

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.



PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY A COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.—RUFUS T. HEPLIN, Editor.

VOL. IV.—NO. 24.

RALEIGH, THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1859.

\$1.50 a year, in advance.

ORIGINAL.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.
Calvinism vs. Arminianism,
Reviewed.—No. VII.

REV. R. T. HEPLIN:—I pass to the consideration of P. T. P.'s No. IV. on the "Holiness of God." The "Holiness of God" is a perfection of his nature, and cannot be viewed as originating in, or arising out of, any attribute of his nature. It is, therefore, perfectly absurd to say that "the will of God, whether secret or revealed, is founded upon His holiness;" for in this view, the nature and perfection of one attribute, is derived from another. The nature and perfections of no one attribute is derived from, or is dependent, upon another. All the attributes of God are equally essential to his very being; and we cannot conceive the idea in our mind, of his existence, apart from, or independent, of them all. It is because of the absolute and infinite perfection of his very essence that we ascribe to Him Wisdom, Justice, Mercy, Truth, Goodness, and Holiness and not because his infinitely perfect Wisdom, Justice, &c., give us the idea, that out of these, or founded upon them, the "Holiness of God" itself, arises, or is based upon them. "Holiness," as Wisdom, &c., being essential to his nature, cannot be predicated of any other of his attributes, any more than his justice is predicated of his mercy. His attributes are all absolute in their character, and necessarily inherent, and are constituent perfections of his nature; and can, therefore, be in no sense "founded upon" each other. They are co-essential and eternal with his essence, and constitute that essence in the full amplitude of his self-sufficiency and unoriginate being.

Arminianism, therefore, does not conceive of "Holiness" as being "founded upon" (as P. T. P. affirms) any other attribute, or as being "at the foundation of his electing love; as his electing love is at the foundation of His scheme of redemption," but as consisting with, and harmoniously operating together, in the redemption of mankind. This, then, being essential to the divine nature and character, demonstrates conclusively, that God's "Holiness" could not be the fundamental principle of performing, through Mercy itself, an act, by which any portion of the race of Adam, could be secured or saved, "by an eternal and unconditional election," for, in such a case, this "election," being "unconditional," must necessarily be an arbitrary act, and therefore, not just.

The infinite knowledge of God is such, even in the estimation of Arminians, that it comprehends, in one glance, everything in his whole territory. And, therefore, his sight (not "fore-sight") of these is perfect, comprehending every minutia, so that he sees with absolute certainty, every emotion, good or bad, of man's nature, as these emotions are actuated by his "Spirit working in due season," or as men are led captive by the "devil at his will." This infinite knowledge could not, therefore, be in the condition supposed by P. T. P., in which "God could see nothing in the moral character of man which could be pleasing to Him." For, his sight in this instance, embraces the very thing in man as redeemed by Christ, and a subject of the Spirit's influence, which, even his holiness itself, could approve, and his saving mercy would regard as a proper ground of the election of the character thus seen by him.—See Gal. iii. 7, 8; Eph. i. 3-13; 1 Pet. i. 1, 2.

Arminianism teaches that God distributes to us degrees of talents to men, and requires their use according to the abilities which he has, and does, endow them; and, that, in this relation he actually does more for some than he does for others, yet, does all in these respects "that infinite wisdom, almighty power, and boundless love can do, without forcing them to be saved." In proof, it is demonstrated that He gives "light to every one that cometh into the world."—John i. 9, and grants a "manifestation of the Spirit to every man, to profit withal."—1 Cor. xii. 7; John xvi. 4-11, and actually affirms that the salvation or damnation of men, turns upon the improvement or non-improvement of the talents thus given; or which is the same in its principle, their faith and obedience, or their unbelief.—Mark xvi. 15, 16.—

