

Youths' Department.

Lessons for 1871.

THE WORDS OF JESUS.

SUNDAY, MARCH 19TH, 1871.

The Golden Rule.—Matt. vii. 1-12.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."—v. 12.

SCRIPTURE SELECTIONS.—Matt. v. 38-48; xviii. 21-35; 1 Cor. xiii.

Which verse of our lesson contains the golden rule? Repeat the verse. What does Jesus mean by "the law and prophets"? What by saying "this is the law and the prophets"?

Does this golden rule ask too much of us? What is meant by the word "therefore"? Why is it used in v. 12? From which verses does it draw this golden rule? What is meant by v. 1? Does the golden rule agree with this direction? Name some sorts of conduct which they forbid. What is meant by v. 3? Does this agree with the rule? Name some acts which they condemn.

Who are meant by "dogs" and "swine," in v. 6? What persons now deserve these names? What is meant by "that which is holy"? v. 6. What by "your pearls"? v. 6. What command about these does Jesus give in v. 6? What does this mean? What reason for this does Jesus give? v. 6. Is this according to the golden rule.

What is taught us in v. 7, 8? Why does Jesus speak of this? What is taught in v. 9-11? Why did Jesus add this illustration? How should it affect us? Will you adopt the golden rule?

SUMMARY.—The golden rule requires honest judgment on ourselves, kindness to others, and that wisdom which God alone can give, and which we may have by asking.

ANALYSIS.—I. Specials rules of conduct.—1. For judging others. v. 3-5. 2. For dispensing benefits. v. 6. 3. For obtaining help of God. v. 7-11.

II. The Golden Rule of conduct.—1. Enunciated; v. 12. "Therefore . . . to them." 2. Confirmed; v. 12. "For this is," etc.

EXPOSITION.—The law and the prophets.—A common title for the whole of the Old Testament.

This is the law, etc.—That is, this golden rule is the law etc. See Matt. xxii. 36-40; Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14. His hearers professed great reverence for the law and the prophets, therefore he refers to it.

Verses 1.—Not that the faculty of judging is to be laid aside. "Judge not rashly, censoriously, unjustly, the conduct of others."—G. W. Clark. The penalty is clearly stated in v. 1, 2; and confirmed in Matt. vi. 14, 15; xviii. 32-35; Luke vi. 37; Rom. xiv. 10-13.

"Mote," here means a very small splinter of wood, while "beam," is a joist, or immense stick. This verse with v. 4, 5, rebuke the prevalent blindness of men to their own faults, and their quickness to discover, to point out, and to proffer help for the faults of others.

Dogs; swine.—Among the Jews were unclean beasts and hence were held in utter contempt. "Dogs," denotes elsewhere in the New Testament not the common state of nature, but obduracy and positive and fierce hatred of the Gospel; Phil. iii. 2; 2 Peter ii. 22; Rev. xvii. 15. In like manner swine is an image not of natural carnality, but of that gross and obstinate sluggishness, which can make no use of what is holy but to defile it; compare 2 Peter ii. 22 with Psalm lxxx. 13.

Holy; pearls.—Denote those pure and precious doctrines, experiences, and promises which belong to the children of God, or to those prepared by the Holy Spirit for their reception. To such these things are holy and desirable. Matt. xiii. 45, 46; but others no more appreciate them than dogs do holy things, or swine do pearls.

Give not, etc.—To kindness there are limits, which are here fixed. See Prov. ix. 7; xxiii. 9; Matt. xxii. 5, 6; Acts xlii. 45, 46; Rom. xiv. 16. But are these dog-like, or swinish men to be uncared for entirely? Rebuke, warning, etc., are appropriate for them, not pearls.

Recite.—Scripture Catechism, 187, 188.

A QUEER WILL.—A will filed in the San Francisco Probate Court reads:

"San Francisco, Jan. 20, 1871.—All and any property standing in my name, real and personal, I leave to my wife, Mary Anderson, and likewise my two daughters, Mary and Jennie.

John Anderson."

The two daughters anxiously inquire whether they are a part of the legacy or sharers in it.

ANSWER TO SCRIPTURE ENIGMA.

No. LXII.

FEAR NOT.

The words "Fear not" to Abram came, Hagar, and Jacob too; Joshua and Gideon felt their power; Daniel their solace knew.

Good Zacharias heard these words: The shepherds' hearts they cheered; And Peter, Jairus, Paul, and John, Were strengthened when they feared.

If we are of the Saviour's flock, We, too, have nought to dread: A kingdom is the Father's gift, And Christ our risen Head.

