CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

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

VOL. IV---NO. 47. RALEIGH, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1859. $1.50 a year, in advance.

ORIGINAL.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

"Harper's Magazine" and John Wesley.---No. 2.

The delay in furnishing you with this article has been unavoidable. I pass on to notice the essayist's remarks on the doctrine of the "witness of the Spirit." He says, "kindred to the doctrine of perfection was his notion of the Spirit's witness to a genuine conversion." After giving a very brief abstract of Wesley's "notion," he continues, "we will not venture further into this mystic theology than to observe that the notion of a witness of sonship making its impression on the mental consciousness alone, antecedent to, and unmixed with, spiritual affections is a refinement nowhere intimated in the Scriptures." Now a sufficient reply to this will be a *fair* statement of the doctrine as held and taught by Mr. Wesley. Satirists and formalists have ridiculed the doctrine from the time of Wesley until the present, but it is nevertheless precious to thousands who derive their richest enjoyments in the present life therefrom, and who build upon its truth their surest hope of a blissful future beyond the grave.

"The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."—What does this passage teach? We answer, it teaches, first, that the Holy Spirit bears witness to the pardon and adoption of the christian; and secondly, that *our spirit* testifies to our adoption by assuring us that we have the *direct* witness of the Spirit of God to that fact. Now, the witness of the Spirit of God is not only *distinct from* the witness of our own spirit, but is *direct*. Thus, in the first impulses of persuasion that he is "born again," the christian will have the "witness of *the* Spirit." This *must* be so, else our justification or acceptance with God cannot be known by us. Justification is an act of the Divine mind, by which we are acquitted from the sentence of guilt, and admitted into Divine favor. If this be so, and even the Harper writer would scarcely deny it, then none but God can know that this act has been certainly performed, unless he furnishes evidence of the fact in some way.—and that way is through *the* Spirit. "In the hour of conversion, before we have time for *good works*, or the *fruits* of the Spirit, or even for engaging in a course of reasoning by which we infer our adoption, by comparing our experience with the Scripture marks of regeneration, the Holy Spirit *directly* assures us that God loves us and freely accepts us in Christ Jesus." Then it is, after this evidence has been given us of our pardon, that "we love him *because* he *first* loved us. *Without* this evidence or witness we could not have known that God loved us, without which we could not have loved him. To explain the *manner* in which the Spirit so operates as to produce this evidence or direct witness is beyond the power or knowledge of man; but as to the *fact*, there can be no doubt whatever, as it is a matter of express revelation.

"Having received the testimony of *the* Spirit, it will not be long before we will regain the *joint* evidence of *our own* spirit." Perhaps we will be induced or tempted to doubt the fact of the direct evidence of *the* Spirit; then it will be that *our own spirit—i. e.*, "our consciousness of possessing those characteristics described in the Scriptures, as constituting the christian"—will confirm us in believing that we have the testimony of the Spirit of God. And as long as we "fear God and keep his commandments," just so long will these two witnesses continue their united testimony that we are his children.

We quote further from the essayist:—"The new creation is its best evidence.—It testifies of itself, and its testimony is confirmed by the Scriptures, that distinguish the genuine from the false, leaving no ground for doubtful conjecture or enthusiastic fancies." Then he gives a quotation to fortify his position: We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." "*We know because* we *love*." This is pronounced by him to be "as rational as Scriptural." Grant it. But the book tells us that, "We love him *because* he *first* loved us." And this too, is "as rational as Scriptural." For without we *know* that God loves us, we cannot love him; nor can we ever '*love the brethren*' until we are conscious that we love Him "who first loved us." And of course we can never bring forth the genuine fruits of conversion—*i. e.*—"the fruits of the Spirit," such as love, joy, peace, long-suffering, &c., until we know that we are converted. If this be not so, we would thank the astute writer in Harper to expose the sophistry or to exhibit the true Scriptural teaching.—The following which I quote from Ralston is clear and I think conclusive:

"The testimony of our own spirit we do not profess by intuition, but it is derived through a process of reasoning. Thus the bible describes certain moral qualities of the soul, and moral habits of life, as belonging peculiarly to the children of God. By the exercise of his own consciousness, and a contemplation of our own lives, we may form an opinion concerning our own character; then, by the exercise of our reasoning faculty, we may compare our character with the character described in Scripture, as pertaining to the child of God, and rationally draw the conclusion that we sustain that relation. This is the only plan by which our spirit can witness to the fact. Now, to say that this is also the sense in which we are to understand that the Spirit of God witnesses to our adoption, we think is an erroneous view of the subject."

