at night, these creatures prowled about the flock. With the iron part of the rod he could give a good blow when any attack was threatened.

In Psalm 23: 4, we have mention made of "thy rod and thy staff." There is meaning in both, and distinct meaning. God's rod draws us back kindly and lovingly if we go aside from His path; God's staff protects us against the onset, open or secret, whether it be men or devils that are the enemies watching an opportunity for attack. In this we find unspeakable comfort. The young, inexperienced believer may reckon on having the crook of that blessed rod put forth to draw him back from danger and wandering; and also may expect that the staff of it shall not fail to come down upon those that "seek his soul to destroy it."

CORRESPONDENCE.

The following communications were received some time ago, but were crowded out of our columns. It will be seen that they were written in reference to certain answers to questions in the "Inquiry Column" of the Advocate for June. As the subjects are well worthy of the consideration of our readers, we willingly publish the letters.—Editor.

To the Editor of the Monthly Advocate,

DEAR SIR,—The selections under the heading "Ornamental Crosses," in the June No. of the Advocate appear to me to teach a Theology of a very doubtful nature. The apparent tendency of those extracts, with the exception of that from Ryle, is to show that the cross being the form of the instrument on which Christ suffered is thereby rendered sacred. It may be that the authors would disclaim any such interpretation, but I fail to see that any other meaning can be found in their statements. The author of the poetical selection, Dr. Bonar, I believe, speaks of the Cross as "Lowly,"—"Awful,"—"Solemn." Such terms are, uo doubt, peculiarly applicable to the death of Christ upon the Cross. but to apply them, as he does, to the Cross itself, is wholly unwarranted, and seems to tread very closely in the steps of Romish adoration. In like manner, Spurgeon, reproving the use of the Cross as an ornament, asks—"Will you make an adorament of that which was your Master's death?" To refuse to use the Cross because it was the "Master's death," the "instrument of his torture," is an act of reverence for the form, differing in degree but not in spirit, from the worship of the Popish devotee. The comparison used by Mr. Spurgeon in the same extract, is utterly irrelevant,—the Cross did not cause the death of Christ,-mark His own words-"I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." It was in the exercise of this power and not as a victim to the cruelties of Roman soldiers and Jewish people that the Saviour died.

It is good, Paul tells us, to avoid the use of anything whereby a "brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." This is virtually the reason assigned in the "Inquiry Column" of the Advocate for not using the Cross, and if these results follow from its use, as they doubtless may, then "it is good" to abstain therefrom, but besides this, and the fact that it has the "appearance of evil," I do not think any scriptural reason can be assigned. These, however, are quite sufficient.

CORNWALLIS, N. S., June 12, 1880.

To the Editor of the Monthly Advocate,
Sir,—The following account of a "Christening" appeared in a western paper some
time ago, on which, with your permission, I will make a few remarks:—

There was a christening in Baltimore on New Year's day, which was not a christening. A minister went, by request, to the house of an acquaintance to baptize a child in the presence of a few invited friends. The ceremony proceeded smoothly until the parents were asked the name of the child; when it was discovered that the house was divided against itself, the mother giving one name, and the father another; neither would yield, and the clergyman extricated himself from an embarassing situation by postponing the ceremony."