

Sunday Reading.

A Word about Words.

Ah me! these terrible tongues of ours! Are we half aware of their mighty powers? Do we ever trouble our heads at all...

Immortality.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., LL. D.

Life, death, eternity—how vast, how deep, how solemn these three words, so familiar to us all! Who can measure, who can fathom their meaning? In the midst of life we are surrounded by death and confronted by eternity...

The immortality of the soul is a universal instinct and desire of the human race. Like the idea of God, it is implanted in our intellectual and moral constitution. We cannot think backward without reaching an ultimate cause which has no beginning...

parent can commit a child to the cold grave, no friend can bid farewell to a bosom friend, without the ardent wish of the recovery of the loss and a meeting again in a better world...

Filled with God's Fullness.

BY BISHOP M. SIMPSON.

I love the brave fireman who puts up the ladder and comes down with my child. I can't help taking that man to my arms. He saved my boy. Shall I not love God—Jesus—who died for all my children to save them from eternal ruin and rescued them from that perdition to which they are going?

Happy is the man who can bring the very atmosphere of heaven with him whenever he approaches us!—who acts upon our spirits as the May breezes act upon the first shoots of the tulip and the violet! He is a bountiful giver.

The Christian Messenger.

Bible Lessons for 1883.

FOURTH QUARTER.

Lesson IX.—DECEMBER 2, 1883.

DAVID'S ENEMY—SAUL. I Sam. xviii 1-16.

COMMIT TO MEMORY: Vs. 14-16.

GOLDEN TEXT.—"And David behaved himself wisely in all his ways; and the LORD was with him.—I Sam. xviii. 14.

DAILY HOME READINGS.

- M. The Lesson, I Sam. xviii. 1-16. T. The King's Son-in-Law, I Sam. xviii. 17-30. W. Dangers and Deliverances, I Sam., chap. xix. T. A Prayer of David, Psalm lix. F. David's Psalm of Praise, Psalm cxlv. S. Popularity of Jesus, Mark iii. 7-20. S. Enemies of Jesus, John vii. 1-13, 37-53.

DAVID TRIED BY PROSPERITY AND ADVERSITY.

LESSON OUTLINE.—I. Royal Friends, Vs. 1-4. II. Favor with the People, Vs. 5-7, 16. III. Saul jealous and hostile, Vs. 8-15.

QUESTIONS.—Vs. 1-4.—Who was filled with love and admiration for David? What does this show of the character of the two men? How did Saul then feel towards David? What did he do with him? (Cf. ch. xvi. 21, 22.) Whom did David marry? vs. 27.

Vs. 5-7, 16.—How did David act in his new sphere? What was the secret of his success? How was he regarded by the people?

Vs. 8-15.—What excited Saul's anger and envy? How does God regard envy? What did Saul know about himself? How was Saul afflicted? Why? What did he try to do? Why was he afraid of David? How can a young person act wisely? Ps. cxix. 9. How can he have the Lord with him? Eccl. xii. 1.

Scripture Searchings.—What other great and good men of the Bible had severe trials in youth? What evil spiritual powers did Jesus meet and conquer? What did Pilate know about the motives of the Jewish rulers?

David had encountered three perils, and won three victories. (1) Over his own spirit (xvii. 28, 29); (2) over the temptation of Saul's armor (xvii. 39); and (3) over the giant. But more discipline was needed to fit him for his future exalted position. Sudden elevation had been fatal to Saul, and might have ruined David. From the sheepcote to the battle field, and from victory there to the palace, as the king's friend, was his brilliant course. Petted and applauded by the whole nation, and honored by royalty, he was in great peril; but he was called to the very trial that was needed to keep him humble, and to shut him up to the Lord. The Lesson opens with David coming with the head of Goliath to the king, and his introduction to Saul and Jonathan.

