

CHRISTIAN



ADVOCATE.

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

VOL. IV.—NO. 28.

RALEIGH, THURSDAY.

JULY 14, 1859.

\$1.50 a year, in advance.

ORIGINAL.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

Calvinism vs. Arminianism. Reviewed.—No. XI.

REV. R. T. HEFLIN: I am now brought up, full force, to "THE DEEDS OF GOD," as given in No. VIII of the communications of P. T. P. These have claimed for them a great amount of "mystery." Truly so. The "mystery" of these I do not intend to fiddle with, as I have never been initiated into the "secret counsels" of the Divine Being. And I am ready to acknowledge that it will be a great "difficulty" to reconcile, both, "Divine decrees," as well as "Divine influence and free agency." This, no man can do, simply because no man understands how the Spirit of God operates on the human mind, and for this reason, also, no man can prove the two inconsistent. Dr. L. N. Rice, as here quoted, "A better reason, however, may be alleged than this. 'No man can prove' the existence of such 'Decrees' or 'Divine influence' as Calvinism contends for, and inculcates in chap. iii. and x. of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church. That the Arminians differ in their views on the 'Divine Decrees,' is very true. The 'Doctrinal Treatise' of the Methodist E. Church, not only show the difference, but demonstrate, from Calvinistic authorities, that the Calvinistic views are certainly not the true notion of the 'Decrees of God,' which the Scriptures teach. The Calvinistic view is also proved in these 'Treatises,' (and therefore they are *hated* so much) to be blasphemous; and hence, in the language of Mr. Wesley, it may, must be, said, "Let it be observed, that this doctrine represents our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, the righteous, the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth, as an hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity. For it cannot be denied, that he every where speaks, as if he was willing that all men should be saved. Therefore to say, he was not willing that all men should be saved, is to represent him as a more hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied that the gracious words which came out of his mouth, are full of invitations to all sinners. To say, then, that he did not intend to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that he says, *Come unto me, all ye that weary and are heavy laden.* And, then you say, he calls those who cannot come, those whom he knows to be unable to come, those whom he can make able to come, but will not, how is it possible to describe greater insincerity?" (See No. VII. of P. T. P.) You represent him as mocking his helpless creatures, by offering what he never intends to give. You describe him as saying one thing, and meaning another; as pretending the love which he had not. *Him in whose mouth was no guile, you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity; then, especially, when drawing him up, and said, O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together—and ye would not.* . . . This is the blasphemous charge contained in the horrible doctrine of predestination. And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every assessor of it. You represent God as worse than the devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust. . . . But you say you will prove it by Scripture. Hold! What will you prove by Scripture? That God is worse than the devil? It cannot be. Whatever that scripture proves, it never can prove this. Whatever its true meaning be, this cannot be its true meaning. Do you ask, "What is its true meaning, then?" If I say, "I know not," you have gained nothing. For there are many Scriptures, the true sense whereof neither you nor I shall know, till death is swallowed up in victory. But this I know, better it were to say, it had no sense at all, than to say it had such a sense as this. It cannot mean, whatever it mean besides, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the judge of all the world is unjust. No scripture can mean, that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works; that is, whatever it prove beside, no Scripture can prove predestination. —Doctrinal Treatise, edition of 1814, pp. 37-40.

That Arminianism has been the fruitful cause of the "Theology of New England" becoming contaminated with Unitarianism and Universalism, is altogether erroneous. New England was Calvinistic altogether, before Arminianism, through Methodism, was introduced; and more, it was infested with Unitarianism and Universalism, long before Methodism was known there; and where Methodism had the most influence, there these heresies scarcely exist, and they rage most wildly

Calvinism was and is the most rampant. Universalism is nothing but Calvinism extended in the objects of the "Decrees": the latter contemplate but a part of mankind, the former the whole of human kind, as being unconditionally decreed to be saved. "A Calvinistic clergy originated Universalism, and still lived and died a Calvinist." See Calvinistic Controversy by Dr. W. Fisk, pp. 87-92, for these facts.

I proceed to notice, briefly, P. T. P.'s No. IX. in the N. C. Presbyterian of May 14th, on "The Deeds of God." There is not much for me to notice here at present; this subject will be thoroughly investigated hereafter, therefore, only very briefly now.

