those who have no claim upon his services and who are already supplied with church officers, may not the Church properly step in here with a canon and say, "Study to be quiet, and to do your own business?" Let us suppose that a few extreme men with particular theological tenets have set their names to a document, in which they charge that certain of their brethren in the ministry do not preach the Gospel, that they preach what the apostle calls "another gospel;" and let us suppose that the newspaper organ of these extremists publicly asserts the right of those persons to preach the Gospel to those over whom the clergyman claims jurisdiction, may not the Church step in and say, "I cannot tolerate such wrangling among brethren of one household; your charge is a very grave one, and when the apostle makes this charge he adds, concerning the guilty one, 'Let him be accursed.' Your charge, therefore, is tantamount to saying, 'Rev. Mr. Blank, let him be accursed; he preached another gospel.'" But such anathemas are not to be wantonly hurled; such accusations are not to be spread broadcast. We must have courtesy, charity, love and order in our household. This is the way to truth and peace. The canon is essential, moreover, not only to avoid confusion and strife, but also to promote the efficacy of the work and the comfort of the workmen. When the field is so large and the laborers so few it is important that the few should be placed where they will not interfere with each other—where they will not cover the same ground, where they can have a definite charge, in which they can take a personal interest, and for which they will be especially responsible. There must be a place for every man and every man in his place. As judges have their separate districts, as military commanders have their own departments, as there is order in the State, so must there be order in the Church. When Christ sent out His disciples to preach the Gospel He gave them a limit, which is in precise accordance with one of the objects aimed at in these canons. Though He sent them to announce the Kingdom of Heaven He commanded them, saying, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." He told the Canaan woman, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Why did our Lord only spend three of the thirty-three years of his life in preaching, and the others in privacy? "Because there is a time to keep silence, as well as a time to speak," as the wise man tells us. This is a lesson which some men are slow to learn, but one which our Lord himself practised. If He knew that the world would be converted, even if he did not preach at all times and in all places, is it too much to expect of the modesty of Christian ministers that they should believe the world may be converted without making it necessary for them to violate the laws which they have promised to obey? The principle of specific duties and limited responsibility shows itself all along in the history of the Christian Church. If any man suggest that the Divine commission to preach the Gospel to every creature supersedes the necessity of any human alliances, I ask to whom was that commission given? Was it not given to the college of the Apostles, and not to any single individual? It descends, therefore, to a similar body in the Christian church, as a collective body, or else to the Church at large. Certainly it does not descend to any one individual man for any conduct he may propose to himself in opposition to the determination of all others who have an equal right in this commission. The command of our Lord was manifestly to give authority to the Apostles to go beyond the Jewish fold in their proclamation of the Gospel and to announce it to the Gentiles. It was a commission, moreover, to preach the "good news," for so the Greek word is literally rendered. But this missionary work, though it be so essential a part of the ministerial office, is not intended to supersede the pastoral work of the Church. The one has for its object the proclamations of an unknown God and Saviour to the heathen; the other the edifying of Christians in the faith they have already received, and the duty of making Christ known to those who have never heard of Him is not to be confounded with the right to override a clergyman in the charge of the flock over which the Church has constituted him the pastor, any more than the duty of feeding a starving man involves the right of interfering with the diet which your neighbor provides for his family. The commissions to preach the gospel to every creature given by the apostle in person, must come, if it come at all, to a man living in the nineteenth century, either by virtue of some immediate divine revelation or else immediately through the Church of Christ. If any man claims a direct interposition from heaven we know how to understand him. On the other hand, if he seeks authority from the Church of Christ, then he is bound to do what the Church authorizes him to do, but not what the Church expressly forbids his doing. If the Church ordains him a deacon he has a right to baptise, but not to administer the Lord's Supper. He has a right to preach if specially licensed by the bishop; if not the Church does not allow him to preach. But what now is claimed for some men is the right to take the responsibility into their own hands without regard to the claims of individuals or to the laws of the Church. Now it is scarcely necessary to add that no Protestant canon can tolerate such pretensions. No church can permit her ministers to claim, by virtue of a commission given to an apostolic college eighteen hundred years ago, a right descended by apostolic snecession to trample our canons under foot. No society can prosper—it cannot long exist—under such a state of things. Granting the right of the clergy and laity to protest against an obnoxious law, while the law stands it must not be violated. Let us not be willing to believe that there is a deliberate intention on the part of any of the clergy to violate avowedly the laws to which they have promised to conform. The human heart is very deceitful. Men easily come to believe that to be lawful which they think to be their duty. But there can be no doubt that, whatever be the excesses and follies of individuals, the great part of the Church is loyal to its divine constitution; the great mass of the clergy and laity are opposed, yes, inflexibly opposed, to the infraction of laws, whether it be on the one side or on the other. In conclusion, let me only add that what the Church needs is rest, quiet, peace, and not the burden and waste of war; not that the laborers in the vineyard should wound each other and devastate each other's field as in civil war, but that each man should quietly work his own appointed field. There is an immense and irresistible power for good in steady, persistent, solid work for Christ and His Gospel. The men who are noisy and bring themselves into public notice may seek their reward in the shape of popular applause; but those who work quietly will receive their reward in the blessing and support of Almighty God. And as God is said to be on the side of the strongest battalions, so it will be found that the Lord Jesus Christ is upon the side of those who faithfully and lovingly study to be quiet and to do their own business.

