

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.



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

VOL. IV.—NO. 26.

RALEIGH, THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1859.

\$1.50 a year, in advance.

ORIGINAL.

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

REV. R. T. HEFLIN:—I now pass to No. VI. of P. T. P.'s communications. It is on the "Goodness of God." The goodness of God is a subject to be admired by angels and men, and has been the subject of contemplation of the wisest and best in all ages. Whatever, therefore, is derogatory thereto, in the systems of men, must be rejected by man, as unworthy of his acceptance. If Arminianism, as a system, teaches anything of this character, so as to involve the entire system, then it should be abhorred by all good and intelligent men. P. T. P. affirms this of it as a system.

1. He charges this system with, not only denying the Calvinistic view, as stated by him, but as affirming. "That it is contrary to the mercy, as well as the justice of God, to choose some of the human race to salvation, and leave others to perish; that such a purpose on the part of God would make Him 'more cruel than the devil,'" and that to invite men to the provisions of the gospel, having previously determined not to bestow the influences of His Spirit in sufficient strength to enable them to accept the invitation, is a "mockery of His helpless creatures." As to the first, the Arminians do believe it to be "contrary to the mercy, as well as the justice of God, to choose some of the human race to salvation and leave others to perish; if that 'choosing' and 'leaving' was *irrespective and independent* of their good or evil conduct; and they predicate their views upon such passages as follows: Ezek. xviii. 20-32, xxxiii. 7-20; Jeremiah, xviii. 1-10.—Here, both the "mercy of God in choosing," and his "justice in leaving" or punishing men is clearly demonstrated, as being predicated upon their *obeying or sinning*. His administration in this regard is to be judged of according to these principles, and not by his sovereign will, which Calvinism represents as *chiefly, if not only* contemplated in this transaction. As to the second, "That such a purpose, on the part of God, would make Him 'more cruel than the devil,'" I observe, that this is certainly the case, if God's conduct, in this matter, towards men, is wholly irrespective of their moral character, and grounded upon His *decree*, by which, for the "manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death."—Confession of Faith Presbyterian Church, Chap. iii. Sect. 3; and especially also Sect. v., in which it is positively denied, that faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, are conditions or causes moving him thereto." Here, then the decree is wholly independent of any consideration of "faith," &c., in the object predestinated to life; and of course, unbelief, &c., in those "fore-ordained to everlasting death." This is *unconditional* predestination to life, and *unconditional* "fore-ordination to everlasting death."—Now, if this be the true notion, then it is also true, that "God is more cruel than the devil," because, though the "devil" would do this to all the "angels and men," he cannot accomplish it in a single instance, but God has, (if this Calvinism is true) done this with perhaps, "millions" of "men."

As to the third, "That to invite men to the provisions of the gospel, having previously determined not to bestow the influences of His Spirit in sufficient strength to enable them to accept the invitation, is a 'mockery of His creatures.'" I observe, this is true upon the supposition noticed in the above paragraph. The teaching of Calvinism on the invitations that God "has previously determined not to bestow," is thus expressed with regard to the "passed by." "Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved."—Confession of Faith, &c., Chap. x. Sect. 4. These were, 1. Not redeemed by Christ. 2. Nor effectually called. 3. Therefore, they cannot be "justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved."—Confession, &c., Chap. iii. Sect. 6 and Chap x. *entire*. Now, to "invite" such to "the provisions of the gospel," when, all this time, God has *fixed* by an "eternal decree," that none of these things shall prove "effectual," and has positively "decided" that they should not be "redeemed by Christ," &c., is certainly nothing else, and nothing less, than *solemn "mockery"*, with a witness. And this is especially affirmed by P. T. P. with regard to inefficient calling or "drawing," which fully sustains the position I have proved; his words are: "That God refuses to draw all men by that almighty power," &c., and yet "invites" them, &c., and then damns them, because they "will not come," &c., when he knew they could not, because he "refused to draw them" without which it was impossible for them to "accept the

invitations." If this is not "cruelty," there can be no such thing in the universe.