I. No one denies that "God determined to manage the world just as he does manage it;" nor does any one pretend that this is a "horrible delusion." The question is, does he "manage" the concerns of man's salvation, by his grace, as he does the reasons by his providence. If he does, then we object to this "doctrine" as being unmitigably "horrible." If God's determination to save all those whom He does save, in the same manner, and on the same unconditional principles that he causes his sun to rise, and the tides to ebb and flow; we contend that in such an instance, the saved are thus saved, not as free, moral agents, but passive subjects in his hands, as the sun rises, or the tides ebb and flow. It follows from this, that the counterpart of this is, the "foreordination" to everlasting death, of those not saved, makes them, also, to be passively, or unconditionally damned. That their damnation flows from the "foreordination of God, as that has *freely* determined that they shall not be redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, or saved."—Chap. iii. and x. Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church.

2. It is not denied that God has decrees of some sort. The decrees of God concerning the salvation or damnation of men, as set forth in the Bible, and believed and taught by Arminians, are given in such statements as follows: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark, xvi. 16. See also Acts, xiii. 38-41.

3. God's DEEDS ARE ETERNAL. This may be so, but it cannot be proved. The "deeds of God," in Gen. i. ii. and iii. seem to have been determined upon "in the beginning;" this is especially so with regard to the creation of man. God may have had a purpose before the "beginning," but the decree was then uttered and framed. A "purpose" is one thing, "a decree" is quite another. A "purpose" must exist, in the very nature of things, prior (in point of order) to a "decree." A "decree" is the published determination of some authority, whether of an individual or of a legislative body, and constitutes the rule of action, both as respects the subjects of it, and the administrator of government. Both are bound by its principles. See Mark xvi. 16. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning," is a sentence that will hardly prove that either the purpose, or decree of God, is eternal. "From the beginning" cannot mean from "eternity," unless "eternity" had a beginning.

4. God's DEEDS ARE UNCHANGEABLE. Admitted. But, as these concerns man's salvation, &c., their operation is strictly conditional. See for proof, Isa. i. 19, 20; Leviticus, xxv. 16; Ezek. xviii. 24-32; Mark xvi. 16; Acts iii. 19; Rev. ii. 4, 5, 10; iii. 21, 22; 2 Pet. i. 5-11.

5. God's PURPOSES ARE UNCONDITIONAL. Admitted. They doubtless, are unchangeable, but certainly cannot be unconditional as they regard the salvation of man. The authorities in the paragraph 4, fully demonstrate the absurdity and unscripturalness of this proposition. There is evidently an error here, as to "God's purposes." His knowledge of man's conduct is perfect, and his "purposes" with regard to the results, are perfect; but, yet, His conduct towards man is regulated by the laws he has given, as the expressed principles of His government; and, according to those laws, his "purposes" are formed, and also executed. No "uncertainty" can exist here, unless we suppose God to be ignorant of his own laws and the mode of their administration. His "purposes" are unchangeably fixed, and will be carried out, according to the conditions of his own revealed laws, and mode of their application. See the texts above.

6. God's PURPOSES ARE ETERNAL. This in a certain sense may be admitted; but not, if by this is meant, that they are "accomplished" without regard to conditions to be attended to by man. This is proved by our Saviour's own words, Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke, xiii. 34; Isa. v. 1-7.

7. The "end" of "God's purposes," is a double one. 1. His "glory,"

as that is set forth in His Word and Providence, and secured to Him in the wise and equitable administration of the "Decrees"; the latter contemplate but a part of mankind, the former the whole of human kind, as being unconditionally decreed to be saved. "A Calvinistic clergy originated Universalism, and still lived and died a Calvinist." See Calvinistic Controversy by Dr. W. Fisk, pp. 87-92, for these facts.

2. The question regarding "the extent of God's purposes," may be easily answered upon Arminian principles. Such as depend exclusively upon his own action, are unconditionally accomplished. Such as regard the concurrence of intelligent beings, are differently consummated as the different agencies and circumstances give these things their peculiar moral character, either good or evil, according to that saying of St. Paul, Rom. ii. 1-6.

Yours affectionately,
PETER DOUB.
Amherst, N. C., June 3, 1859.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

Stinginess in the M. E. Church.