From this view, it follows that P. T. P. has misrepresented the doctrinal views of Mr. Wesley and of Methodists, when he says that "they deny that in respect to spiritual gifts, God does more for one unregenerated sinner than he does for another, &c.," for, in this regard, it is contended that He does all that is necessary to be done for their salvation. And herein Wesley and the Methodists agree with the Bible.—See Isaiah v. 1-7; and Christ, Matt. xxiii. 37-39; and if Calvinism differs from Methodism, *alias* Arminianism, in this particular, as P. T. P. affirms, I can only say, so does it also from Isaiah and Christ. "The consequence" (does not therefore follow, which P. T. P. affirms) "that those who have done so much better than 'the rest' have regenerated themselves

by sending forth streams from a fountain which is totally polluted." And that "therefore a holy God is pleased with what a man has done for himself, every imagination of the thoughts of whose heart is only evil continually;" not so, but the grace of God, through Christ, working in the sinner "to will and to do," prepares him to "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling." Here is the whole ground of this entire matter.

So far is the Arminian view from "encouraging man's continued rebellion against God," that it is the only safe ground to deal with man. As, on the one hand, he is assured that whatever is necessary to be done by "infinite wisdom, almighty power and boundless love" will be done, to put sinful man in the possession of the means necessary for him to "work out his salvation;" and on the other hand, by the responsibility of man in this relation, he is assured that if he uses not the grace given, that his damnation results, as a necessary consequence, of grace abused, and salvation neglected.—Heb. ii. 3. So that the conclusion of P. T. P., is absurd, when he affirms that "it will be impressed upon him that he must not only put forth that ability which he has, but must depend upon it to make him differ from those who go on in sin and are lost, &c.," for, in this regard, the exercise of his ability in the use of the means of grace, or the rejection of it, makes the whole ground of difference. He is fully apprized that no "dependence" whatever, can be placed upon his own "ability" either to improve his moral nature, or to regenerate his soul; but that his dependence must be upon the grace of God in Christ, for everything good in him, or done by him. He is "stripped," not only "of his self-righteousness," but also of all false hopes growing out of the spurious doctrine of "the righteousness of Christ," so that he neither "clings to a single fragment of his filthy rags," nor to the imaginary robe of Christ's "righteousness." His "conversion" will be deep and solid, so as to be assured that he "is passed from death unto life," without any misgivings growing out of a mere hope that he is renewed in the inner-man. Nothing is true of all that is insinuated about the conversion of the Arminian subjects, as "a turning from one sentiment or *test* to another," but a clear, full, sensible and assured revival of their whole soul in the image of God.

With regard to "experience," Arminianism, *alias* Methodism, contemplates quite a different one from that which Calvinism considers as the only true one. It is altogether a mistake, to say the least, that Wesley was giving an account of his own experience, as P. T. P. affirms, as a regenerated man, in either of the Sermons quoted. He was giving, first, the character of a "natural man," for he says so himself. Secondly, he then gives the character and the *strugglings* of an *awakened sinner*, for so he affirms. So that it does not follow that his "experience was Calvinistic," but, that he was describing the *apostolic* view of the experience of an awakened sinner, as is seen in Rom. vii. 14-25; and showing almost conclusively, that such an one was unable to liberate himself from his prison, demonstrating, alike, that the "Calvinistic experience of a regenerated Christian, founded upon Rom. vii. 14-25, was radically wrong, and that a sinner is utterly dependent upon the inward operations of the Holy Spirit; even to see and feel his condition. His deliverance, if effected at all, he is assured must be by "God, through Jesus Christ our Lord;" and at the same time, when effected, that the sinner is no longer under "condemnation," but is "made free by the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," and therefore is actually able to *fulfill* the righteousness of the law." This Arminian and Scriptural experience, is anything else than "Calvinistic."

Yours affectionately,
PETER DOUB.
Fayetteville, N. C., May 28, 1859.

SELECTIONS.

Decisions of the College of Bishops.