NOTES.—Vs. 1.—When David went to meet Goliath, Saul asked of Abner: "Whose son is this youth?" Abner did not know. But when David returned from the combat, Abner took him, with the giant's head, in his hand, to Saul. The king asked David himself who he was. And the modest reply was: "I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite." It was at this first meeting of David and Jonathan that that wonderful love between them began; a love "passing the love of women" (2 Sam. i. 26). The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David. That is, was bound or chained to. See same phrase expressing Jacob's love to Benjamin (Gen. xlv. 30). Jonathan, as son of Saul, was presumptive heir of the throne; and if any one might be envious of David's renown, it was he. But his was a noble nature that could not harbor such a mean passion as envy, and moreover, he was one who loved God. The two young men were much alike, especially in the heroic spirit (see Jonathan's grand achievement in xiv. 6-11); and in faith in God. Compare xiv. 6, with xvii. 45-47. Many in the king's court applauded David, and some may have resolved to learn from him how to use the sling; all admired his boldness and skill, but Jonathan loved him.

Vs. 2.—Saul took him that day, etc. According to xvi. 21, David had been in Saul's service before, as a minstrel, but had not secured the king's attention sufficiently to be remembered. It was now, most likely, that the latter part of the verse referred to, (xvi. 21), was fulfilled.

Vs. 3, 4.—Jonathan and David made a covenant. Literally, struck a covenant; referring to the animal slain in its ratification. As Abraham and Jehovah passed between the pieces of the sacrifice (Gen. xv), so, it is likely David and Jonathan did; and by this solemn cere-

mony bound themselves in a covenant of love. Jonathan stripped himself. A sure evidence of his great love. So Christ stripped himself for us (Phil. ii. 6-8). Of the robe. A mantle worn by men of rank. His garments. (Coat). His regimentals—here including his sword, bow, and girdle attached to it. Even... to his bow. Love stops at no sacrifice. This was Jonathan's favorite weapon (2 Sam. i. 22). And to his girdle. A costly thing, doubtless set with jewels. The rustic suit of David was not fitted for court life; but in the splendid dress of Jonathan he is ready for his new position.

Vs. 5.—David was now made a general of the army, and went out on different expeditions against the enemy, whither-soever Saul sent him. In this exalted place he behaved himself wisely, and his elevation neither turned his head, nor excited the jealousy of the people, nor, what is more wonderful, the envy of the court.

Vs. 6.—Takes us back to what happened as the army was returning after the slaughter of the Philistine, and the destruction of the Philistine army. The women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, after the manner of Miriam and the women of her day, as they rejoiced over the triumph over the Egyptians (Ex. xv. 20, 21). The dancing, as well as the music, was an expression of joy; was a religious observance; and was generally confined to the women. There is nothing here to favor the dance of modern society, which is for a far different purpose, and conducted by a commingling of the sexes.

Vs. 7.—The singing of the women was responsive, with a refrain which praised a subject at the expense of his king. David his ten thousands. The giant had been more formidable than many thousands, and had kept the whole army of Israel in terror. See 2 Sam. xviii. 3.

Vs. 8, 9.—Saul was very wroth. His vanity was greater than his gratitude. Like many a one who hears the gospel, he was angry with the truth. What can he have more but the kingdom? Perhaps he remembered Samuel's words in 1 Sam. xiii. 14, and saw in David the one of whom the prophet spoke. Saul eyed David. A most expressive saying. Henceforth he had the evil eye—one full of suspicion, envy, and hatred.

Vs. 10, 11.—The devil is quick to enter a heart that is opened to him. The evil spirit from God came upon Saul. Evil spirits are under the Lord's control, and are his messengers to accomplish his purpose. He prophesied, raved. He had the frenzy or agitation of the true prophet, but it is not likely that he had the true prophet's message. David played with his harp. Upon his harp to exorcise the evil spirit, as in xvi. 23. Javelin. Rather, spear, which served as a sceptre, and was a symbol of royalty. Cast the javelin (spear). Envy and hatred had developed into murder, as they so often do. He said, I will smite David, etc. Yes, but the Lord was his keeper, and the Lord had said far differently. Twice. Having avoided the spear once, David went back, faithful to his post of duty.