I have more than once intimated that the temporal economy of our church had a tendency to make our people stingy; but before I discuss this point, I wish to make myself understood. I do not assert that our church, as a whole, is open to this charge. In Eastern North Carolina, there is, in many places a commendable degree of liberality. But I believe this liberality has been brought about despite the practical influence of our economy, rather than by it. To illustrate what I am driving at, just let me say, that there is a certain church I wot of, which does not require either piety or morality as a test of membership, yet it will not object to these qualities, and a member may be pious in spite of the practical influence of the church to which he belongs. Just so, a member of the M. E. Church, may be liberal, although the practical working of her temporal machinery has never been such as to develop this feeling; and this I will now proceed to show.

1. This salary allowed was ridiculously small. I need not go back to the time when this salary, (save the mark) was less than \$100.00. Our fathers were very zealous to guard the purity of the church, but in doing so, they had no right to disregard the plain teachings of Christ. He laid it down as an established maxim that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Now, if a carpenter, mason, painter, or any other mechanic, is worthy to receive from \$2.00 to \$3.00 per day for their labor, why should a Methodist preacher be considered so inferior as to be worthy of only \$100.00 a year.—Hard labor is generally more appreciated by the world than hand labor, and yet hand labor and heart labor combined were considered very unworthy things by our fathers or their certainly could not have laid such an embargo upon them. I assert, without the fear of successful contradiction, that the temporal economy of our church in this respect, is contrary to all the teachings of the Bible on this subject. Have preachers any right then to complain, if people are stingy?

2. This poor, pitiful salary, was divided into quarterly installments, and this was called, *quarterage*.—Here is the secret Pandemonium from which all those evils connected with covetousness, have sprung. Or, rather! That's the word. Well, our fathers (I mean by fathers,) very soon learned that this magic word included one whole dollar divided into four quarters, and all that they had to do was, to pay a quarter every three months. The church has not yet recovered from these primitive views, and this very ready accounts for the fact, that men of equal wealth in our church are less liberal than those of the Episcopal and Presbyterian.

3. This quarterage, one hundred dollar system led the people to believe that it would be awful indeed if the preachers were not forever kept down in the vale of poverty. If the sun of prosperity were permitted to shine upon them they would spread themselves as a green Bay tree, and this would ruin every thing. They soon learned to associate preachers and poverty together, and we all know that early associations are often very lasting, and extend from generation to generation. As evidence that the children have imbibed, in some degree, the views of the fathers on this subject, I need only refer to the fact, that men of wealth sometimes leave our church, and join the Episcopal or Presbyterian. While members of our church they thought it doing great things to pay \$10 a year to the preacher, but after being brought in contact with those who have been taught differently from their youth up, they pay the Episcopal or Presbyterian minister \$50 just as cheerfully as they