Luke xii. 32. Eph. i. 22, 23; v. 23. Genesis xv. 1-6; xxi. 15-19; xlv. 1-4. Joshua vii. 24-26; viii. 1, 2. Judges vi. 14, 23. Daniel v. 5-21. Luke i. 11-17; ii. 8-11; v. 4-11; viii. 41, 42, 49-55. Acts xvii. 21-25. Rev. i. 9-20.

BIBLE SCENES.

No. XVII.

Here is a scene, from the Old Testament, of suffering injury under great provocation; and the absence of a retaliatory spirit:

Gaze upon this long rocky ridge, almost overhanging the stately walled city, which is only divided from it by a deep narrow ravine. Up the green slopes, rich with groves of olive, myrtle, palm, and fig, a large company are winding, their heads covered and weeping bitterly. As they reach the northern and highest of the four peaks a woeful man meets them, confers briefly with the leader, and then returns to the city. A little further on comes one with gifts, and reverence, and lying lips, which gain their object. As the band descends the rough road on the other side, a man assails the leader with bitterest taunt and insult; stoning and cursing. The indignant soldiers would slay the miscreant; but the victim, whose heart is wrung by a sharper pang, stays their zeal, and passes on in silence.

Who is the man of woeful countenance, and who is he that assails the afflicted man?

TAKING THINGS WITHOUT ASKING.

Boys seldom like to hear much about prayer. I never did when I was a boy. I had an idea that it was not manly to pray much, and so I said my prayers when I was obliged to, and never uttered a real prayer till I was driven to it by a sense that it was certainly very unmanly not to pray. Boys have a great idea of being manly, and I honor them for it; but they often make sad mistakes in the way which they take of showing manliness. But one thing you will admit is manly and noble, and that is to ask for what you receive. It is wrong to take without asking, and very shabby not to say "Thank you," after receiving gifts; yet this is just what a person does who does not pray. I once had that lesson impressed upon my mind in rather a peculiar manner, and I must tell you about it. When I was a boy, I was playing out in the street one winter's day, catching rides on sleighs, and it was great fun. Boys would rather catch rides any day than go out regularly and properly take a drive. As I was catching on to one sleigh and another, sometimes having a nice time and oft-times getting a cut from a big black whip, I at last fastened like a barnacle to the side of a countryman's cutter. An old gentleman sat alone on the seat, and he looked at me rather benignantly, as I thought, and neither said anything nor swung his old whip over me; so I ventured to climb up on the side of his cutter. Another benignant look from the countryman, but not a word. Emboldened by his supposed goodness, I ventured to tumble into the cutter and take a seat under his warm buffalo-robe, beside him, and he then spoke. The colloquy was as follows:

"Young man, do you like to ride?"

"Yes, sir."

"Do you own this cutter, young man?"

"No, sir."

"It's a pretty nice cutter, isn't it?"

"Yes, sir, it is, and a nice horse drawing it."

"Did I ask you to get in?"

"No, sir."

"Did you ask if you might get in?"

"No, sir."

"Well, then, why did you get in?"

"Well, sir, I—I thought you looked good, and kind, and that you would have no objection."

"And so, young man, because you

thought I was good and kind, you took advantage of that kindness, and took a favor without asking for it?"

"Yes, sir."

"Is this ride worth having?"

"Yes, sir."

"Well, now, young man, I want to tell you two things. You should never take a mean advantage of the kindness of others; and what is worth having is worth at least asking for. Now as you tumbled into this sleigh without asking me, I shall tumble you into that snowdrift without asking you."

And out I went like a shot off a shovel, and he didn't make much fuss about it either. I picked myself up in a slightly bewildered state, but I never forgot that lesson.

God is good, and benevolent, but he wishes us to ask for what we want, and to thank him for what we receive; and there is no true manliness in taking the best of heaven's gifts, and making no acknowledgment for them; is there, boys?—Churchman.

"WHERE IS THE LIQUOR?"

On a certain occasion, one Paul Denton, a Methodist preacher in Texas, advertised a barbecue, with better liquor than is usually furnished. When the people assembled, a desperado in the crowd cried out: "Mr. Paul Denton, your reverence has lied. You promised not only a good barbecue, but better liquor. Where's the liquor?"

"There!" answered the missionary, in tones of thunder, and pointing his long bony finger at the matchless double spring, gushing up in two strong columns with a sound like a shout of joy, from the bosom of the earth. "There!" he repeated, with a look terrible as lightning, while his enemy actually trembled at his feet; "there is the liquor which God the Eternal brews for all his children."