Nashville, Tenn., May 4, 1858.
At a meeting of the College of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the decision of the Bishops on questions of law was taken up, when Bishop Pierce presented questions decided by him, arising out of charges preferred by the Rev. William Closs against the Rev. R. O. Burton. "Charge, *maladministration*."—First specification: "In having refused to investigate charge first in the bill of charges referred to him by the North Carolina Conference. This charge was ruled out by the presiding elder, on the exception of the accused, on the ground of its indefiniteness."

It is true that we have not in our Discipline any precise statute declaring in what manner charges shall be drawn. We are left to the analogies of law, and the obvious proprieties of the subject, as these have been recognized and established by

usage. The charge ought to be definite, as to time or place or substance or circumstance. This is necessary, first, that the accused may understand the precise nature of the charge against him, second, that the court may determine whether the facts constitute an offence, and thus graduate its guilt, and third, that the verdict in the case may bar a future prosecution for the same offence. If the parties in a cause waive all objection to the manner in which the charge is drawn, and mutually agree to go into trial, the court is under no obligation to interfere, unless it be in behalf of those too ignorant to know their rights and privileges. An accused person, preacher or layman, is entitled to all the protection of his rights which the constitution and usage of the Church secure to him.

The charge objected to by the accused, and ruled out by the presiding elder, is vague and indefinite, and therefore the first specification is not sustained.

Second specification: "In having admitted *ex parte* testimony, after giving assurance that no *ex parte* testimony would be admitted." The assurance here mentioned, it is stated, and not denied, was given to both the accuser and the accused; they were upon equal terms. The charge of policy was not mentioned to either, and both might, if they had sought it, have availed themselves of it, subject to the decision of the presiding officer. An Episcopal decision, often quoted in the progress of this case, allows the introduction of *ex parte* testimony in certain cases, some of which it specifies. The records of this Conference, and the usage of the Church, everywhere, justify it. In this case a Bishop advised it, and therefore the second specification is not sustained.

Third specification: "In having suppressed testimony, by ruling that a witness for the defence was not bound to answer questions when cross-examined, of which ruling witness availed himself, and refused to answer." In ecclesiastical courts a witness may refuse to testify, nor is there any power in the church to compel him. A presiding officer in a church trial may decide that a question is improper, and the witness may with propriety refuse to answer. In church trials a witness is not bound to reveal confidential communications made to him as an intimate friend, or as advice or counsel in a cause. The question asked by the accuser in this case involved communications which may have been made to the accused during the progress of the case, and, of course, after the charges were preferred, and, if answered, would not have been evidence, and therefore the third specification is not sustained.

Fourth specification: "In allowing a witness for the defence to change his testimony after it had been read and approved by himself, and pending the discussion, and after I had used said testimony to show that it proved the guilt of the accused." In all courts, civil and ecclesiastical, if the testimony of a witness is misapprehended, he may, at his own suggestion, or on the demand of the judge, jury or counsel, explain his testimony, and do this at any stage of the proceedings, before the verdict. In this case, according to the record, no word was altered or added, and the explanation consisted simply in enclosing a sentence in quotation marks; and therefore the fourth specification is not sustained.

Fifth specification: "That after the testimony had been closed, and argument submitted on both sides, he introduced and examined a new witness on behalf of the accused." This, I grant, was a novel case; and my decision is that it was justified by the peculiar circumstances of the case, and was alike demanded by the affirmation of the accused, and, if he was misinformed, necessary for the vindication of the accuser, and therefore the fifth specification is not sustained.

Sixth specification: "That after the parties had retired, he remained with the committee, and took part in their deliberations in making up their decision." On this point there is nothing but usage to guide us, save the opinion of Bishop Hedding, which has long been recognized as sound and judicious. True, Bishop Hedding's opinion is declared particularly in regard to the trial of a member, but as to the forms of trial, neither the Discipline nor usage secures any privilege to a preacher, local or traveling, which they deny to a member. If a preacher is pastor of a particular church, so is the presiding elder of the pastor of his district. If the relation of pastor, as one authority has decided, justifies the thing in one case, the same relation justifies it in the other. Until some legitimate authority, by specific direction, orders to the contrary, an administrator is not to be condemned who simply conforms to long-established usage; and therefore the sixth specification is not sustained.

