

Our Young Folks.

"Thank You."

Baby was all ready for his bath this morning, when mamma found she had forgotten the sponge. So she said to her little boy Fred, "Please, go get the sponge."

The Cup of Cold Water.

A young English woman was sent to France to be educated in a Huguenot school in Paris. A few evenings before the fatal massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, she and some of her young companions were taking a walk in some part of the town where there were sentinels placed, perhaps on the walls; and you know that when a soldier is on guard he must not leave his post until he is relieved—that is, till another soldier comes to take his place.

"Did You Swear, Papa?"

Flora was at the window watching for papa. She was growing impatient, for it was almost time for the stars to come out, and she wanted to give him a good-night kiss. Presently Flora's quick ear caught the sound of a familiar footstep, and with a cry of joy she bounded away to meet her father. Before she reached the gate a gentleman who was passing stopped to speak with him.

So much as thou lovest, so much thou knowest.—Baruch.

Sabbath School Teacher.

LESSON XX.

May 10, 1875. A PRAISING MOTHER. I Sam. i. 27-28. COMMIT TO MEMORY, vs. 27, 28. PARALLEL PASSAGES.—Judges xiii. 1, Luke i. 13, 17. SCRIPTURE READINGS.—As to the "yearly sacrifice," see Deut. xii. 11-14, and I Sam. x. 6, on wearing (v. 22, 23), see Gen. xxi. 8, on the offerings (v. 24), see Num. xviii. 12, 13, for the form of solemn adoration, see I Sam. xiv. 30, xix. 6, 2 Sam. iv. 9, with (v. 27), compare I Sam. i. 17, and with (v. 28), Judges xiii. 7. GOLDEN TEXT.—I have lent him to the Lord; as long as he liveth he shall be lent to the Lord.—I Sam. i. 28. CENTRAL TRUTH.—Every burden is to be carried to the Lord. Samuel is the connecting link between the Judges and the Kings of Israel. He is, besides, an important and noble person in himself, and we may infer from the minute details regarding his birth and training, that the Lord intended him for a conspicuous place. (See in connection with this, the record of the birth of Moses, Ex. ii. 1-3, of Samson, Judges xiii. 1-6, of Obad, Ruth v. 14-17, and of the Baptist.) The condition of the people at Samuel's birth, was bad. Eli was old. His sons were corrupt. The want of a settled government was being felt. The people were under the Philistines, yet restive, and the struggles of the book of Judges (xiii.-xvii), were being constantly renewed. Samson and Eli in different parts of the country, and in the early part of his life, Samuel headed these efforts, which were finally successful under Samuel (I Sam. vii. 13, 14), bringing to an end a bondage to the Philistines which lasted (Judges xiii. 1) forty years. The tabernacle, as we learn from v. 3, was at Shiloh, and to it, among others, Elkannah (v. 1), of Ramah (I Sam. vii. 17), or Ramathaim-zophim (a Levite, 1 Chron. vi. 27-34), went yearly to sacrifice. He had two wives, like Lamech, Jacob, King Josiah and others, and with the usual results, loss of peace at home. One Hannah (or Anna, a name suggestive of our word lovely or charming), like Rachel was childless; while the other Peninnah (or "pearl," as the widely diffused name Margaret means), had a family. From the importance an eastern wife derives from her children, and among Jews from the hope of the Messiah, the disappointment natural in all such cases, was intense to Hannah, and rendered still more so by her rival's scorn, provoked by Elkannah's tenderness to Hannah. Marriage was ordained by God between one man and one woman, (Mal. ii. 16), and though good men have disregarded this rule, they seem to have suffered in every case from it. The Lord knows best what is for our happiness. Hannah carried her grief to the Lord (v. 8), and earnestly praying and making her vow (after the example of Jacob's, Gen. xxviii. 