

# British American Presbyterian

Vol. 4—No. 28.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 20, 1875.

[Whole No. 184

## Contributors and Correspondents.

### DIARY IN THE EAST.

HEBRON, SOLOMON'S POOLS, &c.

On February 16th, after many delay and disappointments, we at last started for an expedition to Hebron. It was a beautiful morning, after a rather frosty night. I had a horse which I had never ridden before; my two friends had their usual animals, and as guide, we had a young man on a donkey, who would take care of our steeds at Hebron. All our baggage consisted of the saddle bags on Mr. W's horse, and a small travelling bag hanging at the saddle bow of each of us ladies. As I mounted my horse, its owner, in Arabic, gave some rather anxious directions, which, when interpreted, were to the effect that I must keep a very light hand on the bridle, for it would not bear being curbed. This is apt to be the case in Palestine, from the extremely severe native bits which are used, which, if the rein is much tightened, hurt the poor horse's mouth sadly. In riding out I endeavoured to obey the orders given me, and held the rein in what at home would be thought a rather dangerously loose manner, and did not think it possible I could be offending my horse. But it thought differently, as I found to my cost. We rode down the steep slope from the Jaffa gate, and were passing along southward under the city walls, when, my friends being a little in advance of me, I shook the reins to admonish my horse that I should like to get on a little faster. This it resented, and, instead of going faster, began to spin round and round like a teetotum. This was not pleasant, for at my right hand there was a steep bank, over which I every moment expected we should go. But I was mercifully protected from this by the sloping road being a little slippery, so that very soon the pirouetting ended in my horse coming down on its side. Of course I came to the ground also, and was pinned there with my legs under the horse, till the guide, who had been watching me from a little distance, rushed up and tried to drag me out. This was easily done, as the horse at the same moment managed to regain his feet, and so left me free. My two friends hearing a little noise, looked round in time to see the last pirouette before I came to the ground. Mr. W., of course, hastened to see after me and very thankful we all were that neither the horse nor I were the worse of its escapade, which might have had a very serious ending for both of us had we gone over the bank. The only bad consequence was, that at first they would not trust me to ride the horse without having it led by the guide. So he rode in front of me on his donkey, leading my horse. It was rather humiliating to be led thus at the tail of an ass, but it was better than giving up our trip, and soon they saw that the horse behaved well enough when the reins were allowed to dangle quite loose, and I was again trusted to guide myself and it. We rode past Bethlehem without going into it. The road, so far, was no worse than the other stony tracks we had often followed near Jerusalem. Just a short way south of Bethlehem, we came on a little flat where a small stream rambled about amid rocks and swampy bits of ground. This was a very venisome place for us and the horses. As to the track, there was no saying where it was. Every mule and camel, of the many that carry firewood along this way, seemed to have made a new track for itself. Amid these we floundered on, sometimes slipping over rocks, sometimes nearly bogged. Fuddy figures and ladies were, in spite of catching up our skirts, and very thankful we were when we had got through this bad step without any of us sticking fast altogether. It was wonderful that the guide's little donkey got through at all. He had to drive it before him then, and many another time between Jerusalem and Hebron, so that it seemed to me that but for the honor of the thing, it might as well have gone on foot all the way.

Solomon's Pools are at the side of the track to Hebron, about an hour's ride from Bethlehem. They are most interesting remains of the glory of ancient days in Palestine. On the right of the Hebron track is the spring, or collection of springs, from which the pools are partly filled. They are enclosed in a small building, and the mouth of the reservoir is closed by a gate like a well's mouth. Some suppose it to be the "Fountain sealed, the spring shut up" of Canticles. The pools have been so often measured and described that need not enter into these particulars. I may say that I saw them in a very different state from most people. They are, generally, only very partially filled, but when I saw them the upper part was overflowing at the lower end, quite like a waterfall pouring over the side wall, forming a stream that rushed down the valley. This second one was also filled, and the third had water at its lower end, under the pressure of water, and the stream flowed from it, uniting with that which the upper one, rushed on down to the lower part of the plain, and ravaged the gardens of Urías, carrying away the bankments intended to regulate the