Vs. 12, 13.—Afraid of David. One would suppose that it would have been David who was afraid of Saul. But the wicked have cowardly hearts.

Vs. 14-16.—Whether in prosperity or adversity, David behaved wisely (prudently). The people loved him, and the Lord was with him. The very efforts of Saul to destroy him, but increased his popularity.

Help for Parents, or for the Teacher of the Primary Class.

Give special prominence to Saul, rather than to David. The Golden Text so clearly presents David, that for various reasons Saul, the reigning king, is really second to David; the subject, whether the latter be shepherd-boy or warrior. The first act of Saul towards David was one of confidence in his wisdom and strength. He found David capable and worthy. Elevation to honor did not spoil him. Success attended him for two reasons: 1. The Lord was with him. 2. He behaved himself wisely. The plaudits of the people would not probably have disturbed Saul, had there not been comparisons made that were not in his favor. Saul's enmity did not lessen. But David was wise "in all his ways," and all the people loved him. Meanwhile, though Saul feared David, he had murder in his heart, which often showed itself in his acts. David was prudent in keeping out of Saul's way, and guarding himself. —Abridged from the Baptist Teacher.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

The New Chair.

MR. EDITOR,—

I am sorry for my own sake as well as for that of Acadia, that I am not able to class myself among those who have nobly given their thousands, nor yet even among those who have given their hundreds. But going on the principle that she who cast into the treasury "two mites," making a farthing, did more than they who cast in of their abundance, I may humbly claim the right to say a few words in reply to the letter of Rev. D. A. Steele in your last issue.

I have first of all to complain of what Bro. Steele did not say. There are three points especially which I, in common with many others, would like to have cleared up by those who attempt to justify the creation of the new chair.

1st. We want to see it made clear that a chair of Didactics or of the principles and practice of education is the most pressing need of the College at the present time? If Bro. Steele will make this point evident it will be so much in favor of said chair.

2. We would have been greatly relieved and hence greatly obliged if Bro. S. had informed us where the money is to come from to pay the salary of the new professor. Is it to come from the Endowment Fund, or do the personal friends of Dr. Rand and of the College propose to raise it by private subscriptions?

3. We would feel much better satisfied if Bro. S. had justified what he frankly admits to be an "invidious distinction" made between Dr. Rand and the other professors. It is true that Bro. Steele notices this point, but, as I shall show before I close, he does by no means clear it up to the satisfaction of his readers.

But I have next to complain of what Bro. Steele has said. It is, of course, not necessary for me to say here that Bro. S. has the very highest place in my esteem and confidence, as he justly has in the esteem of all his brethren and the denomination he so ably and faithfully serves. But still I must humbly beg to differ from him on this question.

1. Bro. Steele complains that those who have written letters on this new appointment did not do so over their proper signature, claiming that if they had done so "they would have commanded more respect." However that may be, there are often the best of reasons for a writer's withholding his name from the public, and most people will see nothing disrespectful in so doing, if what is written be true and to the point.

By the way, how would it have been if "all this bundle of anonymity" had been in favor of the new chair? Would Bro. Steele have felt inclined to complain? At all events, a number of anonymous letters did appear in favor of it, and I am not so sure but that some of them were from Bro. Steele himself, but about these letters we hear no word of complaint, nor is there any reason why we should, for it is perfectly proper for a man to say what he believes ought to be said without giving himself credit for it before the public.

2. As to the manner in which the appointment was made. I do not believe that any of the writers of the pamphlet could have so far forgotten themselves as to suspect Bro. Steele or any other of the Governors as being a "party to a plot." Men, however, are often unconsciously influenced by strong personal friendships. As for myself, I feel free to say that it has not yet been shown that the whole affair was not kept by far too secret. Bro. Steele tells us that the matter could not possibly have been brought before the late Convention. He asks us to look at the circumstances, which he gives as follows: "Here is a gentleman holding a high office under the New Brunswick Government, in whom the Governors of Acadia College saw a possible candidate for the new department. How else could they have treated with that man except with the utmost privacy?" The answer to this is obvious. There was no need that Dr. Rand's name be mentioned before the Convention. The Governors could have said to the Convention: "Brethren, we think it desirable to establish a chair of Didactics in the College, provided a suitable man can be found to fill it." If the Convention had agreed with the Governors that the thing was desirable, the matter of selecting the man would have been cheerfully entrusted to the Board. Hence Bro. Steele's argument on this point is not happy.