He then offers several considerations in proof. I quote a portion of them.

"1. This is evidently, as already stated, to confound the two witnesses—to make the witness of our own spirit and that of the Spirit of God essentially the same and really but one witness; whereas, the Scriptures plainly teach that there are two witnesses:—'the Spirit of God,' in the heart of the christian, crying, 'Abba, Father,' and 'his own spirit,' uniting in testimony to the same fact.

'The above (erroneous) view of the subject appears evidently to exhibit the witness of the Spirit in a sense entirely inadequate to the purpose for which, according to Scripture, it is designed. The witness of the Spirit is designed to give us *an assurance of our adoption, so satisfactory as to amount to real knowledge*. Now, as the forgiveness of sin, or adoption into the family of God, is an act of God. it follows that God must be the prime witness of the fact; but to suppose that this witness is only given in the *indirect sense*, as described, is in effect to discard the witness altogether, so far as the simple question of adoption is concerned. For, if the description of the christian character given in Scripture by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is all the agency of the Spirit allowed in the witness in question, then it follows that this witness does not testify at all to the adoption of any individual. The Scriptures only testify to the general *truth* that *all* who possess a certain moral character are the children of God: but with regard to the question *whether this* or *that individual* possesses that character or not, they are silent. As to the simple fact of my adoption, according to the above (erroneous) theory, it is not learned from the testimony of the Spirit, but *must be a matter of inference, derived though a process of reasoning*. Hence, unless we presuppose the *infallibility* of our reasoning powers, we may have erred in this *intellectual process*; we may have formed an improper view of our own moral character; we may have misunderstood the Scriptures in reference to the moral character peculiar to the children of God; or we may have blundered in the comparison of ourselves with the Scripture requirement, and in the conclusion, drawn from such comparison, that we are the children of God. In all or any of these particulars we may have erred; and it so, it follows that the conclusion arising from this process of ratiocination cannot amount to *certain knowledge*, but can, *at best*, be but *probable conjecture*. Therefore, it is clear, that as it is the privilege of the christian *to know* that *he belongs to the family of God, it must be possible* for him to have an evidence of the fact superior to the individual testimony now in question" Hence, I conclude, that possibly the essayist is at fault, when he says, that "the inner experience," by which I understand him to mean the *intellectual process* alluded to in the extract from Ralston, "that the inner experience of a christian life is sufficiently certain for all the purposes of piety, rectitude, and a tranquil death," for as shown by Ralston, a man may err in the intellectual process, or at best have but a probable conjecture upon which to rely.

I did not purpose to notice the writer's remarks upon Wesley's "notion" of "christian perfection," but it is necessary, as he appears to base his criticisms chiefly upon the self-contradiction of "an imperfect perfection," that is, that Wesley applied the term "perfection" to "a less than total sinlessness," and that "it is like asserting a circle with the proportions of a triangle" &c., &c. He finds fault with the *doctrine* because he does not like the *name* by which it is called. He thinks it well enough to aim at perfection, and thinks every man should try to become a perfect gentleman, that "Wesley was both a gentleman and a christian of the highest style, yet he made no professions to either." If by this he means simply that Wesley did not go about *boasting* of his perfection in religious life, or of his gentlemanly bearing, I agree heartily with him. But if he means to say that Wesley did not profess to have enjoyed "perfect love," or "christian perfection," he is simply mistaken. Dr. Bangs has proved this point beyond all question. I refer the reader to the quotations from Dr. B.'s article in Dr. Rosser's work on "Experimental Religion."

There are some excellent passages in the essay upon which I have thus commented. Indeed, they are so truthful and striking, that I intend to copy a few of the most noticeable that you, Mr. Editor, may, if you choose, give them a place in the columns of "our" excellent "Advocate." P. J.

For the N. C. Ch. Advocate.

Bible Characters--Jubal.

Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ. That man could use the voice in making music before the fall, seems to be reasonable. That hours were spent by the innocent pair in Eden in singing praises to God, seems so reasonable that we cannot doubt but that it was so.

Perhaps, though the music was far inferior to that made in Eden, many a dark and sad hour was relieved by some sweet hopeful song concerning redemption after the fall.

But it seems that instrumental music was unknown until the days of the ingenious *Jubal*.

His harp, and organ, perhaps, were crude, and the music not very sublime, yet it was the foundation of a science which has done great good to the world.

Instrumental music is second only to vocal music.