Not in the shimmering still over smoky fires choked with poisonous gases, and surrounded with stench of sickening odors and corruption, doth your Father in heaven prepare the precious essence of life,—pure cold water. But in the glade and grassy dell, where the red deer wanders, and the child loves to play, there God brews it; and down, low down in the deepest valleys,

where the fountain murmurs and the rills sing; and high up on the mountain tops, where the naked granite glitters like gold in the sun, where storm clouds brood and the thunder storms crash; and out, on the wild wide sea, where the hurricane howls music and the big waves roar the chorus, sweeping the march of God,—there he brews it,—beverage of life, health-giving water. And everywhere it is a thing of beauty, gleaming in the dew drop, singing in the summer rain, shining in the ice gem, till they seem turned to living jewels; spreading a golden veil over the setting sun, or a white gauze around the midnight moon; sporting in the cataract; sleeping in the glacier; dancing in the hail shower; folding its bright curtains softly around the wintry world, and waving the many-colored iris, that seraph's zone of the earth, and whose wool is the sun-beams of heaven, all checked over with the celestial flowers of the mystic hand of refraction,—that blessed life-water. No poison bubbles on its brink; its foam brings not madness and murder; no blood stains its liquid glass; pale widows and starving children weep not burning tears in its depths! Speak out, my friends; would you exchange it for the demon's drink, alcohol?"

A shout like the roar of the tempest, answered: "No!"—J. B. Gough.

DEAN STANLEY AT SURREY CHAPEL.

A more than ordinary interest was attached to one of the Rev. Newman Hall's recent weekly lectures at Surrey chapel in consequence of the expected presidency of the Dean of Westminster, who took the chair at half past 8 o'clock. The proceedings having been opened with prayer, Mr. Hall said a few words explanatory of the secular and unsectarian character of the meeting, which was merely held, he said, in promotion of the innocent and instructive recreation of the working classes. These meetings on Monday nights were in no sense ecclesiastical, and were of a secular rather than a religious character, though it was hoped the tendency was always in favour of religion. Although on Sunday this was a church, yet on Monday nights instead of being shut up useless in the dark and cold, it was em-

ployed for gathering in the people, many of whom might otherwise be worse employed, to give them innocent and instructive recreation. There were some who might decline to assist either as chairman or lecturers because the building had a religious character, but they thanked the Dean not only for giving up some of his valuable time, but also that he did not object to come, although it was Rowland Hill's chapel. Dean Stanley then rose and was received with loud and general cheering. He alluded to the interesting subject of the evening's lecture, "Jerusalem and its Neighbourhood," places which he himself had visited, and had written letters home describing what he saw. There were three features connected with the Holy Land which his own visit there had deeply impressed on his mind: the first was, that while only a small number of persons were interested in such countries as Greece and Egypt, all ranks and all classes were alike interested in the land which was bound up with the history of the religion which was equally important to all; the second was, the homely character of the scenes associated with our religion, as if to impress upon us the fact that Christianity owes its impressiveness to the truths it teaches, and not to the places where it originated. The Dean then dwelt very emphatically on the third idea, which much impressed his mind: the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, whether occupying or not the very ground traditionally attributed to it, had been, nevertheless, in all ages associated with the greatest facts of Christianity the crucifixion and the resurrection of our Lord. Under that one roof there were chapels appropriated to the different sections of the Church. The Roman Catholic, the Armenian, and the Greek Christians, though differing in minor points of doctrine, as well as in government and ceremonial, met together round the same great central truths, and around the memorials of the one Lord to whom they all professed reverence.

LORD LORNE AND THE PRINCESS LOUISE DESCENDED FROM A GLASGOW MERCHANT.

A great deal has been written of late about the ancestors of Lord Lorne and the Princess Louise. We have not, however, seen any notice taken of one who was not only a citizen of Glasgow, but a common ancestor of both—viz.: John Stuart, Earl of Lennox, who died about 370 years ago.

He had his country residence at Croostoun Castle, in Renfrewshire, and his town residence in the High Street of Glasgow. He married Margaret Montgomeri, a daughter of Lord Eglinton, and had nine children. Matthew, the eldest, is now represented (through Henry Lord Darnley) by Her Majesty; Robert is represented by Earl Darnley; William died unmarried; John is represented by a party in the humble ranks of life; and Allan by Lord Blantyre; Elizabeth, the eldest daughter (married the Earl of Argyle, is represented by the Duke of Argyle; Marion (married Lord Chrichton) is represented by the Marquis of Bute; Janet (married Lord Ross) is represented by the earl of Glasgow; and Margaret (married Colquhoun of Luss) is represented by Sir James Colquhoun. It would thus appear that Lord Lorne and the Princess Louise are not only descended from a Glasgow citizen, but are what parties north of the Tweed call Highland cousins. If her Majesty has not yet fixed on a title for Lord Lorne, we would respectfully suggest "The Duke of St. Mungo."—Glasgow Herald.

GOOD HUMOR A DUTY.

Can any one define good humor? We all know what it is. We can feel and enjoy it, but it is hard to pin the thing down to any formal definition.