20-22), in the presence of Eli, she was thought by him to be under the influence of wine—a proof that was growing in no protection against drunkenness, for he does not seem to have thought it a new thing to see a woman drunk. She modestly corrected his mistake, received his blessing, recorded her vow, and, composed in spirit, went her way. When the Lord gave her a child, remembering her prayer and vow, she called him Samuel ("asked of God"), (v. 20). He was God's gift in answer to prayer, and his name was a memorial of the same. Our lesson emphasizes the devout spirit of the mother; but we are not to ignore the religious character of Samuel's father also, "who went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice," (v. 21). In too many cases, men, even fathers, neglect divine service, leaving women and children to worship. This is all wrong. The head of a house ought to offer his weekly sacrifice in God's house (Heb. x. 26), and the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise. The disorderly state of things at this time, had probably reduced the attendance at the three great festivals to one "yearly sacrifice." Elkannah seems to have shared in Hannah's feeling; "his vow" (v. 21). She must have told him (see Num. xxx. 6-10). "But Hannah went not up" (v. 22). Nor should we pass by her domestic faithfulness. There are times when even the enjoyment of religious privileges is to give place to home duties. If women are busy outside, while their children suffer from their absence, they err grievously; but they who are most useful abroad, are commonly so also at home. Eastern mothers did not wear their children for two, or sometimes three years. Her husband was reasonable, respected her motives and judgment, and helped her in her mission. "Only the Lord establish his word," in allusion probably to v. 17, which may have had some accompanying hopeful hint regarding the child. We see here a faithful woman, keeping her vow (Eccl. v. 4), and to the Lord (Ps. lxxvi. 11). Vows ought never to be made rashly (Prov. xx. 25), nor imply anything wrong. We have many examples in the Old and one or two in the New Testament (Acts xviii. 18). It is a promise to God of one's self, or of something belonging to us. Men sometimes make such resolves under pressure of fear or hope. In the New Testament, little notice of this form of religion is found as compared with the Old, for we are to walk by faith, and feel that all belongs to him. Corrupt and human systems of religion make much of vows. She, when the child was weaned, went to Shiloh, taking either three bullocks (two years had been omitted, or a bullock of three years old, as the Greek reads), and three years old, (as the Greek reads), and three accompanying great offerings for three bullocks (see Num. xviii. 12). One only is mentioned as being slain. Great irregularity seems to have been allowed at this time. She presented herself and her child to Eli, (v. 26), owned her obligation to God on the very spot where she prayed; "here" (v. 26), and glorified God as the hearer of prayer (v. 27), and surrendered her child to God for his life, or as it is otherwise rendered "all the days for which he is borrowed"—"and he the same day." The last clause, "and he