Zion Church, Madison Avenue.

The first of a series of sermons under the auspices of the American Church Union, to be preached in the Episcopal churches of this city on Sunday evenings during Lent, was delivered at Zion church, Madison avenue, last evening, by the Rev. George F. Seymour, D.D. The subject was "The obligation of observing Lent stronger than that which justifies Christians in keeping holy the first day of the week instead of the seventh." The reverend gentleman took for his text the fifth verse of the sixth chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians:—"In stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings," &c. The speaker contended that there was more obligation on the part of Christians to observe the lenten season than there was for them to observe the first day as sacred instead of the seventh. By what authority, by what warrant was Sunday instituted as the day to be kept holy instead of the seventh? Simply because it was warranted by the acts of the apostles and their successors, and yet there was no command to observe the first day in the Bible. To be sure St. Paul had advised the Christians to take up collections for the poor and the needy on the first day, yet notwithstanding the strict command of the Almighty, written by the finger of God in the Old Testament, to keep the seventh day holy, and no command in the New Testament having superseded that command, Christians observed the first day and not the seventh. The practice of the apostles and their successors from generation to generation down to the present time was the warrant for this observance. The same authority that warranted Sunday instead of Saturday as the day to be kept holy, a day of rest, also commanded Christians to keep the lenten season—that is, all Christians who acknowledge the authority of the Church and do not strive to enter into a conflict with its practices and observances. Even those persons who contended that they observed no practice not sanctioned or commanded by the Bible observed the first day as holy, thereby perhaps unconsciously acknowledging an ecclesiastical austerity. If the first day was observed for this reason, then why not the lenten season for the same reason? In fact, the reasons calling for the observance of Lent were stronger than those that changed the observance of the seventh day to the first, for there was no command of God to observe the first day, whereas the observance of Lent was commanded by His high authority. If one command of the Bible was acknowledged and obeyed all commands therein should be acknowledged and obeyed. Christians should accept all or nothing, one thing or the other. The Jew might ask the Christian by what biblical authority he observed the first day as holy, and he might hesitate for an answer, whereas the orders in the Bible to observe Lent are clear and plain. If Christians went by no fixed principles they were children of caprice, liable to be carried away by every wind and at the instigation of mere whims. Jonah spent a long time "in fasting, weeping and mourning," in the Sermon on the Mount the Saviour said, "When ye fast be not as hypocrites, of sad countenance," &c., and surely the Lord would not have given specific directions to observe a duty which he did not expect his disciples and their successors to observe. In the fifth chapter of St. Luke and in the parallel one of St. Mark it is recorded that the Saviour said, "But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days." The Saviour meant by "those days" the days in the years that would follow after He, the bridegroom, had been taken away. "Those days" of fasting were the seven weeks preceding Easter. The Saviour had intended his words as a prophecy and a command, telling his disciples what would come to pass and what might be done. Moses fasted forty days and Elijah the same time, and both, sanctified by so long an abstension were allowed to converse on the mount of transfiguration with Him who fasted forty days and forty nights—they representing the law and the prophets. The Holy Scriptures enforced the duty of fasting. St. Paul was "in fastings" often. In the tenth chapter of Daniel it is recorded: "In those days I, Daniel, was mourning three full weeks; I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled." The city of Nineveh was about to be destroyed, but the people proclaimed and observed a fast, and the reward was that Nineveh was spared. Cornelius, the centurion, fasted until the ninth hour, when an angel came to him and told him what he should do to become a Christian. Fasting was always rewarded when done in a true spirit of repentance. The speaker closed by referring to the fact that fasting was taught us by our very nature in times of calamity, of sorrow, of sickness. When in sorrow a man refused his usual bread; when death was in a family, the family forgot their usual plentiful board; when sickness befell a member of it, and days and nights of watching was done, their hunger was forgotten, and exhorting Christians, to be sorry for their sins and in repenting for them, be like St. Paul, "in fasting often."