The good-humored man is at all events a happy man, a man to be envied, a man on whom troubles sit lightly, and a man who confers as much happiness as he enjoys. He radiates it as it were, and his good humor becomes an atmosphere in which other people's good humor, latent or pined half to death, comes out, revives and flourishes.

Good humor can scarcely be called a moral virtue. It depends perhaps as much on disposition and the perfect action of the liver as on anything else. A good humored man must be ipso facto a dyspeptic man, a man that enjoys a good dinner. Now a quality which depends upon the action of a man's liver can scarcely be a high moral quality.

And yet has any man a right to be dyspeptic? Is it not a moral duty not to be? Setting aside rare cases of inevitable misfortune, is not dyspepsia a man's own fault generally, the result of his gluttony,

his laziness, his stupidity, his carelessness or his ignorance? And are these things moral virtues?

Has a man any right to make himself wretched, to peep the world with horrors, to be a nuisance to himself and everybody around him, because he lacks the sense to control his appetite or the energy to take sufficient exercise to keep his liver healthy? One of these days we shall come to the conclusion that the snarling fretful, ill-tempered or complaining and depressed victim is not merely to be pitied, but deserves to be punished as he is. He may be very devotional, in his way. He may make high pretensions to piety and religious feeling, but he is none the less a nuisance, and on the whole, dyspeptic piety is as unhealthy as any other dyspeptic thing.

ORIGIN OF THE NORTH-AMERICAN INDIAN.

Whence came the inhabitants of the darker regions of the North, now the domain of our republic? is an open question. It has never been answered by a satisfying fact, and probably never will be. Nearly all investigators have travelled from the same starting point. Assuming the unity of the human race to be a fact, according to popular Biblical interpretation, and considering the garden of delight spoken of in Holy Writ as the old homestead of the whole human family; students, reversing the better order of logic, have been busy with guesses and in a hunt for plausible hypotheses for more than three centuries. And often fanciful and foolish have been these hypotheses. Rejecting as heterodox the ideas of Lord Kames and others, that the old Americans may have been an indigenous race of men, and regarding the most beautiful creature of earth, who first breathed in Eden, as the mother of us all—Barbarian and Civilized man—scholars have earnestly sought for coincidences of language, traditions, customs, and crania, for proof that the first dull-red people of this continent were tawny immigrants from Asia. They have cited some mystic poetry of the half-fabulous bards, or the dark oracular sayings of the priests and seers and philosophers of ancient days, to show that our continent was undoubtedly known to the early navigators of the Mediterranean Sea, and was naturally peopled by them or their countrymen. They have cited, in proof, passages from Hesiod and Homer. They have pointed to the narratives of Hanno, the Carthaginian explorer of the seas. They have argued nervously from dialogues of Theopompus, and sentences from the stories of Diodorus Siculus, Plato and Aristotle. They have strained common sense to its utmost tension in the arrangement of fancied evidence that the aborigines of America were descendants of the Phœnicians, or of the Chinese or Japanese family of the Mongolians, or of the Egyptians, or the Hindus; and writers like Grotius, Thorowgood, Adair, Boudinot, and others, have argued, without showing a single promise of solid fact, that the fathers of our barbarian brethren were the men of the "lost tribes of Israel," who took counsel to go forth into a further country where never mankind dwelt."—Harper's Magazine.

WAS ST. PAUL A BACHELOR?

It seems to be a pretty general impression that Paul was a bachelor, and many ladies of the present day have formed an opinion of him which is decidedly unfavorable. I believe, and propose to show, that Paul was actually a married man, and a strong advocate of "Woman's Rights." The Corinthian Church had written to him for directions upon the subject of matrimony in a time of great persecution, and, under the circumstances, he seems to think that for the time being the unmarried had better remain so. Eusebius, Clement, and other historians speak of Paul as a married man, and according to the best historical evidence we can get, he was at the time of writing this epistle a widower. And thus he remained true to his dead, and admonished other men who had lost their wives to pursue a similar course. Is there anything very objectionable in this advice? If there is a woman in America who is particularly anxious for her husband to marry again after her death, we should like to see her. The Apostle's "advice to wives" in the fifth chapter of Ephesians, seems to be very offensive to some because he admonishes them to obedience. Husbands are very fond of quoting it. If there is but one text in the Bible with which they are acquainted, it is that; but do you ever hear the 25th verse from masculine lips? Listen: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it." There, gentlemen, is your rule of conduct—don't forget, and, by the way, bow do you like it? Where is there a greater love than this? and what an exalted opinion Paul must have had of woman to deem her worthy of such affection! Rest assured that obedience will gladly follow a love like that. When men are honest, loyal, and true—when they tenderly love and shield, even at the sacrifice of self, then woman will "honor and obey" without any objections or regrets.—Packard's Monthly.