worshipped the Lord there," must apply to Hannah; there is a confusion of masculine and feminine in v. 7 also. We may learn from this narrative the following: (1) In everything... make your requests known unto God (Phil. iv. 6). It is the best help against an enemy, the best way to peace (compare I Sam. i. 18, with Acts ii. 46, 47, and Phil. iv. 7). (2) Pay your vows. Wicked men call on God in their trouble, and forget him when out of their straits (Job xviii. 10). How many broken pledges are recorded against men concerning strong drink, gifts in money, if they grow rich, marriage, and the service of the Lord, in baptism and the supper! (3) Particularly should vows regarding children, be kept. They are given to God. Yet they are not treated as if the Lord's. If they die, there is often rebellious grief. If they live, they are allowed to go their own way, not taught, not restrained, not brought up for God, often committed to the care of teachers, who will mislead them, or for the sake of supposed temporary advantages, or showy attainments, they are put under influences that corrupt the soul. (4) Children should be brought up to serve God from their infancy—in the nursery, in the infant school, and onward in the church. These are our Shiloh; and if mothers and fathers brought their children and visited them there, to see how they do, there would be blessing all around, for God is faithful and keeps that which is committed unto him (2 Tim. i. 12). (5) These mothers, whose early lack of children fixes their attention on their sons when born, may well shadow to us the church which in God's time shall have a multitude of sons innumerable (see Isa. xlix. 21, and Rev. vii. 9). (6) And now, children, suppose your parents have given you to the Lord, and desired that you should be his, are you holding back or giving yourself to him? SUGGESTIVE TOPICS. The father of Samuel—his residence—character—habit—error—penalty—mother of Samuel—meaning of name—character—sorrow—suffering—resources—how misunderstood—her explanation—the Lord's promise by his servant—its effects on her—her domestic character—when Samuel presented to the Lord—how—with what feeling—sacrifice—vow made—fulfilled—the nature of a vow—why in Old Testament rather than New—abuse of—broken vows—baptismal vows—how to be kept—how broken—the ill effects—how children can be prevented—our Shiloh—and the duties of parents to the Sunday-school and church. The Common Hammer. The hammer seems a simple instrument enough, but Mr. J. Richards, in a book on mechanical topics, lately published in England, finds in it much that is curious and interesting, as the following extract will show: "Few people in witnessing the use of a hammer, or in using one themselves, ever think of it as an engine giving out tons of force, concentrating and applying power by functions which, if performed by other mechanism, would involve trains of gearing, levers, or screws; and that such mechanism, if employed instead of hammers, must lack that important function of applying force in any direction that the will may direct. "A simple hand-hammer is, in the abstract, one of the most intricate of mechanical agents; that is, its action is more difficult to analyse than that of many complex machines involving trains of mechanism; but our familiarity with hammers makes us overlook this fact, and the hammer has been applied to the mistaken name of mechanical powers. "Let the reader compare a hammer with a wheel and axle, inclined plane, screw, or lever, as an agent for concentrating and applying power, noting the principles of its action first, and then considering its universal use, and he will conclude that if there is a mechanical device that comprehends distinct principles, that device is the common hammer; it seems, indeed, to be one of those things provided to meet a human necessity, and without which mechanical contrivances to which there has been applied the mistaken name of mechanical powers. "Considered as a mechanical agent, the hammer concentrates the power of the arms, and applies it in a manner that meets the requirements of the work. If great force is needed, a long swing and slow blows are required; if but little force is required, a short swing and rapid blows will serve, the degree of force being not only continually at control, but the direction at which it is applied also. Other mechanism, if used instead of hammers to perform the same duty, would from its nature require to be a complicated machine, and act but in one direction or in one plane. Two things characterize every Church that is in the highest condition of spiritual health. The one is that they all worship, the other that they all work. The first up pertains more directly to the heart; the second and appertains as well to the head, the hands, and the feet. The fullest combination of the two would almost realize the ideal of Church life in its highest form Theodora L. Cuyler. Look above you, and in the overarching firmament read the truth of an all-providing Providence. You sky is God's outspread hand, and the glittering stars are the jewels in the fingers of the Almighty. Do you not see that His hand closes round you on all sides, and that you cannot go where universal love shines not?—Gibb.