Plymouth Church, Brooklyn.

Yesterday morning the services in Plymouth church were conducted by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. After receiving several new members into his congregation and administering baptism to some adults, the reverend gentleman having adverted to local matters, commended to the consideration of his audience an orphanage in Brooklyn which is under the care of the Right Rev. Dr. Loughlin, the Catholic Diocesan of Long Island. Mr. Beecher then read the fifteenth chapter of the First Corinthians as the lesson of the day, and preached from the second verse of the third chapter, First Epistle of John. Combining the mysterious affinity between these two passages in the sacred Scriptures, the reverend preacher, in a brilliant discourse which lasted an hour, was listened to, as he always is, amid the breathless attention of his audience.

In the evening Mr. Beecher preached to a full audience on the hatefulness and abomination of sin. He treated the subject in a novel and interesting manner. In the course of his sermon he said that in Canada and other countries where lumber grew a great many persons were engaged in cutting the timber to a proper length, stripping off the bark and rolling the lumber to the streams and rivers, where it remained piled up until the rains came and the freshets sent it down to its destination. There were too many men who, in the course of their lives, went on piling up sin on sin, hoping that ultimately some freshet would, as in the case of the lumber, come and sweep away the accumulated heap of their transgressions. That was very good for lumber, but it would not do for human souls. This expression caused a movement of merriment among the congregation, who were reminded by the reverend gentleman that they must be always endeavoring to do God's work, and not waiting for some chance to wipe out their sins. If a man were a liar, a drunkard, or a thief, and resolved to reform himself, he would not have done his work unless he ceased not only to lie, to drink, to steal, but to tell the truth at all times, to be temperate, and strictly honest. It was impossible for any man to live a negative kind of existence. Gamblers, liars and drunkards plunged into their vices not up to their elbows merely, but up to their necks. If men set all their sails to serve the devil, they ought, at least, when they became penitent and sorry for their sins, set all their sails to serve God. To do this they must not only cease to do wrong, but act right. By acting right they would put down wrong. In this strain the reverend gentleman continued for an hour, and at the close of his discourse offered up an extempore prayer, after which the audience separated.

Services at the Church of the Redeemer (Universalist), Brooklyn.

There was a numerous congregation, despite the snow storm, assembled at this church last evening, drawn thither by the announcement that the Rev. George H. Hopkins, of Boston, would preach upon the occasion. The reverend gentleman took for his text the words found in the sixteenth verse, third chapter of the second Corinthians:—"Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord the veil shall be taken away." He began by saying that he was about to talk in a simple way of simple truths, and asserted that no man has reached the full status of manhood. There were two forces in each soul—one the carnal and the other the spiritual. The one drags him down and debases, while the other elevates and ennobles. Still we persist in giving preference to the baser element, rejecting the truths which will make us happy. The speaker argued that though man might gain temporary satisfaction from the indulgence of his own evil instincts, yet that great giant, the world, soon stripped the dream from his mind and made him fall back dissatisfied with himself. But no matter how low a man may fall there was that innate germ of truth in every soul upon the earth which the angels could warm into the beauty of gratitude and love of God. They did not believe in the doctrine of total deprivity, taught by by the doctors of old. He dwelt upon the true beauties of religion and sought to impress his hearers with the necessity for its possession in order to comprehend true happiness. It does not conflict with business nor check man's desire for position; it only tells a man to remember that all success comes from God, and that gratitude therefor belongs to God. It tells him not to give up his manhood, his principle and his honor; it is that something which bids a man to be honest in the warehouse as in the church. The man who heeds not religion lives with a veil before his heart. Religion was a warm and invigorating influence around which clusters all that is beautiful in life and which can be looked forward to in eternity. The tenure of life is as slender as the spider's web. Blot out the revelations of Christ, and where is life? Religion will not take from man a single thing that will be for his welfare, while it will remove all that is hurtful. Exhorting the congregation to seek the holy influence of the teachings of Christ and exercise themselves in all their several relations of life, as followers in the footsteps of the Lord, the reverend gentleman closed his remarks, which had absorbed the attention of his hearers for upwards of one hour during their delivery.