But Arminians are charged with teaching that which "nullifies the grace of God altogether," because they teach that God does for men "all that infinite wisdom, almighty power, and boundless love can do without forcing them to be saved," and that he "gives sufficient and saving grace to all men." Now, in answer to this, I observe: 1. The whole of this view of the Arminians is sustained by the Bible.—"What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done for it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes;—Isa. v. 1-7. The parable of the "pounds" and the talents prove the same. Paul teaches the same in 1 Cor. xii. 7. And Christ, Matt. xxiii. 37-39; Luke, xiii. 34, 35. 2. The clear reason of the thing proves Arminianism to be true on this point. For, if men are damned for their *own* conduct, when viewed in connexion with the grace, &c., of God, it must be because that "grace was sufficient" to save them, or they are condemned for the rejection of grace which God knew he never intended to make effectual in their case. Where is the "goodness of God" in this? Who is the "mockery of God" in this? offering men grace (according to Calvinism) which he knows cannot save them; and knows too, that "previously" to his "invitations" given them, that He "determined not to bestow the influences of His Spirit in sufficient strength to enable them to accept the invitation." Who now "nullifies" the grace of God altogether? the Calvinist or Arminian. The Calvinist truly, as he makes (i. e., his system) it ineffectual *per se*, and not the Arminian, because, his system considers it, like the above scriptures, sufficiently efficacious to save men; and does so, in all cases, where, by the wilful rejection of it, it is not received in vain.

"If the Arminian system be true, God would be unjust to bestow 'sufficient saving grace'" upon one, and withhold it from another of his sinful human creatures. And so He cannot bestow a certain degree of "sufficient saving grace" upon one without being under obligation to bestow an equal degree of "sufficient saving grace" upon all, &c. Arminianism, however, as a system, never taught that doctrine; but teaches the same that Christ did in the parable of talents.—Matt. xxv. 14-30. Where there are three degrees, *five, two and one*. This latter is proved to have been sufficient *per se* to save, but became ineffectual, because *rejected*, i. e., *buried*, ver. 25, and if it had been properly used, would have been salutary, ver. 27. The doctrine here is the very essence of Arminianism. Although there are degrees in "saving grace," they are all "sufficient" *per se*, and may all be rejected, or "received in vain." God is therefore, not "under obligation" to give to all alike degrees of grace; but if he damns any for rejecting that which is rejected must have been a "sufficient saving grace," or else it was *unjust* in God in damning them for rejecting, "insufficient grace," especially as their damnation could not have been avoided, even if they had used it. What! "insufficient saving grace" save if used!!

Arminianism, as a system, denies that God is "under obligation to bestow" grace upon any man; it teaches that it is the "gift" of God. That no man ever did, or can "deserve it;" and therefore, no man can have any claim upon God, on the ground of *justice*, or any other principle. It is all of mercy, through Christ Jesus. It never taught anything else, the assertion of P. T. P., to the contrary, notwithstanding. These facts of Arminian teaching fully invalidate the instances given by P. T. P. of an aged man and young lady. As also the case of Paul and Alexander: for no one of all its principles, inculcates the sentiment that *all* men must have exactly the same quantum of grace to save them. But if the thing is both *good and just*, the grace must be "sufficient" *per se*, or else that damnation, resultant from the rejection of insufficient grace, or "neglect of so great a salvation," when that "great salvation" could not, by any possibility, be obtained, though grace was used, and the salvation not "neglected" must be entirely unjust. From the above, it also follows, that P. T. P. has misrepresented Arminianism in its teachings of sinners, when he affirms: "The Arminian system informs him that God is bound to give, and has given him as much 'sufficient saving grace' as any body else," &c. Does this follow from the Arminian view given by Christ, of *five, two, and one* talents, as given to men?

As to the "654th of Methodist Hymns," Arminians can sing it with a good deal of grace, as descriptive of their "Experience," without conceiving at all, that grace alone "works out their own salvation with fear and trembling." They believe that God works, and that they then can and must work, if saved at all.

Yours affectionately,
PETER DOUB.
Lumberton, N. C., May 31, 1859.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.
Zion Church.

This church, now a Station in the N. C. Conference, is on the plank road between Fayetteville and Albemarle, 3 miles east of the Pedee river. The building is large and well furnished, with a spacious gallery for the colored people. It stands on a hill, covered with a good oak grove, and in the midst of a densely populated, intelligent neighborhood, many of whom are professors of religion, and spiritual worshippers of Christ. On this hill are several dry goods stores, and a large Masonic hall, painted white, in the basement of which a flourishing school is kept. The grave-yard in front of the church is an object of peculiar interest, and I assure you, Mr. Editor it was so to me, on this my first visit to this consecrated place, called hither as I was by Rev. P. H. Scovelle to assist him in a two day's meeting. Here rests the dust of many whose memory is precious to the church. Rev. Absalom Brown, and Rev. Alfred Richardson, formerly of the South Carolina Conference, sleep here, as do many others of like faith.