were wont to pay their \$10 quarterage. This view of the subject is susceptible of still stronger proof. In what portion of North Carolina did Methodism first get a foothold?—Was it not in the middle counties, and those just east of the mountains? Now compare this section of our Conference with the East, and what do we see? I will not press this point, but it is a notorious fact, that in the East the general rule is to pay the preacher, and not to pay is the exception. When our agents want money where do they go to get it? Why is it, that those portions of the State more recently brought under the influence of Methodism are more liberal than those who date their allegiance back through one or two generations? The question is easily answered. Those who have been more recently brought into the church (or rather, under Methodist influence) are free from that hereditary disease known as quarter dollar quarterage. Facts are stubborn things, but they speak for themselves. In view then, of the facts already adduced, I think it a sort of wonder that there are any liberal men in our church. But even in despotic governments the benign principles of Republicanism will sometimes break forth, so the liberal teachings of the Bible on this subject will sometimes be exhibited despite the fetters of church legislation, and regardless of that "Old Egypian" which has always been a "dead fly" in the Ointment of Methodism. We meet up now and then with an aged father in the church, and when he is approached in behalf of the preacher or any of the great enterprises of the day, he draws a long sigh and begins to tell about the time when Bro. Bruce, or Bro. Compton, or Bro. Reid, used to travel the circuit when it was larger than the Raleigh District is now, and they never had anything to say about money, and a heap more people were converted than now. Moreover they used to travel on horseback, but now preachers are so proud they have to travel in buggies, &c. It is sometimes the case that the preacher has his patience sorely tried, for he finds that one such carrier has poisoned a whole church; but let it not be forgotten, that this ancient Brother imbibed his notions from the teachings (practical) of the church on this subject. Let us see. Forty years ago it may be, Bro. James Reid was the preacher in charge. His circuit was larger than Raleigh District now, and contained one or two thousand members. He was entitled to \$100. Old Fogey was a young man then and he thought one dollar a large sum for him to pay where there were so many to do so small a thing. Well, early impressions are generally lasting, and having been taught in early life to place a small estimate upon the services of the preacher, the lesson is not forgotten in his old age. Who will say that the church is not more to blame than our venerable Brother? And just here I remember a copy which I used to write after when I was a very young school boy: "As the twig is bent the tree's inclined." Just so, the church bent the twig wrong in the start, and the tree has been inclined that way ever since. Individually, we are taught to "train up a child in the way he should go," and if the fathers of the church had only acted upon this maxim, the children would have been a very different stock. Look at the Roman Catholic church! We need not shut our eyes to the truth that she is making rapid strides in this country. In spite of American and Foreign Christian Unions, her progress is still onward. Cathedral, and church, and college, rise up as if by magic, throughout the country. Where does the money come from to build these? From the rich? Not only the rich but the poor also. But why refer to this church? Because, however, corrupt and degenerate she may be in some things, she has copied the example of the Bible in this respect, and taught the duty of giving, and hence her children give as a matter of duty, and not as a matter of convenience. The Bible makes it a duty to give, but how many members of our church give from considerations of this sort? Why is this? Simply because the teachings of the Holy Book on this subject have not been enforced by our church. We need not try to conceal the fact that our fathers have given Mr. Wesley the pre-eminence over the Bible in this respect. He could enforce the doctrine of Justification by faith as well as any man, but to the details essential to a church organization, he never turned his attention, or at least he never wrote anything of any value on the subject. It has been very unpopular to preach about money, and with some, popularity is everything; consequently, the members of our church have been left to form their own opinions about this duty, and the result with many is simply this: If they like the preach-

er they will give him something (if they have it to spare), and if they don't like him, they just let him slide.

It will be perceived that I have been speaking of the past—of the influence of the \$100 system. I need not prolong this article by any allusion to the stupendous sum of \$150. Surely the stream of liberality will now gush forth, and like the overflow of the great father of waters, inundate the whole country. I have not exhausted the subject, but fearing that I may exhaust the patience of your readers, I will now come to—lastly, for the present.

And lastly. Just let me say here, that the church needs money as well as the State. Neither can get along without it. Just in proportion as a church is liberal, just in that proportion will it succeed. Numbers are comparatively nothing. Ten members of enlarged views are worth more than one hundred who are good for nothing except to sing and shout. Schools, colleges, churches, and parsonages are essential. Paying the preacher is essential; but singing and shouting alone, will do none of these things. The Methodist church has the wealth to do all these things, and if she neglects to do them others will come in and occupy the field. Dr. Warren, of Edenton could give \$25,000 to the University of the South, and yet I venture to predict that both Agents for Trinity College do not collect that much for the college this year. Yet I venture to say, there are many members of our church equally as wealthy as Dr. Warren; but they retain the lessons which they learned in early life with too much tenacity to do things on a large scale. Members of other churches often leave large legacies when they die, for benevolent purposes, but except in the case of Wofford, when did a Methodist ever leave anything worth speaking of? They remember the *quarterage* business to life's latest hour.

L. W. MARTIN.
For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

"Methodist Pulpit, South," Again.

Since I had occasion to notice this *chef d'oeuvre* of all sermon literature I have not only read those sermons, which I had hitherto neglected, but have re-perused several others. And I say that it has been with increased delight and admiration! I was, perhaps too anxious to say a kind word for this grand and splendid *oeuvre* of Methodism. Hence, it was I prepared my really unworthy and unsatisfactory article, before I had read the entire volume, and omitted necessarily, the mention of certain efforts, quite equal to those particularized. If I were to essay a second article on this charming and excellent volume, I should have to express my great admiration for several sermons which have not been treated with even the cold respect of a passing glance by any *critique* I have yet seen. The respective efforts of Dr. Lovick, Pierce, Rev. S. G. Stark, Rev. Jno. E. Edwards, and especially of Rev. John C. Granberry, richly deserve the hearty notice of the most elegant and eloquent pen; and if your humble servant were equal to the task, he should certainly, under the immediate promptings of gratified emotion, endeavor to so catch the Promethean fire that consecrates and gleams in their thoughts, and permeates their flowing mellifluous periods, that if he could not sing a pure Attic song in their praise, he at least, could in grateful anglo-saxon, reflect the true sentiments of his heart.