The Brooklyn City Mission.

The thirty-eighth anniversary of the Brooklyn City Mission and Tract Society was held last night at the Dutch Reformed church on the Heights. Rev. Dr. Storrs presided and made a few remarks explanatory of the progress and growth of the institution. The society was formed in 1829, when the receipts for the first year were $231. For the year 1867 the receipts from twenty-seven churches amounted in the aggregate to $22,000, while there is a balance in the treasury of $1,572 54.

Lecture by Bishop Loughlin.

Right Rev. John Loughlin, Catholic Bishop of Brooklyn, last evening delivered a lecture, entitled "Christian Benevolence," before a very large audience, at St. Mary's church (Father J. B. McDonald's), Remsen and Leonard streets, E. D. The lecture was listened to with profound attention. It was one of the learned bishop's happiest efforts. His argument was that charity was the foundation of the Church and that it originated from God. The man who thinks he loves God and hates his neighbor lives in the midst of darkness. The love of God and the love of our neighbor are inseparable. The distinction between natural and supernatural love was explained at length by the bishop, and he brought his eloquent discourse to a conclusion by a refutation of the common error that Catholic charity was of a contracted nature. The proceeds of the lecture will be devoted to the five free schools of the parish established by Father McDonald.

THE SPIRITUALISTS AT DODWORTH HALL.

Dr. Bullock Expresses His Opinion on the Subject of Shams.

From week to week at Dodworth Hall audiences dwindle and taper off in nearer approximation to nobody-ish proportions; while the First Spiritualists' Society struggles on in vain effort to maintain its foothold as an organization, though since the departure of Miss Emma Hardinge with rather less success than before. Even the admission fee system (of ten cents per head) has been abandoned, since it was of no use to attempt to collect fees where there was nobody of whom to collect them; and at present things have an impecunious appearance, which extends even to the congregation. It has always been so with great reformers—the geniuses of manners and morals, politics and religion—and people who have most ideas in their heads are often found with the least greenbacks in their pockets. It is one of the misfortunes of people with ideas that they are often compelled to eke out their overcoats and pantaloons from that peculiar thoroughfare which leads from the City Hall to the Bowery; for, though Mr. Emerson is of the opinion that all currency is simply ideal and represents ideas, it unfortunately often happens that the currency is often more valuable than the idea it is supposed to represent, besides being vastly more available for business purposes. Ideas, though the very basis of coin, and forty per cent more valuable than greenbacks, will not save one from seediness of exterior; and, as many a reformer has found out to his cost, are not even current for one's breakfast. Engaged even in great works of reform one must not forget bread and butter. Bread and butter is the great motive power of the world—the mainspring of all progress—and to speak of progress or reform without bread and butter is like campaigning in the enemy's country without a commissary department. It is the basis of the moralist's moralizing; for bread and butter the poet manufactures his divine doggerel; for bread and butter the clergyman looks reverend and talks metaphysics; for bread and butter the philanthropist invents schemes for the amelioration of the condition of the poor; for bread and butter the doctor prescribes or the quack quacks you to death; and for bread and butter the sad-faced sexton buries you—in short, bread and butter is the basis of all progress and the motive of all professions, from the clergyman, who saves sins for the consideration of bread and butter, to the undertaker, who takes a solemn delight in providing one with a coffin, because it is his bread and butter, and the sexton who moves about the earth in weeds, because it is his bread and butter. In fact, in bread and butter we live and move, and in bread and butter nave and sustain our being—an aphorism which seems to be sadly neglected by the First Spiritualists' Society of the city of New York, whose apparent contempt of bread and butter and their apparent endeavor to demonstrate by their daily lives that one can live without it—the singular pronoun is used because, though grammatically two, logically bread and butter are one thing only, and ought never to be regarded separately—are simply heroic. Heroes of reform they are, every one of them; but even heroes have been known to fail of subsisting respectably on heroism; and heroism, though grand and tragic and excellently adapted to dramatic effect, is often of no avail without bread and butter as a commissary department.