Nor is his position strengthened by saying that there was not time. It was a matter of sufficient importance to claim a few hours of the time given to other subjects. At the Convention in Yarmouth, when grave questions were claiming the attention of the brethren,

they were found quite willing to remain and discuss them until midnight, and they would willingly have done the same in Halifax if this matter had been mooted. Yes, there was plenty of time, but even if there had not been time, Acadia has lived a good many years without a chair of Didactics, and, no doubt, could have struggled along somehow until next Convention, when there would likely be time for a fair discussion of the matter.

3. With regard to the value of the department, Bro. S. differs in toto from the views of the pamphlet. Yes, and I think he will find from the large majority of his brethren composing the Baptist Convention. He wonders why Educationists have come to this late day without seeing the necessity of teaching a man how to express himself. Or, in other words, he wonders that the great and wealthy institutions of Great Britain and the United States have not long ago established chairs in the department of Didactics. Well, that is the very question that has been puzzling many others besides Bro. Steele. It is most remarkable that if this department is so essential to a college course that some of the world's great and wise Educationists have not come to see and feel its importance before Acadia was thought of. I am inclined to think that the absence of this department in the great Universities of the world can only be accounted for by supposing that after careful thought on the subject the world's Educationists have concluded that it is a matter of little importance.

My own opinion is that when a man finds much difficulty in expressing himself the cause is not to be found in the fact that he has not had a course in Didactics, but far more likely in the fact that he has nothing to express. 4. As to the matter of salary, I said above that Bro. Steele has not cleared up this point to the satisfaction of his readers. Bro. S. says he felt the responsibility he was incurring, but he reasoned thus: "How can Dr. Rand come down from his position in New Brunswick and accept half the salary at Acadia?" Did Dr. Rand not offer to come down without being asked? Let some one who ought to know better than me answer. For my own part, I fail to see that there would be any more impropriety in asking Dr. Rand to come down from the higher position, than there is in asking Drs. Sawyer and Higgins, and Prof. Jones to stay down from the higher and more remunerative position to which any one of them might long ago have gone up. "What would then be said," we are asked, "if Dr. Rand had accepted the situation at a lower salary? Why, that there were reasons for such a descent, that Dr. Rand was glad to have an excuse to get out of an uncomfortable position." If to prevent this suspicion was the object in giving the higher salary, I can only say it has utterly failed, for that very thing is abroad.

Bro. Steele believes that the Senate have the best of reasons for this new departure, which they will put before the people in due time. That may be, but the good reasons seem not to be in the possession of those who have written in favor of the new appointment. If there are good reasons for it now is the time to put them before the public, and thus bring to an end a discussion which ought to cease here and now if the recent appointment is a desirable thing. E. J. GRANT. Dartmouth, Nov. 9th, 1883.

(Continued.)

Dr. Saunders' Letters.

IN DEFENCE OF DR. RAND.

NO. III.

To the Editor of the Herald: SIR,—No further reference to the business connected with Dr. Rand's appointment is necessary to convince every impartial mind that nothing has been done to reflect on the integrity and honor of the college boards. Hitherto the denomination has left the management of the institutions to the Board of Governors. Annual reports to the Convention alone have been required. Popular verdicts have never been sought before action was taken, not even in movements of an advanced character, as, for instance, in the case of building a school for young ladies. If in the past the policy and direction of the institutions have been left to the Governors, there are additional reasons why the same policy should be adhered to at present, and in the future.

The original charter of the college contemplated "the body of the college," to which body a large measure of power and responsibility were to be committed. In the early days of our college it was thought the material did not exist for forming this body. No attempt was therefore made to do it. The authors of the charter were evidently believers in the development theory. They ac-