

*diately* refer to agreement in doctrinal theology, is further proved by the declaration of Paul. "therefore though I understand *all* mysteries and *all* knowledge, and have not charity, I am nothing": showing that the head may be perfectly sound in biblical knowledge, where there is no communion with God; because the heart is not right in his sight. On the other hand, knowledge may be exceedingly defective—theological sentiments crude, and in many cases exceedingly erroneous, yet the God of heaven will not refuse to walk or dwell with the man if he be of an humble and contrite heart. Let knowledge and sentiments be as they may, whenever the door of the heart is thrown open to Christ, he enters in and never departs while he is permitted to sit on the throne of the soul's affections. While, then, the Lord, the God of glory is willing to walk with a man, I shall ever rejoice to be found worthy of being one of the company; and should I thereby be found in fellowship with the *most* ignorant, yea, the *most* perversely instructed christian on earth, I shall fear no evil; for "God is with me," would be the ever ready response of my soul to every objector. If blamed for not rejecting the humble, erring christian from the church, I should answer, Christ agrees with me in the matter, for he "will in no wise cast him out." When reprimanded for sitting with such an one at the Lord's table, I reply, Christ sat with him, and supped with him, and he with Christ; and I with them. Christ did not commune with either of us because of the correctness of our theological views, because we held all truths as He held them, but because of a positive agreement of heart—a *oneness* of spirit, that secured the most delightful fellowship while we walked together with Christ in gospel ordinances, notwithstanding the immense—the immeasurable disparity that existed between our appreciation of truth and His. Close communionists, of every grade, know, that if God walks with them at all, it must be on the basis of the agreement herein set forth. And if God can walk with them—notwithstanding their (comparatively) almost entire destitution of biblical and Divine knowledge, simply because of their "right" state of heart; is it not strange—surpassing strange, that they will not see the propriety of walking together with their brethren on the same basis? and also to the full extent to which they admit, that God walks with all his children? Let them, however, persist in their singular course, if they will, but let them no longer pretend to find an apology for it in the text, "Can two walk together except they be agreed?"

#### VISION A BLESSING.

BY DANIEL CLARK.

"How charming is divine philosophy!  
Not harsh and crabbed as dull fools suppose!"

—MILTON.

In the theory of vision there are many curious

phenomena, some of which have perplexed the most learned of our physiological philosophers. They inform us accurately of the different tunics or coats which envelope the eye. They are scrupulously nice in pointing out the *iris*, with its radiating and its concentric muscular fibres. The muscles which are attached to the surface of the eyeball do not escape their notice. The aqueous and the crystalline humours, with the double convex lens, share with their fellows a critical analysis. The retinal expansion of the optic nerve passes beneath the field of microscopic investigation. But in Physiology, as well as in the other branches of Natural Science, there are mysteries. A boundary is set to the boasted wisdom of man. "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther" is inscribed upon all his enquiries. Look at the eye alone. How is it that a sensitive retina communicates with the mind? Whence comes it that all external objects are painted invertedly in the "camera obscura" of our earthly tabernacle, and that we see them, nevertheless, in their real situation? Whence is it that objects of the most colossal magnitude are delineated on the eye with extreme minuteness, and that yet we perceive every thing in its proper size? We look from the steeple of Knox's Church upon the bustling throngs beneath us—we behold many thousand houses, the intersecting streets, and the surrounding country, each painted exactly in our eye, in a space not larger than a quarter of an inch. Millions of rays enter by a small aperture, the pupil. They are united on the living retina, without confusion, and constantly preserving the same order which the points of the object had that emitted them. Move the eyes about, and we have a living, portable panorama. We shall see the river rushing down, like a white Arabian steed, from the mountain heights, and meandering in the plains; birds hovering in the air with reluctant wing; flocks frisking about in innocent glee, and cropping the green herbage of the meadows; fish sporting on the surface of the white-crested billows; every tree and every blade of grass, all sending their quota of rays to form the inimitable picture of living and existing creation. Is it not wonderful, too, that we do not see objects double; and that, although we have two eyes, each object still appears but one.

"The beams of light had been in vain displayed  
Had not the eye been fit for vision made;  
In vain the Author had the eye prepared  
With so much skill, had not the light appear'd."

The sense of sight is the most important of the senses, whether we view it in the wonderful extent of its range, or the construction of its individual or collective parts. With the senses of touch and taste we come to the knowledge of many of the objects of our perceptions. With the organ of smell the odiferous particles of the rose, or the less agreeable floating effluvia is perceived. The ear, almost with instinctive knowledge, measures the vibrations of the