These few remarks are put forth by way of advice to all reformers not to neglect the commissary department. Poor human nature, though the most heroic thing extant, must have its internal revenue of bread and butter at least three times a day, or it is liable to lose its capacity for heroism. And with this crumb of pertinent advice, it is to be hoped that the spirits will take to mending the impecuniosity of the faithful.

Thus far by way of preface, which ought to be to that which follows what the cork is to the bottle. Dr. Bullock—whether reverend or otherwise matteroth not—lectured the Spiritualists last evening at Dodworth Hall on the general subject of shams, a subject vastly relevant to the occasion. The audience was after Milton's ideal in the matter—viz., fit though few; and whether most fit or most few it might have puzzled the spectator to decide. The fitness was certainly emphatic enough, and if it was exceeded in emphasis by anything else it was due to the fact that the fewness of the audience was more emphatic still. Upon entering the first thing that impressed the spectator was the general baldness of the heads of the assemblage, though it is one of the tendencies of profound thought to induce baldness, and man of ideas must really be forgiven should the heat of intellectual inspiration have singed their cranniums of hair. At the desk lolled a short gentleman not quite as bald as the rest, whose proportions, similar to those of the celebrated Wouter Van Twiller, might have reminded the spectator of a colossal frog seated bolt upright, had the spectator been of humorous inclination and in a mood of sufficient wickedness to make light of the *personnel* of an apostle of reform; and, anon, the corpulent gentleman rose from his seat and, waddling forward to the desk, stood still for a moment with an imposing gesture which was meant as a warning to all whisperers to keep "mum" as a mummy. At this juncture had the forementioned spectator continued in mood of irreverent mental comment upon the appearance of things that same spectator would have been likely to murmur to himself, "A frog standing on its hind legs—a huge, colossal frog." The spectator was not there, however, and consequently nothing of the kind was either thought or muttered.

"I want to read you a portion of Isaiah," croaked the frog, or said the Doctor; and the Doctor was permitted to read it, the bald heads of the audience in the meantime glistening most brilliantly as the gas was turned fully on. The uplifted hand fell, and to carry out the analogy the uplifted paw of the frog fell at the same time. "'I am sick unto death of burnt sacrifices and bullocks,' said the Lord," thus read on the Doctor, while the audience were left to reciprocate the sentiment concerning bullocks, or not to reciprocate, as best suited them. Some few probably reciprocated, though none of the exceedingly faithful manifested the slightest comprehension of the present applicability of the passage. Hence the Doctor proceeded to exegesis. He intended, he averred, to discuss the general subject of shams. There was sham religion and sham democracy; sham religion kept building hospitals and sinshouses, and sham democracy was now building Tammany Hall, while republicanism was compelled to take to attics and corner groceries for the holding of political meetings. Sham religion built Gothic edifices to carry on its dummery, while they (that is Dr. Bullock and the spiritualists) were compelled to resort to Dodworth Hall, and could hardly afford to pay for that. Hospitals were the shame of religion, the outcroppings of its age of sham; and in the days of its purity religion had no need of hospitals. In those days every man was like the good Samaritan—viz., bound up the wounds of his brother, took him to the nearest place of safety, inn or otherwise, left him in good care and promised to pay when he came back; though whether the benevolent Samaritan ever came back and paid the bill is not stated in the parable, and, hence, the parable is not applicable to present inn-keepers, who seldom trust strangers on such terms. The Doctor proceeded:—Sham was up for judgment, and to-day was its judgment day. The high court of the Senate was about to sit in judgment on a great show. He did not wish to be personal; but it was so, and he had a solemn duty to perform. He did not suppose he had a great deal of influence in the matter; but he was solemnly impressed that he ought to say something about it. Truth had essence about it; it was nourished by a perennial toproot, and could not perish. In the words of the immortal poet,

Truth crushed to earth would rise again.

It was sham that could not survive the day of judgment. He believed in the eternity of truth; he had no faith in show whatever—it was an abomination which ought not to be tolerated.