The two sermons by Rev. J. C. Granberry, appear to me to be among the most admirable in the volume, perhaps I might, with entire truth, give them the highest position in the scale of excellence. If you will turn to the writings of Richard Hooker, that grand old master, you will find an eloquent passage on Faith, and after you have read it, turn then to pages 180-81, of this volume, and you will readily perceive that our own richly gifted brother has set forth, in higher strains of earnest eloquence its character, than has been attained in the stately and elaborate style of him of whom D'Israeli, the elder, said, that he was the "first vernacular writer whose classical pen harmonized numerous prose." If Hooker has dug deep into the eternal rock on which is founded the whole edifice of human society, in search of the materials with which to build up the frame of ecclesiastical polity, our more youthful representative man, has made religion most lovely and amiable, hanging on the altar of God, the freshest garlands of fancy and imagination, and dedicating in the fervency of his ministrations, the product of his clear, deep, pure, ripe intellect, to the service of Him, whose most precious gifts they are, even as pious Abel offered up to the Lord, at an early hour in primeval times, the firstlings of his flock.

But, brother Hefflin, I must stop, or I shall catch myself writing either a set article, or as some might think, a fulsome panegyric, neither of which do I propose. My opinion is honest if erroneous, for I never saw brother G., know scarcely anything about him, and probably will never meet him. But, that he is a *first rate* sermonizer, no one will deny, who has mind enough to comprehend his vigorous thoughts, or cultivated taste enough to appreciate the singular simplicity and scholarly elegance of his periods.

I for one, rejoice to know that the volume is meeting with increasingly rapid sale. Reader, if, like Dean Swift, when you are reading a book, it seems to be alive, or talking to you, by all means secure this volume. Remember that 't was Plato who went to play when he was elected to the consulship, but the evening before he died, he read. Mind lives by mind as it has been developed and preserved; and man, by this medium, has shown himself in action like an angel, in words, like a God. Take this from him and he is nothing.' It is Plato, too, that says: 'Books are immortal sons defying their sires.' I doubt not that this splendid volume will survive the mutilations of scores of decades to come, and will perpetuate the memory of the contributors, long after their eloquent tongues shall have been still in death.

By the way, your compositor made me to accuse Dr. Means of being guilty of "barbaric splendor." It should be "barbaric splendor."

T. B. K.
For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

Letters from Northwest—No. 3.

BRO. HEFLIN:—It is an old saying, which we of the Western world are fond of repeating, that "Westward the star of empire takes its way." This may all be very true, but many of your readers have likewise been informed that Eastward is the source of light. I must acknowledge that I prefer light to empire; and, as an indirect effect of this, you have the anomalous fact of my Northwestern letter, dated from Yankee land.

In leaving Green Castle, there was the same sadness that always affects me when parting from those whom I have learned to love. But added to this was a new source of sorrow. I left there the grave of one that was dearer to me than all else on earth. As I sat for the last time, and gazed on her grave, with its neatly polished stone, and read again and again her dying words—"The water is deep and cold, but Jesus is with me." I felt, how vain in time of trial, is that philosophy which we form for ourselves before. The body, says philosophy, is but a cold, mouldering clod, why linger so fondly around its resting place? The body, says affection, is the only visible and tangible part of the being around whom our heart's tendrils have twined themselves; and as the maiden fringes the casket, though empty and broken, that once contained her jewels, so the loving heart cannot leave, without a tearful adieu, to the burial place of its choicest jewel. But the christian has this motto comfort, that the sainted dead are not left behind; but, that wherever he goes, they as ministering spirits go with him.

Shall I attempt to describe them. Tens of thousands have been overwhelmed with awe while beholding them; but of these, how few have been able to move others by their descriptions. I will not attempt it. And yet it would be unparadoxical to past them by in silence. The Falls of Niagara have always disappointed me. They do not appear so high, nor consequently so majestic as imagination or even memory, depicts them. Why is this? Are they not one hundred and fifty feet high, good measure, and a thousand yards wide? All very true; and this last fact is the secret of our disappointment. The width is too great in proportion to the height. This is a principle constantly coming under our observation. The Capitol at Washington, having so long a front, appears low, while an ordinary sized house, of half its height would appear high. A steeple or an obelisk two hundred feet high appears towering; a hill of the same height appears insignificant.