The Love and Culture of Flowers. Nothing is so pleasant and encouraging as success in the culture of flowers. It is a pleasure with no compensating pain— one which purifies while it pleases. We gaze upon the beautiful plants and brilliant flowers with a delicious commingling of admiration and love. They are the offspring of our forethought, taste, and care—a new, mysterious, and glorious creation. They grow—truly, but very like the stars and the rainbow. A few short weeks ago the brown earthy beds were bare and lifeless, now they are carpeted with the latest and fairest of earth's children. We have created all this grace, moulded the earth, the sunshine and the rain into forms of matchless beauty, and crystallized the dew-drops into gems of loveliness. There is no greater pleasure than this in all the earth, save that sweetest and noblest of pleasures, the fruit of good deeds. There may be hard-hearted, selfish people who love flowers, we suppose, for there were bad angels in heaven, and very unreliable people in the first and best of all gardens; but it has never been our ill-fortune to meet with one such, and if by accident we should discover a monstrosity of this kind, we would be more frightened than we were a long time ago at what we thought a ghost sitting on a cemetery gate. To love flowers, however, because of their sweetness, and beauty, and companionship, and as the wonderful work of a Father's loving hand, is what we mean when we speak of the love of flowers. Many cultivate flowers from a desire to excel their neighbors, or as an evidence of their refinement and culture, who know nothing of the absorbing love that causes a man almost involuntarily to raise the hat and bow the head in the presence of so much heaven-born loveliness. This love of flowers is confined to no age or station; we see it in the prince and peasant, it is shown by the aged father tottering near the grave, who seems almost to adore the fragrant flower in his button-hole, and by the little ones, who, with childish glee, search the meadows for the dandelions of early spring. The love of flowers, we fancy, is the most pure and absorbing with the young. The innocent and pure can love the pure flowers, we think, with an earnestness and devotion unknown to some of us that are older. A beautiful sight greeted us not long since, which we will endeavor to portray. A plant stood on the sill of the window, which attracted more than ordinary admiration from a little girl whose parents were probably the owners of both house and plant. Pleasure was expressed in every feature; and when we saw the gentle kiss imprinted on each flower and opening bud, we came nearer breaking that command which forbids coveting than we ever did before—and we didn't want the plant either. This little girl had been brought up in an atmosphere of love and flowers and plants. Several years ago we happened to be in one of our nurseries, when two little German girls, coarsely dressed, and apparently sisters, entered the grounds, and when first attracting our especial attention, had made their way to the green-house, and were endeavouring to purchase a pot-plant. When one was selected and the price ascertained, each one brought a few pennies from the depths of her dress pocket, and an anxious counting commenced. Their united purses did not seem enough, and another search was made in the corners of the pockets, followed by a more careful counting; and when the sad truth became apparent that their means were insufficient for the purchase, we watched the sorrowful countenance, the silent tear—a beautiful study for an artist. When the good gardener, with a smile of pleasure—the glow of a kindly act—delivered the plant to his anxious customers, taking their little all in payment, their joy shed sunshine all around. This is the genuine love of flowers that we wish to see spread all over the land. We want to see flowers in the mansion, the cottage and the garret; in the school-rooms, the hospitals and the churches. Above all we wish the young to cultivate flowers. This is why we write in a simple way of flowers, and of simple flowers, and leave fine writing about rare and costly things to others. These living preachers, through voiceless lips, are exerting an influence for good that few realize, and nowhere greater than in our new-born land, America.—Vick's Floral Guide. Ministers' Stipends in England and Scotland. The Church of Scotland has no brilliant prizes to offer to her ministers, but the average of comfort in the matter of professional income is probably higher among the Scotch than among the English clergy. It is very difficult to get at an accurate statement of the annual yield of the benefices of England, and for the figures bearing upon the subject which we are about to quote, we claim the character of an approximate estimate only. The other day the Bishop of Lichfield put the average income of the beneficed clergy of his diocese at £270. Taking the entire kingdom, that figure would have to be increased, but we can hardly be much wide of the mark if we fix the general average at something below £320. Many persons will probably be surprised to learn that there are close upon 1,200 livings in England, the annual value of which falls short of £100, while there are over 8,000 which range between £100 and £200. If we turn to a parliamentary paper which has just been issued, we find that in Scotland, out of 842 benefices, there are only 51 of less value than £200, while what appears to be the poorest of all is worth £140. As we have already observed, there are few "lat" livings north of the Tweed. Only one parish minister has more than £1,000 a year—and his stipend is stated at £1,102, but then "he total revenue" of the church, including the annual value of the manse or parsonage houses and glebe lands, give an average for each beneficed clergyman of a little over £340. The incomes, of course, vary with the price of grain. The present return relates to the year 1872-73, when what are called the "fairs prices" were high; but making every allowance for such fluctuations, the statistics make it clear that if the Scotch clergyman has no such stimulating prospects before him as the possibility of obtaining a