Though it has long been desecrated by wicked men, it is only the *abuse* of a science, useful in itself, that does mischief.

After all, it admits of a doubt whether a man is ever made *worse* by music. That it is used by wicked persons for their amusement is admitted, but it is doubted whether even over rough natures, and hard hearts, it may not wield a restraining influence.

It is evident that it has a good influence over a good person.

How many sad hearts have been cheered, how many desponding sons of adversity have been encouraged and made hopeful by the sweet sounds of instrumental music. How few of us when listening to the charming sounds of the violin, the very best instrumental music, or to the more solemn strains of the organ, reflect that these are only improvements on the invention of the antediluvian "*father* of all such as handle the harp and organ"—Jubal.

May we not hope that the time will come when every harp, and viol, and organ, will be used only to lead on the hosts of the Lord in the great work of converting the world?

When music shall no more be heard associated with sinful mirth, but from every tent, and cottage, and mansion it shall be heard floating on every morning breeze, and every evening Zephyrs laden with the praises of Him who hath redeemed us with His own precious blood? When the sons of men shall vie with the angels in the Heaven born science of music? C.

For the N. C. Ch. Advocate.

Contingent Fund.

In the "Steward's Report' at the Tennessee Conference, published in the Nashville Advocate of the 3d inst., it is stated that they were unable to pay twenty-five cents in the dollar, of their claims. This is too bad, and the Committee was right in asking the Conference to pass a resolution requesting the Bishops at their subsequent Conferences, in the official examination of character, to enquire of each preacher whether he has taken up his "Conference Collection." In the N. C. Conference we have been doing much better than our Tennessee brethren, but not more than half as well as we might. Why is not the whole amount necessary to meet our claims, raised? I believe it is because the preachers do not give proper attention to the matter. I do not believe there is a circuit or station in the conference upon which the assessment could not be raised if proper efforts were made. It may be too late to give an exhortation with a view to practical results, the present year, but I suggest that it be a matter of inquiry at Conference, as to the manner in which the preachers have attended to their duty in taking up this collection.

X.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

Ten Cents for the Missionary Cause.

One of the colored members of my charge attributes his conversion to God to a contribution which he made of ten cents to the missionary cause. On his way home he reflected upon what he had done as follows: Why did I give that money? To send the gospel to the heathen. Why should I wish to send the gospel to them? Because it is the way of life and salvation. But what good has the gospel done to me? I'm a poor sinner, and on my way to hell, and paying money to save the heathen!—But why don't the gospel save me? This led him to make up his mind to seek God, and this year he was made happy in a Savior's love.

Brethren, give the colored people an opportunity to contribute to the support of missions. There is a blessing in it.

JOHN BAYLEY.

Murfreesboro', N. C., Nov. 10, 1859.

SELECTIONS.

From the N. Orleans Ch. Advocate.

The Methodist Church Apostolical.

Many have been the claims of *likeness* and *identity* to the Apostolic Churches. We wish to examine whether the Methodist Church has any claims to present for this honor. Likeness may be expected in three particulars—doctrines, ordinances, and polity. The Methodist Church teaches, that Christ and the Holy Spirit are equally *divine* with the Father; that the atonement, or provision of mercy, is universal; that justification is by faith alone, and regeneration a necessary qualification for heaven; that, (aside from grace,) men are totally depraved, and hence all ability to turn to God is derived from grace; that men can improve this grace and be saved; or abuse it and be lost; and that future rewards and punishments will be eternal. Thus far, likeness is clearly discerned.—Let us now look for the ordinances. A scriptural ordinance, is an *institute* of divine appointment and of perpetual obligation. Of such, the New Testament teaches but two, baptism, and the Lord's supper. These do for us two things; 1. They introduce us into God's household and covenant, and 2. Bind us to duty. We hold them to be *signs*, or symbols, and not necessarily possessing or conveying inherent grace. We try to use the ordinances according to their *spiritual* import, without reference to *mode*, as mode is no where taught as *essential* to duty, and if it is essential to *one* duty it is to *all*.—Hence we allow the right of *private judgment* to candidates for the reception of the ordinances. These views we think the scriptures clearly sustain. The last feature of likeness to be sought is in polity This, in the New Testament, we find in general *principles* only, and no where framed up into fixed form. Here is one of the strongest evidences of the unerring wisdom of the Christian Legislator, and of the inspiration of the Christian system. The gospel was to be preached under all kinds of civil government, from democracy to monarchy. If the gospel system had a *fixed polity*, it would be in constant *collision* with civil government somewhere, and in every age of the world, which would seriously retard, and often completely bar its success.