G. F. P.
Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn.,
May 5, 1858.

The decision of Bishop Early, in the case of the Rev. C. D. Elliott, whose case was tried before the Quarterly Meeting

Conference of the McKendree church, under the presidency of W. D. F. Sawrie, who decided the case of C. D. Elliott to come under the rule of Section 2 of the Discipline, and of the New Testament, to teach the art and science of modern dancing anywhere, or to practice promiscuous dancing anywhere, and therefore the decision of the presiding elder, from which the quarterly meeting Conference of the McKendree Church, in the city of Nashville, appealed, be and the same is hereby affirmed.
(Signed) JOHN EARLY.

The decision of Bishop Early, on motion, unanimously affirmed by the Bishops.

H. H. KAVANAUGH,
Secretary of the Board.

A decision on claims, in the Texas Conference, by Bishop Kavanaugh.

The following questions and answers grew out of the administration of the Rev. A. Davidson, presiding elder of the San Antonio Station, which the presiding elder of the Stewards, and directed a *pro rata* division between the preacher in charge and the presiding elder of the District. And also out of the fact that a preacher had been employed on the station in the absence of the preacher appointed by the Conference, in consequence of the sickness of the family of the latter.

Question 1. Has a presiding elder any right to withhold any part of an appropriation made out of the mission fund to a circuit or station, from the preacher in charge of the said work, for any other cause than a delinquency on the part of said preacher?

Answer. No.
Ques. 2. If a preacher in charge of a circuit or station has an occasion to be absent one or more sermons, not amounting to a desertion or wilful neglect of the duties he owes to the same, and employ a brother in good standing to do the labor of the circuit or station during his absence, does he forfeit any thing under the Discipline?

Ans. He does not.
Ques. 3. If a preacher is hindered from doing his labors, present or absent, in his appointed circuit or station, by the extreme illness of his wife or child, there being no intention on his part to abandon or neglect it, except as unavoidably, is not the absence from labor, and the field of labor, so brought about, "necessary" in a disciplinary sense? And if the preacher resume his labor at the earliest possible day, in the absence of other proof, is not his return evidence of his intention?

Ans. It is.
Ques. 4. Has the presiding elder power to make any other than a *pro rata* distribution of quarterage among preachers placed by his decision, or otherwise, on the same basis?

Ans. He has not.
Ques. 5. Is the presiding elder bound to refund to a preacher money which has been illegitimately diverted from him by his maladministration?

Ans. If the money were diverted from its legitimate claimant by his act, he is morally bound to refund it.
H. H. KAVANAUGH,
Waco, Texas, December 15, 1857.

Question propounded at the Virginia Conference, December, 2, 1858, by Paul Whitehead and James D. Coulling.

Can a preacher not afflicted in his own person be for any other reason placed on the supernumerary list?

In Section 3, page 47, of the Discipline, the question is asked, Who shall compose the Annual Conference? In answer to this question, three classes of preachers are described as entitled to membership. First, "All the travelling preachers in full connection, who are able to do effective service. Second, All the supernumerary preachers, that is to say, those who are so disabled by affliction as to be unable to preach constantly, but are willing to do any work in the ministry which the Bishop may direct, and they may be able to perform. Third, All the supernumerary preachers, that is to say, those who are worn out in the itinerant service."

It will be observed that the above language describes preachers only, and such classes of them as may "compose an Annual Conference," and how they may be disposed of under given circumstances and conditions. As none but preachers are described in the language of the law, I must and do decide that the law of the Discipline refers, in the case of supernumerary preachers, as being "disabled by affliction," to their own persons, and that this alone entitles them to their position.
H. H. KAVANAUGH,
Portsmouth, Va., December 3, 1868.
Affirmed April 21, 1859.