flow of the brook, which usually fertilizes the peach, apricot, olive, and vegetable gardens there. The Germans who are settled there in the ancient gardens of Solomon, or Urías, were obliged to make a channel to carry the water to the one side of their gardens, as the body of water in the pool was so great that they expected it to take some six weeks or two months in emptying itself. The breach of the pool was near the bottom of the wall of great stones, which forms the lower end of the pool. It was sad to see this ancient monument thus going to destruction, and to think, that under Turkish rule, there was very little likelihood of its ever being properly repaired. Their manner of dealing with the aqueduct which still exists, and still carries water from these pools, led the way to the Temple Platform at Jerusalem, gives but little hope of any good or lasting work being done by them. In spite of Baroness Counts offer of expending any sum needed for its repair, it remains in its old half ruined state. They would gladly have taken her money had she trusted them to do the work, but that she was too wise to do, so her offers were refused. Meantime, by way of saving the water for Jerusalem, they have forbidden the inhabitants of Bethlehem to draw water from it as it passes their doors. They feel it a great hardship to be deprived of a privilege they have had from time immemorial. Besides the aqueduct still conveying water, two others have been discovered at different levels; both are quite dry. One of these I saw. It, like the one which conveys water, looks like a low substantial wall running along the ground. At intervals there are small square openings where one could see the water flowing along. One of the old dry aqueducts was so much buried in the ground, that it is supposed it was thus hidden that it might not be easily discovered and destroyed by an invading army. When they were in proper repair, as well as all the other ancient water-works that have been discovered in Jerusalem, that city must have been particularly well supplied with water. Very different from now, when the greater number of the inhabitants have nothing to drink but the rainfall gathered into tanks from the roofs, or even from the dirty shafts.

At the side of Solomon's Pools is a large ruined Khan, showing how much better travellers must have been cared for in old days under the Turks. When the thoughts go back to still older days, what a change is seen. In Solomon's days this road, from Hebron to Jerusalem, must have been a highway of the greatest importance, along which his chariots would pass back and forwards. What splendor must the little rocky glen of Urías have witnessed when the great King came to visit and inspect the "gardens, and orchards, and pools of water," of which he speaks in Ecclesiastes. At present Urías is a most curious looking place. The glen is very narrow and deep, the bottom filled with orchards which produce the finest and earliest fruits of southern Palestine. Up one side of the valley a few flat roofed houses cling to the precipitous banks, the houses belonging to the Germans, who cultivate the gardens. The aqueduct goes along the hillside high above the houses, and riding along a track at the side of the aqueduct it is curious to look down on the little cluster of dwellings, which almost look as if they were parts of the rocks to which they seem to hang on.

From Solomon's Pools our rugged track led us over heights, and across narrow gorges, most of which convey the rainfall down through the hills of the Judean wilderness to the Dead Sea. From several of the higher points of the road we got occasional glimpses of that mysterious lake, and of the flat-topped Moab hills beyond it. In the valleys there was, here and there, a little cultivation, and the hills had a good deal of oak and arbutus scrub on them, which we saw some men engaged in cutting for firewood. In our ride of about five and a-half hours, between Bethlehem and Hebron, we did not pass one house by the side of the way. We did see a few small clusters of houses on the hillsides at a distance from the track, but these were few and far between. Of ancient remains we saw plenty. Traces of terraces on all the hillsides, ruins of houses and villages, tanks, etc. One large tank, brimful of water, was at the very side of the path, but not a house standing within a long distance of it. The land is still "a desolation, an astonishment, a curse, without inhabitants," as God so long ago threatened it should be, when "the Lord could no longer bear the sins of its people."

(To be Continued)

### Extract Minutes of Assembly.

DEAR SIR,—As some seem exercised on the above point in relation to the erection of Presbyteries, allow me to say that in as much as the erection of Presbyteries was by act of Assembly, it is very plain that the Assembly Clerks should have furnished the extracts. It is further evident that if the Assembly Clerks in recording said deed did so in such manner as to show that the reports of Synods on the subject were adopted, without showing of whom the Presbyteries were composed, their minutes were defective. And further, if Synod Clerks were present at the reading of the minutes of Assembly and allowed them, defective, to pass unchallenged, then it became their duty to supply Moderators of Presbyteries with an extract from their minutes as sent Presbytery bounds. It seems that when the General Assembly withheld from Synods the power of erecting their constituent Presbyteries, it retained for itself an inconvenient prerogative. Yours, &c.,

### Presbytery of Saugeen.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—Permit me, through you, to inform "Inquirer" that in the case of the Presbytery of Saugeen, extra minutes of the General Assembly and of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston were necessary on the following grounds:

The Synod included Dr. G. Bell and Rev. R. C. Moffat of Walkerton, with their respective charges within the bounds of the Saugeen Presbytery, and appointed Dr. Bell as the first Moderator.