Many things more of exceeding instructiveness were uttered by the Doctor of which memory fails to make note, albeit, meanwhile, the bald heads were bowed one by one with the weight of powerful conviction (or of excessive drowsiness), and from the mouth of one venerable individual there broke something like the monotonous repetition of a hoarse snore, so deeply was he affected by the words of the orator of the occasion. Meanwhile, also, those who were not bald dropped out one by one as the speaker went on, until none but bare heads were left, and these dropped lower and lower with the weight of every sentence uttered by the philosophical pundit. Then snores in profusion bubbled from every nose, and the Doctor spoke on, and the bald headed audience snored on, and the subject of sham was illustrated both in the talking of the Doctor and the snoring of the audience—the one roaring "Humbug" and the other snoring "Humbug" in deep spiritual unison.

BRIGHAM YOUNG AND HIS SERAGLIO.—Though there is an act of Congress against polygamy and the United States maintain a court in Utah for the purpose of enforcing the laws, this wholesome statute continues to be disrespected there by those highest in social and ecclesiastical position. On the 31st ult., in Great Salt Lake City, Brigham Young was married for the thirty-first time, the happy bride being Miss Merivine Van Cott, a lady 28 years of age, daughter of Elder Van Cott, and formerly, while a gentile, the wife of a Mr. Cobb, from whom she was duly divorced, so that she could resume her maiden name. She is now the thirty-first of the Mormon prophet's wives, not counting those who have been only sealed, or formally married, to him for the sake merely of securing their salvation, since none but married women are admitted into the Mormon heaven. Of the previous thirty wives the most recent was married to Brigham on the 29th of January, 1863; her name was Amelia Folsom, and she emigrated to Utah from Council Bluffs, Iowa. She has since presided over his establishment, and sat in the first place in the temple and the theatre. Now she resigns this distinction to Miss Van Cott, and becomes lost in the general mass of the household. The prophet's thirty-first wedding festival was also distinguished by the marriage of his fourth daughter, Emily, to Elder Hiram B. Clawson, whose first wife is also Mr. Young's eldest daughter, Alice.

THE LOUISIANA STATE TREASURY BANKRUPT.

SPECIAL ORDERS NO. 40.
HEADQUARTERS FIFTH MILITARY DISTRICT,
NEW ORLEANS, LA., Feb. 22, 1868.
[Extract.]

1. The Auditor and Treasurer of the State of Louisiana have officially represented to the Commanding General of the Fifth Military District that "the indebtedness of the State is such that under the present revenue laws the debt cannot be paid," and the Governor of the State has, in an official communication to the Commanding General, declared that the State Treasury is totally bankrupt, that the judges and all the other officers of the State cannot be paid and that unless some remedy be applied the machinery of civil government in the State must stop. The collection of arrear of taxes for four years was, by act of the Legislature, suspended until the year 1870, and the appropriation act of the State, passed on the 25th of March, 1867, to meet the current expenses of the State, expired on the 31st of December, 1867, so that no adequate provision for the current year now exists, and no payments can be made by the Treasurer. The emergency of the case is so pressing and immediate, and prompt action so indispensable to prevent anarchy and confusion and the loss of all semblance of civil law, that the Commanding General feels it his duty to use his authority for the relief of the State in this exigency. Upon the recommendation of his Excellency Governor Baker it is therefore ordered:—

1. That from and after this day all the licenses on trades, professions and occupations, the revenues, dues and taxes of the State of Louisiana shall be payable and collected in United States legal tender treasury notes. It is made the duty of the State Treasurer and of all other persons charged with these collections to exact payments as above.

2. The Auditor and Treasurer of the State shall be required to keep a special and separate account of all dues, taxes, funds or other public moneys which shall be received by them hereafter from any and all collectors of taxes, or from other sources; and it shall be their duty to appropriate the same to the payment of the salaries of the judicial, executive and civil officers of the State, and to pay and discharge all the appropriations made in favor of the charitable institutions, the free public schools, for the rent of the Mechanics' Institute and for the support of the State convicts. The act of the Legislature making appropriations for the general expenses of the State ending the 31st of December, 1867, so far as the appropriations therein set forth apply to the above enumerated officers and institutions, will be adopted by the said Treasurer and Auditor and other officers, as if the said Legislature had passed the same act providing for the year 1868, making appropriations for the objects hereinbefore specified in this order, for the sums contained in said act; provided, however, that the Treasurer of the State shall not pay any other outstanding warrants or other obligations of the State than those that are issued against appropriations for the last quarter of the year 1867, restricting himself in the payment of these last mentioned obligations to those applicable to