Questions submitted to the Chair for decision, at the North Carolina Conference, held at Newbern, in the month of December, 1858, by the Rev. William Carter, a member of the Conference.

Question 1. Is the investigation of a charge of immorality and specifications against an elder, when taken out of the

Conference by the consent of the parties and the Conference, and submitted to a committee of ministers and laymen chosen by the parties, a Bishop being chairman, for adjustment, and the settlement made by the committee reported to and adopted by the Conference, a legal trial?

Ques. 2. Is the settlement made by the said committee, and in view of it, and the evidence in the case, the passage of his character by the Conference, when either one or both of the parties have violated it, a legal barrier to the trial in the future of the said charge and specifications, according to the law and usage of the Church?

WILLIAM CARTER,
Newbern, N. C., December 11, 1858.

To the first question I answer, that such would be a legal trial. The fact that the Conference allowed the parties to refer the case to a committee of friends for a plan of adjustment was an irregularity, but not of such a character as to make the action of the Conference illegal, as the Conference had heard in the first place all the evidence against and in behalf of the accused; and in the second place, requiring the committee to report to them, did not allow the committee to settle any thing finally. The true position of the committee is that of an advisor, and not a judicial body. This position of the committee renders it not material to the law governing the case, whether the persons composing it were members of the Church or not. Had the committee finally settled the case, it would have vitiated the process as to its legality; but as they reported the measures which they advised to the Conference, and the Conference adopted those terms of settlement as their own, being fully in possession of the merits of the case, and then passing the character of the accused, made it clearly a legal trial.

In answer to the second question, I would say, in the first place, that from the terms of the first question, the committee did not settle the case finally, but made the terms for the settlement which the Conference adopted. In the second place, after the Conference had settled the case, and passed the character of the accused, the subsequent violation of the terms of the settlement by "either one or both of the parties," does not open the way for the renewal of the charge and specifications. These having been once legally settled, must stand as a barrier to a subsequent presentation; but if, in violating the terms of settlement, either of the parties involve themselves in a violation of the principles of propriety or of morality, they may be charged to that extent for the violation, and held responsible to the Conference.
H. H. KAVANAUGH.

Question submitted to the Bishop:
When charges and specifications are presented to an Annual Conference against one of its members, are they in the possession of the Conference until they are formally entertained by a vote of the Conference, and may they not at any time previous to this vote be withdrawn?

WM. CARTER,
Newbern, N. C., Dec. 14, 1858.
Charges, under the circumstances specified in the question, are not in the possession of the Conference until the Conference, by vote, agree to entertain them, or shall, without the formality of a vote on entertaining, proceed to the investigation of the charges. Until such action is had, the member presenting the charges may withdraw them.
H. H. KAVANAUGH,
Newbern, N. C., Dec. 14, 1858.

Question submitted by C. E. Deems:
When a member of an Annual Conference has been notified that certain charges will be presented against him at the Conference next ensuing, and the accuser so notifying has read his bill of charges to the Conference, and the Conference has been some time in consideration of the character of the accused, can the accuser then withdraw his charges, or any portion thereof, without the consent of the accused and of the Conference?

CHARLES F. DEEMS,
Newbern, N. C., Dec. 14, 1858.
After a bill of charges has been presented by one member of a Conference against another, after due notification, and the character of the accused has been so far under examination as to have taken evidence against the accused, the accuser cannot withdraw the charges without the consent of the accused and of the Conference. Nor can the accuser withdraw the charges he has preferred against a member, after the Conference has agreed to entertain the charges, without the consent of the Conference.
H. H. KAVANAUGH,
Newbern, N. C., Dec. 14, 1858.

Aunt Hannah and the Church.