As I stood by the graves, I thought "how quick, how quiet and peaceful, how happy and blessed are the dead who rest in hope of the resurrection!" Long will these names be cherished in the memory of the living; "The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance."

As I left Zion, after the close of the meeting, which was, I believe, pleasant and profitable to ministers and people, I felt like saying,
"My soul shall pray for Zion still
While life or breath remains,
There my best friends and kindred dwell,
There God forever reigns."

J. W. PUETT.
Albemarle, N. C. June 7, 1859.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.
Apostolic Succession.

To the Editor: Your paper of the 2d inst., contains an extracted article with remarks appended thereto, on the subject of high churchism, or the Apostolic succession, as it is called; and you intimate that a better understanding of that subject is needed in your part of the country.

Will you allow me to make a very few observations touching that matter, and to say, by way of preliminary, that I think it has not always been conducted before the public, in the books and elsewhere, in the very best and most logical manner on either side of the argument. Presbyterian writers have suffered high churchmen to lug in, and have consented to discuss with them, very much irrelevant matter.—They seem to have forgotten that the party, in any debate, having the truth on its side, has, always, everything to lose and nothing to gain by the discussion of irrelevant issues. And again: they have tacitly, and otherwise, admitted vastly too much, either for truth, or for policy.

I hold the following propositions to be demonstrable:
First. The idea that Jesus Christ, or somebody else, about his time, set up, established or organized the Christian Church or any other church, is totally erroneous.—Nothing of that sort—nothing like it—ever happened in the history of the religion of the Bible, neither in the days of the Apostles nor in any other days.

Second. The doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, as it is called and is well understood, is not nor was it ever the doctrine of any church. It was never set up or affirmed by any body of Christian men claiming to act for or to represent any integral body of Christians. No ecclesiastical Congress or Synod ever endorsed or taught it.

Third. No man pretends, or can for a moment pretend—except by a most egregious blunder, which is capable of the easiest and most palpable exposure—that there is any historic evidence of a connected chain of ordinations coming down from the Apostles. There is not a list of names in point of good, bad or doubtful history, which purports to represent a chain of ordinations from the Apostles. So that all arguments as to the validity or strength of history on that point are of course, irrelevant and superfluous.

Fourth. All reference to or arguments about Mr. John Wesley, in this connection, are wholly immaterial. It matters not a whit to the argument whether he ever ordained any body or not, whether he was a presbyter or a bishop, or what his opinions were on this or any other subject. It asserts no part of the argument to know that there was ever such a man, or when or where he lived or died.

Fifth. The question of the Apostolic Succession embodies and consists of two other integral questions, viz: 1st, whether the theory of religion requires, in order to the existence of a church and ministry, a connected chain of ordinations coming down from actual Apostolic ordinations; and second, whether there exists sufficient historic evidence that such a chain has been actually kept up. The first of these questions is in its nature logically debatable—the second is not.

A question of fact is not debatable until some testimony is produced in support of the fact affirmed. No testimony but history ever can support a historical affirmation; and, as above intimated, no testimony, neither much nor little, has been produced, or attempted to be produced, from history, on the subject of a connected chain of ordinations from the Apostles.

Having bestowed more labor upon this subject than some of my brethren, and seeing the article in your paper, alluded to, I have thought it not amiss to set forth the above thesis, in order, at least, to induce a correct line of thinking on the subject. And I have also had occasion to know that some of the presbyterian writers of our church, Bishop Emory, Mr. Powell, Dr. Bangs, and others, present the singularly awkward argument of denying the doctrine of the Apostolic succession on the one hand, and then of finding the validity of our church and ministry in that doctrine on the other. This is illogical.

Yours truly,
R. ABBEY.
For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

Have We a Poet among Us?

We rather think we have. In proof, we give a statement, and append a poem. Several years ago Hookerton was somewhat noted for intemperance—now it is quite otherwise in that beautiful village. The Sons of Temperance began their good work there. Their opponents got up a grand demonstration, and marched through the streets with drums and bottles, in formidable procession. As Rev. Nathan A. Hooker stood at a corner and viewed the procession, his soul was stirred within him, and hidden poetic fires were kindled in his bosom. That night the Sons had a meeting, and Brother Hooker was called out for a speech. He told them he had no speech, but if they pleased he would give them a song. He then poured forth the following, in stentorian but not unmelodious tones, which "brought down the house."