The General Assembly returned these two ministers to the Bruce Presbytery, and appointed the Rev. W. Park to be the first Moderator, in view of Dr. Bell.

As the minute of the Synod could only contain the deliverance of that Court, a further minute of the General Assembly was required on account of the charges made by the Supreme Court in regard to the Synod's decision.

The minute of Synod was sent in ample time to the Rev. W. Park, of Durham.

As to the other eight Presbyteries, comprising the above-named Synod, an extract minute of Synod was sufficient, and was forwarded in due form before their respective meetings.

An official minute of the General Assembly can only be issued by the Clerks thereof. I remain, Yours truly, JOHN GRAY.

The Mansie, Orillia, August 9, 1875.

### Who is the Oldest and Longest Ordained Clerk of the General Assembly?

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—In the GLOBE report of the consummation of the Union at Montreal, on the 16th June last, occurs the following sentence: "Rev. W. Reid of Canada Presbytery Church, as the longest ordained of Clerks, then, on call of the presiding Moderator, read the preamble, etc."

The Witness report reads as follows: "The Rev. Wm. Reid, the oldest of the Clerks in point of ordination, . . . read the preamble," etc.

On turning to the minutes of the Churches, I find that the Rev. W. Reid was ordained on the 29th January, 1840, and appointed Clerk of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in 1858.

The Rev. W. Fraser, joint-clerk with Rev. W. Reid of the Canada Presbytery Church, was ordained on the 2nd September, 1834, and was appointed Clerk of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada in 1848.

Whether then, it be ordination, or length of service as Clerk, the Rev. W. Fraser is the Senior of the Clerks of the Assembly of the United Church, but his proper place not having been assigned to him at the consummation of the Union, his name has been omitted in several of the accounts of that glorious event given in old country newspapers.

Though none is less prone to push himself forward than Mr. Fraser, yet it is to be regretted that his services and seniority were not recognized in the act of completing the Union. I remain, Yours truly, August 9th, 1875. Vox.

### Seduction, Etc.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

MY DEAR SIR,—As a father I thank you for the faithful words of warning uttered to young women in your last issue. Sometimes it comes to pass that subjects have to be discussed from which people would rather shrink. In nothing is this more the case than in all that refers to the relation of the sexes, but in scarcely any other matter is it so necessary that honest and faithful words should be spoken. If young women could only be made to understand some of the things to which you refer surely great good would be the result. At the same time I have little hope that they will, if they but knew the harsh contemptuous language which young men use in reference to those of them who permit indecency, though not extreme liberties, they would surely be more cautious. If they but knew what foul insinuations were indulged in at the expense of those who take solitary buggy or sleigh rides with young men, they would be more chary and would not make themselves quite so cheap. If they only understood so much of man's nature as to know, what is a fact, that there is no one woman in the world with whom a man is less inclined to take any liberty that has even the faintest shadow of indecency about it, than the one whom he really loves, that love is an infinite respect, and that the first whisper of indecency proves that the pretended love and respect are not there. All this is quite true, but so long as the railing, impudent, and too often indelicate "young fellow" is the favourite with the "girls," and the "seducer by profession" is looked upon by our young women as no lord rather dangerous, but at the same time a "awfully nice" and "jolly" what can you do? The poor foolish creatures in due time get ruined, but other moths unwarned are as ready to fly round the candle with the same sad results. Fathers and mothers say that they don't like to talk on such matters to their daughters. But in a world like this such matters will be talked about, and if parents don't warn, why should they be surprised if foolish ignorant girls are deceived? I feel sorry to see so many young women making themselves so frightfully cheap, as if that would secure them husbands all the sooner. Tell them, Mr. Editor, in the plainest and at the same time most delicate way possible, that they are to use their own adverb, "awfully"

mistaken. I am not good at writing on such a subject, but I endorse all you say about the impossibility of men ever dishonouring the women they really love—the ranting nonsense of Robert Burns and others to the contrary, notwithstanding. Yours, &c., A PATER.