Still, no one can visit Niagara, without feeling that he is beholding one of the wonders of the world, especially if he views it as he ought. To have its magnitude impressed on him most fully, he must view it from many standpoints: from Table Rock, on the Canadian side, from the edge of the American Fall, from the foot of the stair's case, leading to the ferry, or even amid the spray, and almost under the foaming torrent of the American side, from the foot of the Biddle Stair case, or still better, if he is sore-footed, from the edge of

the water below, from the tower of the Terrapin rocks, which lie in the edge of the British Fall, and from the little steamer, the "Maid of the Mist," which boldly ventures up, at most, under the foaming current.— Let one view Niagara from all these points, and from as many others as he can find, and though his disappointment may not entirely wear away, yet, he will leave the place with thoughts and feelings that will cling to him his lifetime. Besides the Falls, there are many other objects of interest, in the immediate vicinity. The Burning Spring constantly sends off inflammable gas; Luddy's Lane, a battle field in the last war with Britain; the Whirlpool, and the Suspension Bridge, on which railroad trains cross, two hundred feet above the boiling water.— But let no one attempt to "do" Niagara Falls, without an abundant supply of spare quarters.

SLEEPING CARS. Railroad traveling is very different from what it was two or three years ago. Then, if one was unfortunately compelled to travel during the night, he was certain to have a sleepless and fatiguing time. Now, by paying an extra half dollar, for a berth in a sleeping car, he can lodge almost as comfortably as in his own bed. I wonder that men have been so long exposed to the fatigue of night travel, without sooner inventing some means of relief. Indeed the sleeping car is not a novelty, for my first reminiscences of North Carolina are connected with it. The first time I entered that State, many a dozen years ago, it was in a sleeping car, having a row of berths on each side, above the seats. That was the first, and the last I had ever seen, till about a year ago. The present style is no better than that, except that it will accommodate more sleepers, and can, at will, have its berths exchanged for seats. It is fast becoming one of the necessary institutions of the age.

NATURAL SCENERY. The scenery on the Hudson did not strike me so favorably as in former years. True, the highlands presented as much wildness as any one can desire, but the towns along the river are too bare of trees and shrubbery, and the vegetation is not sufficiently luxuriant, to render the scenery as beautiful as I formerly esteemed it. Near the city, however, it changes, and one may wish for more charming scenery than is found on the lower Hudson, and in the country between it and the Narragansett Bay.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY. I have had the privilege, once more, of spending several days around my Alma Mater, and of witnessing the Commencement exercises; and I have come with my hopes for her, and my interest in her, stronger than ever. The examinations showed that the standard of scholarship is equal—I think I may truthfully say—superior to that of any college with which I am acquainted; and the Orations on Commencement day, surprised me by their maturity of thought, and their manliness of sentiment. Thirty-six young men took the degree of A. B., of whom all but seven are members of the christian church, and sixteen, ministers of the gospel. Dr. Cummings is the right man for President, and the Faculty are able men.

The College already possesses property amounting to more than \$200,000, with an annual income of more than \$20,000; and the spirit of benevolence and enterprise are still awake. At the recent commencement it was determined that another building should be erected, at an expense of \$50,000.

From the Christian Advocate.

For all the Advocates, and other Southern Methodist Papers.

MR. EDITOR: My attention has been called to the accidental omission of one of the most important items in the list of the Sunday-school statistics, which every preacher in charge is requested to report fully at the next session of his Annual Conference, as published in my paper a few weeks ago. For convenience of reference, I give the entire list again, corrected.

1. The number of schools.
2. The number of officers and teachers.
3. The number of scholars.
4. The number of volumes in library.
5. The number of "Sunday-school Visitors" taken.
6. The amount of money collected for Sunday-school purposes.
7. The amount of money contributed by Sunday-schools for missions.
8. The number of conversions in Sunday-schools.
9. The number of colored catechumens.

CHARLES TAYLOR,
Columbia, S. C.,
Cor. Sec. of the Sunday-school Society of the M. E. Church, South.