The enthusiasm with which it was first received, has continued to this day; and it is warbled forth in melody by many a fair daughter of the eastern counties.

SONS OF TEMPERANCE.

AIR: "A WET SHEET AND A FLOWING SEA."

Let Temperance men from every part
Unite with us in song;
We have our Order's cause at heart,
Its praise upon our tongue.
Let every cheerful Son rehearse,
(United, heart and hand.)
We seek to drive the blighting curse
Of tipping from our land.

Our Order sheds a gleam of hope
On Woman, all forlorn,
And bids the tide of sorrow stop,
And peace and joy return.
Degraded and abandoned man,
A mark for wittlings' puns,
Is raised to cheer his home again
By kind and generous Sons.

Though anti-Temperance men may rail
And muster all our foes,
Our Cause so glorious, must prevail,
Whatever may oppose.
The Dutchman said that, "I hash done
Good business in mine shop,
Before dese men, mit collars on,
Was come and proke me up."

We place these collars on our necks,
To show that all agree,
To shun intoxicating drinks,
More than the upas tree.
This neat rosette, its modesty,
Say, who can disapprove?
Its colors point to purity,
Fidelity and love.

"I cannot love that stupid man"
I heard a fair one say,
"Who joins the motley, tipping clan,
In this enlightened day."
These nice young ladies can but smile
This noble band to see;
Their hearts are beating all the while,
"A Temperance man for me!"

Let sons of Bacchus beat their drum,
And bear their bottles high;
But Sons of Temperance shun vile rum,
And pass the wine-cup by.
What, though these slaves of Bacchus chide
The Sons of Liberty,
We have the ladies on our side,
And merry men are we!

And merry men are we, my boys,
And merry men are we;
The ladies come to aid our cause,
And merry men are we!

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS being asked how he would personate Polly in a painting, replied that he would represent a man climbing over a wall at the risk of his neck, with an open gate close by, through which he might walk with ease and safety.

SELECTIONS.

Philip Bruce.

We lately asked for a memorial of that pioneer of Methodism in North Carolina, Philip Bruce. And a valued lady friend sends us the following, which was clipped from an old number of the *Nashville Christian Advocate*:
"This justly venerated minister was long known to, and highly appreciated by, early Methodists. He was one of the active pioneers of Methodism on the American continent; and although his theater of missionary action was principally the Atlantic States, the last years of his earthly pilgrimage were spent in the West, where he was revered and beloved by all who knew him. He was probably a native of North Carolina, in which State his father resided when the writer visited him in the year 1797. It was understood that Philip Bruce volunteered in defense of his country in the revolutionary struggle, when quite a youth, and was probably at the noted battle of King's Mountain. He, however, became an itinerant Methodist preacher before the close of the war, and was stationed on New Hope circuit, North Carolina, in the year 1781. This was a perilous undertaking at that critical period, when war was raging in its most hideous forms—when disaffection toward the American cause was rife in that State, and when a Methodist preacher was a target for the spleen of the enemies of vital religion. At that date, and under the circumstances, it required no small degree of zeal and moral courage to become a traveling Methodist preacher. And in Philip Bruce we have a striking example of zeal, courage, and entire devotion to God and his work. A communication from Dr. G. D. Taylor, the intimate friend of brother Bruce in his last years, gives some interesting particulars in the history of that good man. 'He informed me,' says Dr. Taylor, 'that he was at the battle of King's Mountain; but as he was somewhat of a chaplain, the troops would not consent for him to enter into the engagement, and being left with the sick and baggage, he was only a spectator of the success of our arms on that occasion. He was sometimes, while riding the circuit, taken prisoner by the British, sometimes by the Americans, but never maltreated by either party. At one time he was persuaded to preach to an assembly of Tories, whose captain had gone to Georgetown for arms, and persuaded them to disperse—he did so, and they dispersed.—When the captain returned with arms, he had no men; and as he was informed through whose influence his men had dispersed, he swore vengeance against Bruce. One day, after he had preached at the house of a friend, up rode the captain with two of his men. Giving his horse to the men, he rushed to the porch where Bruce was quietly reading, and with horrid imprecations, presented his gun at his breast. Bruce caught the muzzle, and a scuffle ensued; the captain drew his sword and made a cut at Bruce's head, but struck the rafter of the porch. While they were thus engaged, up rode three Whigs. The man who had the captain's horse gave the alarm, and Bruce, finding the captain willing to be off, pushed him down the steps, and sprang into the house and shut the door. The captain immediately mounted, and the three whigs rode as fast the other way. As the captain passed the window, Bruce said, Good-bye, captain. In replying, he swore he would kill him before long. Bruce went to an appointment, and although his horse was put up, and the people had begun to collect it was so solemnly impressed on his mind that it was his duty to leave there immediately, that notwithstanding the remonstrance of the landlord, he got his horse and started, leaving an appointment for another time. Among others that attended to hear him preach, was a preacher of another denomination. Bruce was not more than out of sight, when the captain's lieutenant rode up with a file of men, and inquired for the preacher. The one who had come to hear Bruce preach was pointed out to him as the only preacher there, and they instantly shot him down; and as they rode off, bragged that Bruce would never disperse another tory company."