The polity of the New Testament is neither a democracy, aristocracy, or monarchy. It has properly no legislative or judicial departments. All its *laws* are already made—its powers are wholly executive.

But suppose we apply the terms of *civil* to ecclesiastical government; then, the latter is a monarchy, in that Christ is its sole Lawgiver; it is an aristocracy, in that the word and ordinances are administered by Christ's appointees; it is a democracy, in that the discipline of the Church is administered by the ministry and laity together. Now we see it in *operation*. The apostolical ministers were certainly *itinerants*—so were the prophets before them. Were Christ and his Apostles ever *settled pastors?* Never. It is said, "He *went about* doing good." To his ministers he said, "*as ye go, preach!*" They were sent to *seek* for the people, and not to wait for *the people* to seek for them, as is the case in all Congregational and similar Churches. The Apostles were not sent to fill *vacant* churches, but to prepare materials, and build new ones. A settled pastorate has its advantages no doubt, but *itinerancy* has this advantage, that it is scriptural and apostolical. While the church was under *inspired* teachers, they were itinerants without exception. Many designing to popularize church polity, demand its conformity to the State. Can any sensible man suppose that a fixed church polity could assume every possible form of civil government? This delusion is ancient.

"When christianity came to be fully settled in the world, they contrived to model the external government of the church as near as might be to the civil government of the Roman Empire. As every city had its *temporal* magistrate, so every city had its bishop; as every province had its *proconsul*, whose seat was in the metropolis, so also the church had its metropolitan or *Arshbishop*; and as every *diocese* had its *vicarii*, so the church had her *primate*." Why is the Romish Church blamed for demanding that the state should conform to the church? Is it not as reasonable that the state should conform to the church, as to require the church to comform to the state? If inspiration has given us a fixed form of church polity, it is certainly the safest to be governed by inspiration, and hence the better reason to make the state conform to the church.—Then we conclude that *itinerancy* is Apostolical. The Father *sent* the Son, the Son *sent* the Disciples, and the Apostles *sent* Peter and John—Acts 8. 14: and 13, 3: We think therefore, that the *likeness* between the Methodist and Apostolic Churches is clearly made out.

J. A. SPENCE.

Troy Ala.

From the Bible Times.

The Communion Table.

'Surely the Lord Jesus never designed this.' So you said, dear brother, as you 'wept' beside the Lord's Table in a Baptist Church.

With you I say, 'the Lord Jesus never designed this.' He 'never designed' that his disciples should 'break the least of his commandments,' and 'teach for the commandments of God, the traditions of men.' He 'never designed' that the first and plainest of his ordinances should be perverted, set aside and contemned. No, he designed that there should be 'one baptism,' and that none should lay claim to the 'Lord's Table,' who refused to comply with the order of his appointments.

You know full well that Baptists differ in no particular from the established usages of other denominations in making Baptism a prerequisite to communion. For them therefore to invite those who have not been immersed, would be either a denial that Baptism is a prerequisite, or else an endorsement of a ceremony of Baptism which they conscientiously regard as unscriptural.

But why need this question of Baptism separate us? All candid men admit that Immersion is scriptural, why not then end the dispute by all christians being 'buried with Christ in baptism?'

Would the cause of Christ suffer if Immersion was to prevail? Would any principle of Bible truth thereby be compromised? Would the sanctity of any conscience be violated? What are the obstacles to such a consummation of christian union—except the disinclinations of mere preference and the stubbornness of a palpable sectarianism?

Why not, Mr. Editor, turn your efforts in this direction? Surely if one Communion Table is such a desiteratum in the triumph of union, is 'one Baptism' any less so? AN INQUIRER.

Philadelphia, Oct. 29, 1859.

NOTES TO THE ABOVE COMMUNICATION.

It is only by analysis, that we can hope to prosecute our inquiries successfully. For instance, the above article by our Baptist brother, when analyzed, yields the following implications, in order:

1. That baptism by *immersion*, exclusively, is one of Christ's commandments.
2. That any other baptism is merely a human tradition.
3. That by any other mode, Christ's ordinance is perverted, set aside and contemned.
4. That the 'one baptism' mentioned by St. Paul means immersion in water.
5. That none should claim communion without immersion.
6. That christians not immersed *refuse* to comply with the order of Christ's appointments.
7. That the usages of other denominations may justify our own.
8. That to invite unimmersed persons would be to deny baptism as a prerequsite.