### Six Apostolic Principles.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—The annexed six Apostolic principles are extracted from Professor Witherow's "Apostolic Church." They are so Scriptural, so important, and condensed, that I will be glad if you can find a corner in your valuable miscellany. I. The office-bearers were chosen by the people, Matthias, apostle and minister, Acts 1. 13-26, Deacons, Acts vi. 5, 6. II. Elder and Bishop were identical, Phil. i. 1, James v. 14, Titus i. 5-7, 2 John i. 1 Peter v. 1, Acts x. 17-28. III. In each Church there was a plurality of elders, Acts xiv. 23, Acts xv. 17 and 28 Phil. i. 1 IV. Ordination was the act of the Presbytery, 1 Tim. iv. 14, Acts xiii. 1, 3, Acts vi. 6. V. The privilege of appeal to the Assembly of elders, and the right of government exercised by them in their corporate character. Acts xv. records a dispute at Antioch regarding circumcision; 2. not settled there; 3. referred to ecclesiastical Assembly at Jerusalem; 4. they met for deliberation, 5. they pronounced a decision, 6 to this decision the Church of Antioch and Syria submitted. VI. The sole Headship of Christ over the Church, Eph. i. 20-23, Eph. iv. 23, Col. i. 18.

The presbyterian Church has none of the six principles. Independency has three viz., popular election, identity of Presbyter and Bishop, and the Headship of Christ over the Church, but we fail to find the other three in their system.

The six main principles of government that were inspired men established in the Apostolic Church are all recognized and practically carried out among Presbyterians.

The Presbyterian is, in point of government, the only Apostolic Church.

### Theological Training.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—We have been much surprised at the "tompost in a tea-pot" raised by our communication on Theological training, contained in the PRESBYTERIAN of the 23rd May. What was intended simply as an expression of personal opinion, has apparently disturbed the mental equilibrium of some who were referred to with all kindness and respect. The result has been a two-fold reply. First by a Princeton, and now by a Union Seminary student. As to the first of these, we never thought to reply, since the amiable author seemed to do that sufficiently himself; as when he says, "With the pecuniary aid they are worse off in the spring than they would be in Toronto," and further on, "there is ample scope in Toronto for Sabbath School work; but who ever heard of students there getting five dollars per Sabbath for teaching a class?" It is to be hoped that it may be very long ere such a thing be heard of in Toronto! We will just note one point in which either the memory or the veracity of this critic is greatly at fault. He says:—"Your correspondent says he was in N. York Seminary two or three days, and in that time was able to judge of the efficiency of the Professors." Now we never said anything that could by any use of language be tortured into such a meaning.

As to our Union Seminary critic, who is a representative man, induced by "private letters of students" to vindicate their cause—we would inform him that we claim in no sense to be representative: have been induced by no private letters to write; and have never endeavoured to hold any one responsible for our statements. Though no is certain of his ability to identify us, we assure him that we are totally ignorant of his identity, and write in an impersonal manner. We never would have thought it necessary to notice his reply, but would have let him to express his opinion freely as ours was given, if he had only shown a little more respect to candor and veracity. We stated plainly that we had no desire to instigate invidious comparisons, or to undervalue the efficiency of other Seminaries, but that our object in writing was altogether different. And it does seem strange that no one who has attempted a reply ever noticed the point we proposed to discuss, and which we still think must be looked at by our Church. It is stated thus:—"Taking the course of instruction as we find it in the respective institutions, and the question of training men for the work of the ministry in Canada, is there sufficient ground to give a preference to other seminaries?" This is surely a legitimate point of enquiry, and one upon which Canadians should have some decided opinion. He of course covers the question of "fidelity to our own Church, of which a Canadian at Union boasts, and manifests it by attempting a disadvantageous comparison between our Canadian professors and those at N. York. Surely Dr. Schaff won't forget the debt of gratitude he owes "a Canadian at Union," for publishing the fact, wide as your paper circulates, that he has been honored by a "fervent letter" from Gladstone, or Dr. Adams, for having it told that a Webster, a Moore, and Tilden, had been of his hearers! But we fail to see what this has to do with teaching theology! We proceed now to notice more definitely, a few of the misrepresentations and inaccuracies of our critic. He complains grievously of our signature. "A Canadian minister in the United States," lest we should be confounded with "Dr. Orinison or Jarvis of New York, or Rev. I. M. Gibson, of Chicago." It were a pity indeed, if these brethren should be

held responsible in any way for sentiments not their own, but we have a higher respect for their integrity, not to say common sense, than to suppose that either of them would now call himself a Canadian minister.