mitra with all its temporal adjuncts, has left on the whole is one which need excite no feelings of commiseration. Popery in the Church of England. The Ritualists, or rather the Romeists, in the Church of England seem to be more perplexed than alarmed by the Allocation of the Archbishop and Bishops. It is signed by twenty-six prelates and would have been signed by more if it had been more emphatically anti-Ritualistic. If the Romanist clergy finally object to the declarations they will in effect say that they do not agree with the bishops from whom they receive admonition, and whom they address as their "Father in God." Besides, it is not easy for them to reply to the declaration. Are they to object to unity, to obedience to the laws of the Church, or to find fault with the exhortation not to introduce novel practices? Are they to object to the admonition in respect to "practices repugnant to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and to the principles of the Church as derived from Apostolic times, and as authoritatively set forth at the Reformation?" Can they object to the bishops censuring clergyman for failing to "render to episcopal authority that submission which is involved in the idea of episcopacy?" If the prelates had given a list of offenders, or a list of the censured practices, a reply would have been safe and easy. The fix is unpleasant, because the Romanist clergy are obliged to tacitly assent to general propositions, which are nevertheless opposed to their doctrines, practices, and conduct. It is a poor device to say, "Oh, we agree with the declaration of the bishops, and the censures do not apply to us. We are not innovators, but restorers. Our assailed doctrines and practices are neglected, and if they are also Popish that is not our fault." No one will be deceived by such flimsy special pleading. The declaration of the Bishops does censure the Romanists, and the Romanists dare not deny the charge. There is then reason for the perplexity of the Romanists, and there is also good reason for their not being alarmed. The timidity of the Bishops is painfully apparent. No one can read the declaration without seeing that they are far more anxious to prevent secession than to purge their Church of error. Let us not be misapprehended. We are not saying that the Bishops have deliberately resolved that they will have union and truth if they can, but union at any price. But they have not resolved to have truth at any cost. They have not said, "We will purge the Church of Romanism." What they say is, "We must do all we can to prevent secession, and as far as possible purge the Church of Roman error." Why in such a declaration say, "our Church is rightly tolerant of diversity within certain limits, both in opinions and practices. We would not mourn in the least this wise comprehensiveness?" Who does not know that the Church of England is marvellously tolerant of diversity of opinions and practices? In some of her churches the manner of conducting divine service is plain simple, and in accordance with the tradition and thought of Protestantism. In others the service is conducted in the Popish fashion, and even with an excess of Popish ceremonial. Some clergyman preach the Protestant doctrine that at the Communion Christians eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of the Lord, according to His ordinance. Other clergyman preach the Popish doctrine of the real presence. Some clergyman exhort sinners to boldly approach the Throne of Grace, to confess their sins to God, and to plead for mercy in the name of Jesus Christ. Other clergyman support the Romanist doctrine of auricular confession. Surely then, as a solemn declaration against Romanist doctrines and practices, it is unwise to formally approve of this "wise comprehensiveness." The Romanists undoubtedly look upon that as an assurance that what has been tolerated and is tolerated, will be tolerated. The conclusion may be wrong; we hope it is wrong, and that the Bishops will endeavour to put an end to that toleration which permits Popish doctrine to be taught, and Popish practices in the Church of England. The Bishops say, "We are convinced that the number of those who would refuse such reasonable obedience is small, and that the vast majority of the clergy and laity of the Church of England are thoroughly loyal to its doctrine and discipline." We trust that a vast majority of the members of the Church of England are Protestant, but the Bishops underrated the number of Romanists if they think it small, and indeed, if it is small, the episcopal expostulation is superfluous. If the Bishops wish to save the Church from ruin, they must boldly face the difficulty, and recognize that they will not tolerate Popish doctrines or Popish practices. If they pursue that course there will be a secession of the Romanists. If they do not, the Protestants will leave the corrupt Church, and what remains of the Church of England will sooner or later be absorbed into the Church of Rome. The only way to save the Church of England from destruction is to purge it of Popery, and the only way to do that is to turn out the Papists.—London Weekly Review. Presbyterians Eat Raw. Thus does the irresponsible Max Adler settle the matter of the new Presbyterian Cook-Book.—"An advertisement in a Philadelphia paper states that 'the Presbyterian Cook-Book is now ready.' I give the intelligence for what it is worth. It does not interest me greatly, for the reason that when I eat a Presbyterian I don't want to have him cooked. I prefer him raw. I know that this will seem a little too savage for a civilized man, but you may have observed that somehow a fricassee Presbyterian loses that delicate flavor that he has when he is taken as nature made him. The South Sea Islanders always stuff their Presbyterians with onions, and trim them up with celery tops, making the gravy of lard. This is a good enough way of cooking a Swedeborgian; and a Shaker is not bad fixed up in the same style, although I like sliced carrots with boiled Shaker; but give me Presbyterian without any such foolery, and with only a few pinches of salt to put on him before every bite. The Presbyterian Cook-Book is of no use to me.