Aunt Hannah lived out of town.
"Did I never tell you what a time I had at our church last winter?" said she to me one evening.
"No! what of it?"
"Now ain't that strange? Thought I had told everybody about it, to be sure.—

La, well, 'twill be news to you then! You know Nora, Thorndale's darter. She came over to our house, and said our congregation were goin' to have a fair in the village meetin' house!"

"Do tell," sez I. "Who's goin' to preach?"
"Oh," said she, mighty smiling, "we ain't goin' to have preaching; a few young persons of the congregation, who seem to take a deeper interest in the Church's welfare than the members themselves, desire to purchase a few indispensable articles for the meetin' house; and we thought, if all the Church would present us with cakes, and pies, and meats, and such things, we would appoint a night to sell them in the vestry of the church, and take the proceeds to buy the necessary things. The plan is well received, especially by the young.—You know the money is to be spent for charitable purposes, and, on that account, everything given us will sell for double its value."

"Well, I wouldn't have believed that there was so much wisdom left in the world, as to have conjured up that," sez I.
"Tis even so," said Nora. "And what will you give? You live on a farm, and farmers produce lots of things that would be acceptable."
"Well, I will give you two roast turkeys and six roast chickens," sez I, thinking that would be as much as anybody could expect these hard times.
"Um! Well, what else? 'Tis for the church you give it, you know. Church members should not be less anxious for their interest than the world."

"You see I was a church member, and she wasn't."
"Well, I'll give a jaa of peach jam," sez I.
"That will help along some. A few bushels of apples, or a roast pig would be acceptable."
"She was so ravenous, I began to be sorry I'd offered her anything. However, I thought I'd go the whole hog or none, so I promised the pig and apples."

"Of course, you will give us cheese, and pickles, and cakes, and milk, and cream, and then I think you will have done your part at givin'." By the way, we are to have historical tableaux, and Mrs. Amos Bruce wanted you to take the part of the witch of Endor. All you will have to do will be to dress to represent that lady, and stand perfectly still behind a curtain; and people will pay something to see you."
"Wall, I's old and ignorant, and didn't know what I's about, so I consented. I sent them the pig, and the turkeys, and the chickens, and the apples, and the rest of the things wanted, up to the meetin' the day before the fair."

The next day my husband tackled up his old horse and chaise to carry me to the fair. Our old chaise, somehow or other, don't look very well. There's a hole in the top and sides, and some of the spokes of the wheel are gone. The wheels squeak powerfully, too. Wall, we hadn't but just got into town, when it seemed as if all the boys out of jail came hollerin' and hootin' arter us as if they were possessed."

"Hurra for the witch of Endor! Her chariot approacheth! Make way for her majesty!"
"Do ask them unsightly critters to be civil," sez I to my husband; "my patience is gone entirely."
At that he clambered out of the chaise, and after 'em, lick-erto-split, tight as he could get it. And oh, massy sakes! he dropped the reins on the ground, and the old horse took a notion to go, and he went. You see he knew the way to the church, and put chaise for it. Husband, he came hollerin' 'whoa, whoa!' just as I was ridin' up to the meetin'-house. The meetin'-house yard was full of folks, laughin' and starin' as if they hadn't no respectability in 'em. I got out of the chaise, and made my way through the crowd, and when they wouldn't make room, I elbowed them right smartly. I'm desput thin of flesh, and when I hit 'em they gave back as if they'd been struck with a dagger.

Paid twenty cents to go into the church. The tables inside did look beautiful.—Nora, she explained the fixins to me.—There were grabboxes, that contained a hundred things worth one cent, and one thing worth ten, and paid five cents a grab; and if you grabbed right, you would get twice your money's worth. And there was a ring cake. 'Twas divided into fifteen slices. You paid a dollar a slice, and one slice contained a ring worth fifty cents. So he that got the right slice got a ring. And there were the guess cakes, and ever so many such kind of things, too numerous to mention.