Now, is either one of these eight implications *according to the Bible*? But again: our brother asks—Why need this *separate* us? Sure enough; why need it? That is, when the matter is analyzed, why need it separate us at the LORD'S TABLE?—the death-scene, where, if anywhere, it would appear proper that our differences should be forgotten. It must be remembered that this difference *does not separate us any where else*. In reading, praying, singing, speaking—in the pulpit or on the platform, in all kinds of meetings, week day and Sabbath, in streets or tents, halls or churches, anywhere and everywhere, *we may unite*, cordially and joyfully, without a single restraint, acknowledging each other as christians and christian ministers, living and dying together as such—but—at the *Table* we *separate!* WHY? What says the BIBLE?

In Statu Quo.

Father O'Leary was on his regular tour collecting the stipends among the poor Irish under his charge, and had just stopped in upon Paddy Crogan, who was always too poor to pay up. Paddy had just made a sale of the "owld cow," receiving a sovereign in payment, with which, of course, he was loth to part, and was considering how to invest it to the best advantage, when the priest dropped in.

"Good morning, Patrick," said he, "I have called for the stipends, and I hope you are better off to day than the last time I was here."

"Please yer riverence," said Paddy, "I'm niver a bit the better off, for divel the penny have I in the house."

"Well, Patrick, I suppose I will have to pass it over until the next time, by which I hope you will try to save something for the Church."

"I will, plase yer riverence," said Paddy, very humbly; and so the priest left him.

Paddy was in great glee at getting rid of the priest without paying the stipends, and ran to impart the tidings of his success to the "owld woman," who was hoeing the 'praties' in the patch near by.

"I say, Jennet, his riverence was here."

"An' was he, sure?" replied Jennet.

"Yis; an' he axed me for the stipends, an' och, be me faith, an' didn't I fix him nice though."

"An' how, Paddy, did ye pay him, sure?"

"Devil a bit did I, for I towld him I had niver a penny in the house."

"O Patrick! Patrick! how could ye tell such an owdacious lie to his riverence? sure he'll send you to purgatory, an' many's the long day 'twill be 'fore ye get out of it."

"Ah now, Jennet, darlint! an don't be takin' on after that fashion about it, for it was only a smart transaction in a business like way on my part, for divel a lie did I tell his holiness: for it's yourself that knows the sovereign I got for the owld cow is every bit of money we have in the house, and there's a dale of difference between a penny an a sovereign, Jennet."

Paddy's argument had a soothing effect upon the tender conscience of Jennet, but time passed on without the Crogans making any preparations for the payment of the stipends, though the sovereign still remained in the house. The priest called again, and Paddy resolved to tell the old story.

"And how is it with you now, Patrick? have you the stipends for me?" said the priest, as he crossed the threshold.

"Ah, your riverence! an' you may belave me, for I'm poor enough, and niver a penny in the house have I."

Fired with Paddy's prolonged delinquency, the priest hit upon an expedient to bring him to terms; so putting on a stern and solemn look, and raising his finger in a menacing manner, slowly, and with great emphasis, said: "Patrick, I'll put you in *statu quo*;" and turning on his heel left the cabin.

But poor Paddy was not in the happy mood now that he was when he tricked the priest before. *Statu quo* was a place that he had never heard of, and the terrors of it weighed heavily upon him. Starting from his temporary stupor, he ran to Jennet, crying:

"Jennet! his riverence was here again, and he axed me for the stipends, an' when I towld him I had niver a penny in the house said he, 'Patrick, I'll put you in *statu quo*.'"

"O, howly mother, defend us!" cried the terrified Jennet; "sure an' it must be some place worse than purgatory he's going to send you to for lying; run quick, an' give him the sovereign."

Patrick awaited no further invitation. Away he went, as fast as his pedal extremities would carry him, to overtake the priest.

"Your riverence! your riverence!" he almost frantically yelled; "stop, your riverence! an' here's a sovereign I got for the owld cow, an' if ye'll only keep out of *statu quo* you shall have the stipends hereafter whenever you call for them."

Methodist Polity.

The New York Observer says: "The governing power in the Methodist Episcopal Church is in the hands of the clergy exclusively. The laymen have the supplies in their hands, but the preachers, with the control of vast sums already raised, and a willing people, are supreme. Harper's Weekly says: 'The rules of the Methodist Episcopal Church, like those of the Roman Catholic, do not grant the laymen any voice in the government of the Church, which is wholly in the hands of the clergy.' To say nothing of Scripture, this polity needs to be Americanized."