phia, and in 1800 Baltimore; in 1801 and '2, on Richmond district, Va.; in 1803, Salisbury district, N. C.; in 1804, '5, and '6, Newbern district, N. C.; in 1807 and '8, Norfolk district, Va.; in 1809, '10, and '11, Newbern district, N. C.; in 1812, Meherrin district, Va.; in 1813, stationed in Raleigh city, N. C. My acquaintance with this valuable minister commenced in the Virginia Conference, in 1796, which was discontinued on my transfer to the west. I regret that I cannot give further details of his itinerant career, and his eminent useful services. I met him at a camp meeting in Giles county, in the year 1822, in a superannuated state. Dr. Taylor writes as follows: 'He died at his brother Joel Bruce's, in Giles county, Tenn., I think, in June, 1829. He died not only in peace, but in great triumph. I wrote his will; and after traveling and preaching about fifty-two years, his property amounted in value to about three hundred dollars. He was among the very few ministers with whom I have been acquainted whose word and action evinced a sanctified heart.' In him the Wesleyan plan of itinerancy was exemplified. He was the courteous, affable gentleman, and the exemplary, dignified Christian minister.—in language plain, and plain in manners." L. G.

Alick: or, Praying and Working.

'Where's Alick?' asked a minister one day of a baker as he stepped into his store.
'Alick is below, sir, in the bakehouse,' replied the man of bread.
'May I speak with him?' asked the minister.
'Certainly, certainly, sir,' said the baker; 'walk below, sir.'

As the minister went down the stairs leading to the bakehouse, he heard a voice saying, 'Lord, help me to serve thee! Lord, keep me faithful! Lord, make me a good preacher!'

The voice was Alick's, and when the minister reached the bakehouse he found the lad with his shirt sleeves rolled up to his shoulders, kneading dough with all his might, and praying as earnestly as he was working. No doubt he was pleased to find the youthful preacher so well employed.—No doubt that he felt that the appointment which he wanted Alick to fill would be well supplied.

The Lord soon called Alick from the bakehouse to the pulpit, from which he fed thousands of hungry souls with bread of eternal life. The young man carried the working and praying spirit which he had in the workshop into the ministry. The result was that God made him a useful and an honorable man, for our Alick was no less a personage than Alexander Mather, one of the presidents of the Wesleyan Conference.

Prayer and work made Alick all he was, and prayer and work will do great things for all my young readers. Try it, boys girls. Work hard with your studies at school, and when the lesson won't stick to your memories, and the answer to your sum won't come out right, lift your hearts to God and say, 'Lord help me to study! Lord, make my mind clear.' So when you are at play, keep saying in your mind, 'Lord, make me a good boy,' or, 'Lord, make me a good girl! Help me to do right!' When you are at work for your parents, say, 'Lord, help me to obey my father and mother! Lord, make me industrious! Lord, give me a lowly, loving holy heart!' Sometimes it would be well for you to pray with each other.

The Bible and War.

The British and Foreign Bible Society, taking advantage of the political changes which have just taken place in Tuscany, have sent out a special agent to the authorities in Florence, to plead the cause of civil and religious liberty, and to promote the circulation of the Scriptures in Italy.