Wall, they dress me up to represent the witch of Endor; I never was handsome, and they rigged me up at such a rate that I must have looked awful. I stood behind the curtain, and people paid a ninpence to come in and see me. Some went off mad; children generally scared. Some went off laughin' as if they'd split. I evidently produced a powerful impression on all that saw me.

People at last came to see me faster than they could be accommodated. I could hear 'em talking, around the tables, about the witch of Endor's pig, and turkeys, and cake; and I began to feel, at length, dreadfully as though I was making a fool of myself. I stood there feelin' desputly, and had just made up a face to cry over my unfortunate condition, when all of a sudden, down came the curtain, and there I stood right afore 'em all! They set up such a hurrain' as I never heard before or since. I elbowed my way through 'em like wild fire, and made for the gettin'-out place, and struck for home.

Well, I went home with all my witch of Endor riggin on. When husband came to the door to let me in, he was so frightened that he set the dog on me. The dog came towards me, growled, and ran as he'd break his neck, and I haven't seen him from that day to this. I at last convinced my husband that I was his beloved wife. When I explained it all to him, the way he growled was a caution.

Wall, they raised three hundred dollars at that abominable fair. With it they bought an ornamental chandelier, and silk pulpit cushion, and hired carpenters to make gingerbread work all over the meetin'-house.

I'm just of Mrs. Deacon Ware's opinion about church fairs. I am—that they are just the most wicked swindles that orthodox ever tolerated. She says they are killin' to religion, and I think so too.—She says that the older church members think I was desputly put upon at the fair; and I declare, I don't believe but what I was."

Hints to a Prayerless Mother.

As little boy sat looking at his mother one day, he said, "grandpappy will be in heaven!" Mary will be in heaven! Baby is in heaven!" Here the child paused and looked very solemn.

"Well, dear," said the mother, "what about mamma? Will not mamma be in heaven?"

"Oh! no no,"
"Why do you say so?" asked the mother deeply afflicted.
"O, you do not pray, so you will not go to heaven."
"Yes my dear, I do; I often pray for you when you do not see me—very often, indeed."

"Ah," said he, "I never saw you, then kneel down and let me hear if you can pray."

The mother knelt by her child, and prayed aloud for herself and little one, and that day learned a lesson she never will forget.

Mother! are you going to heaven?—Do your little ones think you are going, by all they observe in your conduct! Are you leading them in the way to heaven! Do they often hear your voice going up to the throne of God for them. Those who do not pray on earth, may pray when the earth has passed and their prayer then will not be answered. The rich man prayed for one drop of water—a very small request—but he did not obtain the boon he asked. May you be anxious to pray now that your prayer may be heard and answered.

Cross Men.

Cross men are usually despised by everybody.
Cross men are always in want of friends.
Cross men can't depend upon permanent prosperity.
Cross men when in trouble are left alone and let alone, and "are of all men most miserable."
Cross men are the last men who should ask for favors.
Cross men have neither position nor influence.
Cross men are cut off from the affections good-will, and sympathy of partners, clerks customers, and—everybody.
Cross men when they depart, "which is far better," leave behind a short procession and but few mourners.—Independent.

Extracts from Tillotson.

Nobody is so weak but he is strong enough to bear the misfortune that he does not feel.
No man's religion ever survives his morals.
That is not wit which consists not with wisdom.
No man shall ever come to heaven himself who has not sent heart thither before him.
That man will one day find it but poor gain who hits upon truth with the loss of charity.

Saturday Night.

The week is past, its latest ray Is vanished with the closing day, And 'tis as far beyond our grasp Its now departed hours to grasp, As to recall the moment bright When first creation sprung to light. The week is past! if it has brought Some beams of sweet and soothing thought, If it has left some memory dear, Of heavenly rapture tasted here, It has not wringed its flight in vain, Although it ne'er return again. *Bouring.*