On which the Chicago Advocate remarks:

"The above has been floating among the secular press, which just now seems greatly exercised as to our economy, and is just such an item as the Observer and Weekly would be likely to get up. That the laity have no voice in the government of the Church is simply untrue. Look at facts:

"1. All our churches and parsonages are held by laymen.

"2. Our salaries—'allowances'—as Methodist preachers, are fixed by laymen, and from their decision there is no appeal.

"3. Reception to probation and full membership in our Church can only be made by the ministry upon lay recommendation.

"4. The court of trial for a laymen is a committee of laymen.

"5. His appeal from an adverse decision is to a body of laymen.

"6. The Church—its pastors—are chosen by the people—by laymen—to be preachers and pastors.

"No clerical conclave can empower any man not repeatedly endorsed as the 'messenger of the churches,' with pastoral authority.

"We respectfully recommend to the Observer to secure to the laity powers faintly approximating the above, ere it reads us any additional lectures on the excessive power of Methodist clergy"

Bearing the Cross.

One pleasant summer eve, a poor, deformed girl had wandered alone to one of the public squares in P——, seating herself beneath a tree, where she could see the fountain sending up its playful waters. She forgot for a while her loneliness; but presently a party of young ladies came by, and one, in thoughtless merriment, exclaimed:

"Do look at that little wretch's back!" All turned, and with curious eyes gazed upon her. I was seated on an opposite bench; and as they passed on, marked the tears as they overflowed the eyes of the sensitive child. Approaching her, I endeavored to speak consoling words. With a slight caress of her little hand, and eyes blinded with tears, she looked up to me and said: "Thank you, ma'am, for being so kind. My Sabbath school teacher says my *cross* has been placed upon my back but oh! kind lady, when people look upon me so proudly, and the boys call me ugly names, and the girls won't let me play with them, then I feel so badly, and I cannot help crying. Do tell me, lady, will Jesus never take my cross away?"

Years passed by, and once more at my boarding-house I met the child, now grown to womanhood. Her countenance was spiritually beautiful, but she still bore the burden of her childhood. Being together for some weeks, an intimacy sprang up between us; and one day, as we sat covering, she alluded to our first meeting "My misfortune," said she, "was long a source of grevious unhappiness; but, thank God there at last came to me an answer to my oft-asked question: Shall I never cease to bear this cross?" And, going to her portfolio, she handed me the following lines, observing, "The last line has been my consolation."

The tear will fall, O Father,
When I see
Those curious glances
Fixed on me.
How long this cross, my Savior, must I bear?
"Until thine eyes no more can shed a tear."

The flush will rise, O Father,
When I hear
Those rude, insulting words—
The bitter jeer.
How long, O Lord, must I, with trembling fear?
"Till thou these mocking words, no more cans't hear!"

Sad are my thoughts; O Father,
Well I know,
Oftimes neglects are mine,
For this deep woe.
How long, kind Parent, must I check each sob?
"Until thy heart no more with pain can throb."

Then all my life, O Father,
Teach me how,
Beneath the galling cross
To humbly bow.
O! shall I never cease to feel thy rod?
"All trials cease in heaven, at home with God."

A Preacher's Way to the greatest Usefulness.

In Morphy's oversight of a chess-board, or Napoleon's oversight of Solferino, the secret of success has been a wide comprehension, not a view of here and there a point, with two or three antagonisms, or mutual dependences, but of a multiform range of means with complexness of details toward one great end. A balloon observation was desirable preparatory to a great battle. If as ministers we would accomplish something momentous, let us by abstraction and introversion get the fullest view possible of our powers for usefulness and of the fields for their operation. As we move in places of clerical battle, let us not heedlessly or stumblingly get into some treadmill, some unenlarging routine for our precious days. If we walk aright and our eyes open, each ascending step will enable us to look farther and plan wider for the Divine glory in the salvation of souls. Let us test ourselves. Do we find daily a favorable varying, a change by growth, not a monotonous stand-still, or, worse, an unfavorable varying, a change by decrease in the closet, the study, the resting-parlor? If we are failing of the greatest usefulnes, O let us at once awake before God to the remedy, lest our powers become rigid or collapsed in indolent habits.

FIRE IN ATLANTA.—On last Wednesday night a destructive fire occurred at Atlanta, Ga. Three children were consumed and the amount of property [illegible] timated at 300,000