A Canadian may at least rest assured that he will never assume the designation of a Canadian minister when we have ceased to be such. Surely there is need of a more accurate use of language than is taught in the Seminaries in the States! Such a blunder appears to confirm the estimate our critic has formed of himself, that after spending fifteen or twenty years, and between ten and three thousand dollars, he is not much better adapted for the active battle of life than men there not having spent half the time or means. But he goes on to rectify our mistake by stating the actual facts, accompanied by quotation and exclamation:—"A rural minister of Ontario, who dropped in a few minutes at random, to the lectures," etc. From what authority is his quotation made? How audacious in a rural minister to presume to speak of Union Seminary! We will not humiliate our critic by hinting the possibility of his ever being a rural minister, but shall hope that some worthy city charge may soon get the full benefit of his great talents, and vast erudition; but would ask, would it surpass him to be told that some of the most erudite and successful professors of theology of which any Church could boast, have lived and died rural ministers? Or would it surprise him still more to be told that a rural minister has had under his charge a much larger congregation than either of the respected ministers whose names he mentions? In regard to his assertion that our opportunities of judging the institution "were desultory and cursory to the last degree," he asks:—"How many minutes or hours was he in the building, all told?" We heard eight or nine full lectures, and five or six hours, or almost entire hours, spent in examination. How many Canadian ministers, not students there, have had the same opportunity of knowing Union? We are represented as saying, "the advantage of a large staff of teachers over a small one is more specious than real; and it is added, 'whatever that means, we give it up.' But we don't give it up. But remark that it is a misstatement of what was said; our reference, as every candid reader may see, not being only to the number of Professors, but taken in connection with distinctness of the course followed by them, in illustration of which we referred to the fact of having so many Professors going over precisely the same ground, viz. that of Christ's person and work. And, by the way, there is a great waste of rhetoric in a Canadian at Union's dissertation about Christ's being the Alpha and Omega in the teaching at Union, as if that were not so in Canada. Then as to the results of American training, the challenge is thrown out:—"Are not the first among the foremost" of successful ministers in our Church those educated there? Are there any who have been as acceptable and efficient as some of those wholly trained in the United States?" It is not our province at all to reply to this. We are willing to leave this to those to whom it should be left. But if the case be so, we would take the liberty of suggesting the propriety of closing all Canadian Seminaries, and ministers, taking the advice of our critic to place before young men in Ontario the chances in the American Colleges! Alas to our critic's estimate of professors by numbers appears to be his idea of suitable accommodation, when in reply to our remark about Knox College he says at "Princeton there are about a dozen buildings, almost any one of which cost more than Knox building." We had never, in our simplicity, thought that either numbers or cost per se constituted adaptation or excellence! Let our students examine the commodious class-rooms and students' rooms in our now completed Knox, all heated with steam, and every modern improvement, and contrast them even with Princeton. We saw a company of workmen there this summer, and were told they were going to try and modernise the rooms a little. It is added in another sentence:—"Then the pecuniary and other aid is 'munificent.'" There can be no doubt of it! but we would rather hear of its being meritorious. While anxious to see a scheme promoted by which students will be liberally assisted on the basis of comparative merit, we think the saying of an American minister will apply to our Canadian Church, "If we are to foster a spirit of self-sacrifice in our ministry, this whole system of elementary assistance must be looked into."

The letter we have been reviewing closes thus: "We would like to emphasize the vastly greater interest the New York people take in Student than Toronto citizens." This may explain a remark frequently heard in the United States. The ladies in the towns of America where theological seminaries are, take a far deeper interest in the young men than they do in Canada! This is too bad. Let the ladies in Toronto take note and order themselves accordingly! Mr. Editor, we have trespassed much further on your space than we ought, and shall now conclude with the remark, that there are great reasons not yet limited at, why with the admitted advantages of others, Canadian institutes should be primarily and heartily supported by Canadians.

### A CANADIAN MINISTER NOT IN THE U.S.

AN ITALIAN PROFESSOR has discovered that perfume from flowers have a chemical effect upon the atmosphere, converting its oxygen into ozone, and thus increasing its health-imparting power. As the result of his researches, he states that the essences of cherry, laurel, lavender, mint, juniper melons, fennel, and bergamot are among those which develop the largest quantities of ozone, while anise and thyme develop it in a less degree. Flower destitute of perfume have no such effect.