The Christian Times says: "During the turmoil of war, through the instrumentality of the Bible Society, the Scriptures will be carried into Piedmont, Tuscany, and Parma, and among the strangest mingled masses which fight under the banners of the Allies. The readers of the Bible will learn of a liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free; it is not likely that they will again tamely submit to be trodden under foot by Rome. The candle lighted in Italy shall, by the grace of God, never be put out." There can be no return to ecclesiastical bondage among men who have been made free by the truth of God; there can be no return to political slavery when the great agent of tyranny has been overthrown. The war in Italy, as undertaken by France and Sardinia, is the unwitting agent of civil and religious liberty. The light of history shines upon it, and by it we read that the wicked are blindly working the righteous will of Heaven, and that the present deplorable conflict is the agent to bring about in those blighted Papal lands the triumph of that Gospel which is not only to survive all changes, but is to be established through

them. We are no admirers of Napoleon III., neither do we believe that his enterprise is a scheme for enfranchising Italy religiously or politically, but we think that, in the probable event of his success, circumstances will render this a necessary course. At present the Bible has free circulation throughout the whole of his empire; the head of the Romish Church is virtually a prisoner in his hands. We believe that as a matter of policy he will guarantee to Italy at least a freedom from that Romish tyranny under which she has groaned for centuries."

Criticism.

There is a well-known fable told of an ancient painter who opened a picture to public criticism, requesting that every person who observed a fault would put a mark upon it. When the artist came, in the evening, to take his painting home, he found it one mass of marks of disapprobation. Every critic had found in it something to condemn. The next day having carefully erased the marks, the painter again displayed his work of art, requesting that every beholder who noticed a beauty would put a mark upon it. At evening, he found the canvass was covered with signs of approbation. Every part had found its admirers in similar touches with those that had, only the day previous, been condemned by the critics. Is not this fable true of the world to day? Do not the majority of those who criticize, either to praise or condemn, follow, each one, the bias of their own taste, rather than any just standard of literature or art?

Friday.

It is strange enough that Friday is regarded in all countries as a peculiar day. In England it is generally considered unlucky; many people will not commence an undertaking on that day; and most sailors believe that the vessel is sure to be wrecked that sails on a Friday. If a marriage takes place on that day, the old wives shake their heads, and predict all kinds of misfortunes to the bride and bridegroom. Nay, they even pity all children who are so unlucky as to be born on Friday. In Germany, on the contrary, Friday is considered a lucky day for weddings, commencing new undertakings, or other memorable events; and the reason of this superstition is the ancient belief that the witches and sorcerers held their weekly meetings on this day; and of course while they were amusing themselves with dancing, and riding on broomsticks round the Blocksberg, they could have no time to work any evil.

And by all sensible people Friday is regarded no better and no worse than any other of the six.

Teach Children to Love.

A father had better extinguish his boy's eyes than take away his heart. Who has experienced the joy of friendship, and values sympathy and the affection of the soul, and would not rather lose all that is beautiful in nature's scenery, than be robbed of treasures of the heart? Who would not rather follow his children to the grave than entomb his parental affection? Cherish, then, your heart's best affections. Indulge in the warm and gushing emotions of filial, parental and fraternal love. Think it not a weakness—God is love. Love God—love everybody and everything that is lovely. Teach your children to love the rose, the robin, and their parents. Let it be the constant object of domestic culture to give them warm hearts and ardent affections. Bind your whole family together by these strong cords. You cannot make them too strong. Religion is love to God, and love to man.

Evening Before a Wedding.

"I will tell you," continued her aunt to Louisa, "two things which I have fully proved. The first will go far towards preventing the possibility of any discord after marriage; the second is the best and surest preservative of feminine character."

"Tell me," said Louisa, anxiously.
"The first is this—to demand of your bridegroom, as soon as the marriage ceremony is over, a solemn vow, and promise yourself, never, even in jest, to dispute, or express any disagreement—I tell you, never! for what begins in mere bantering, will lead to serious earnest. Avoid expressing any irritation at one another's words. Mutual forbearance is the one great secret of domestic happiness."

If you have erred, confess it freely, even if confessions cost you some tears.—Further, promise faithfully and solemnly never, upon any pretext or excuse, to have any secret or concealments from each other but to keep your private affairs from father mother, sister, brother, relations, and the world. Let them be known only to each other and your God. Remember that any third person admitted into your confidence becomes a party to stand between you, and will naturally side with one or the other. Promise to avoid this, and renew the vow upon every temptation. It will preserve that perfect confidence, that union, which will indeed make you one. O, if the newly married would but practice this sping of conjugal peace, how many unions would be happy which are now miserable."—Knickerbocker.