

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
 - Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
 - Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
 - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
 - Pages detached/
Pages détachées
 - Showthrough/
Transparence
 - Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
 - Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
 - Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
 - Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
 - Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE
Presbyterian Magazine.

Vol. 1.

FEBRUARY, 1843.

No. 2.

ON BAPTISM.

To prevent disappointment it may be well to state at the commencement, that the object of the writer of this article is not to shew, that the "infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized." The right of the infants of believers to this seal of the covenant is for the present assumed to be well founded. Although the question of "infant baptism" is in this communication waived, yet it is believed, that the exhibition of the true import of infant baptism will bring out much to show, that it is an ordinance agreeable to the general scope of the Scriptures; that it holds a most important place in the Christian system and that it serves ends of high importance for which no provision has been made, if the right of the infants of believers to be baptised be denied. On another occasion, the writer may state those arguments for the baptism of infants which completely satisfy his own mind, and which ought, long ere this, in his opinion, to have finally settled the controversy. The direct object of this communication is to set before the parents of our churches the nature and importance of an ordinance in the scriptural authority of which they all believe.

Every person who has paid any attention to the opinions and practices of many who believe that their infants ought to be baptized, must have remarked that they seem to be in a great measure ignorant of the nature of the institution—some regarding it only as a ceremony rendered venerable by long observance, and others attaching to it a superstitious importance, as if there were in it some mysterious power of securing salvation. Some, unable to say whether there be any advantage in it, and others supposing that the eternal well-being of a child is endangered if the administration of baptism be neglected.

One great proof of the ignorance which prevails respecting baptism, is furnished by the manner in which parents educate their children whom they have devoted to the Lord in Baptism. Did parents know what they did when they got the seal of the covenant put upon their offspring; did they know the responsibilities which lie upon them with respect to their children; did they know the new relationship which is formed between them and their children in baptism; did they know the relationship which subsists between God and them, and between the church and them, it would be impossible for them so utterly to neglect the religious education of their children as multitudes do. When we see parents allow their children to grow up in ignorance of the character and the will of the God to whom they consecrated them, acquiring bad principles and bad habits, and

living as destitute of the fear of God, and as ignorant of salvation and of the means by which it may be attained, as if they were the children of heathens; when we see them anxious only to educate them for the present life; can we avoid coming to the conclusion, either, that they are ignorant of the nature of baptism, or that, when they got their children baptized they were not sincere—that they acted hypocritically with God. Religious education at a public Sabbath school, however much that may be a help to parents, comes very far short of relieving them of the obligations under which they individually lie, to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and for which they are individually responsible.

Nor is the church free from blame with respect to baptized infants. If children are publicly recognised as having a place in the family of God, the church ought certainly to see that they are receiving proper training while under the guardianship of their parents; and ought also, when the proper time comes, to superintend their religious education. This was the ancient practice, and it were well that it were revived. The care of the church ought not to be confined, as it too frequently is, to those of mature age. To provide meat for the full grown and to neglect to provide milk for the babes, is very unlike what the christian family ought to be.

This neglect arises in a great measure from not adverting to the position which a baptized child occupies in the church, and from ignorance of the true nature of church membership. Were these understood, men would either not become church members, or they would strive to be faithful to the duties which that relationship brings along with it. As long as men regard the membership of the church merely as something connected with respectability in the eyes of the world, or as entitling them to certain privileges not connected with corresponding duties; as long as they do not regard themselves as members of God's spiritual family, separated from the world and on progress to immortality, so long will they neglect their duty to their children and to themselves.

The church of God being an institution of Heaven, and in which more of his glory is manifested than in all his other works, contains within itself all the instrumentality which is needed for so training its members, that they may become meet to be made partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. There is a depth of wisdom in its simple orderings which the carnal eye does not see. Instead then, of inventing a new constitution for the church of Christ, based on principles of expediency, the church ought to bring into full operation God's own ordinances; and were this done, an amount of success would attend her ministrations such as has not been since the days of the Apostles; modern improvements are but clumsy substitutes for God's own ordinances. The institutions of the christian church have not, for many centuries, had a fair trial. Every thing has been more or less corrupted or distorted. The church has become in a great measure powerless. The form remains but the genuine spirit is wanting. Are we then to throw away as inefficient the ordinances which

God has given to make men wise and holy, and supply their place by some contrivances of our own? Are we to say of God's laws, that they have been tested by a trial sufficiently long, and have been found wanting; that the world has advanced so far before the attainments of apostolical times that we must have regulations adapted to our improved state? No! let us endeavor to enter into the spirit of those ordinances which God has appointed, and we shall soon see the characteristics of primitive times revive amongst us.

The following observations are designed to set before christians the nature of that divine service, by which infants are recognised as members of the visible church, that, by their understanding it they may be led to discharge those duties which devolve upon them.

Baptism is a sacrament, But what is a sacrament? An answer to this cannot be wrought of the name, which is of latin origin, and was unknown to the writers of the New Testament. The apostles never employed any generic term to express these two ordinances; they called the one simply baptism, and the other, the Lord's supper. We must look at the ordinances themselves that we may understand what a sacrament means.

In those ordinances called sacraments, there are employed certain sensible signs, bread, wine and water. It must be evident that these "elements" can have no virtue connected with the salvation of the soul. Men's sins cannot be washed away by water, nor their souls edified by material food, by whomsoever applied. Even the Roman Catholics seem to be aware of this, for they transubstantiate the bread and the wine into the real body and blood of Christ; but after all, this is a poor contrivance; for it does not appear how eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, which are material, could do any thing for the soul, more than the eating of bread and drinking of wine which are also material. Souls do not eat flesh any more than they eat bread.

The elements in the sacrament are signs, and when understood, they represent to the mind some truths, the knowledge and belief of which is advantageous to the soul. The using of the sign, by washing or eating and drinking, has no efficiency on the soul, but the believing in what is represented by these signs has. What is signified by baptism will be stated by and by, at present it may be remarked, that in the Lord's supper the bread and the wine represent the body and the blood of Christ; the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine represents the body of Christ broken and his blood shed. In that ordinance, therefore, the thing set before the church is the death of Christ as a propitiation for sin; and eating and drinking by believers, symbolizes their appropriating of Christ by faith. This appropriation increases their confidence, awakens love and promotes holiness and joy.

A sacrament is therefore, simply, the exhibition to the church of important truths and privileges by means of outward or "sensible signs." The truths or facts and privileges which have been selected to be sacramentally

set forth, are those fundamental ones on which the whole gospel system is erected.—The universal corruption of human nature and salvation by the death of Christ. The difference between preaching the gospel and the dispensation of a sacrament lies in this, that in the one, those truths are set forth in words, which in the other, are set forth by signs. The gospel takes a wider range than a sacrament. It takes in the whole counsel of God and is addressed to sinners as well as saints. A sacrament confines the attention to one or two truths, but these are the basis of all that the gospel has to say to either good or bad; and also, it can be rightly and properly observed only by a particular class—the friends of Christ. These however, are not in all respects essential differences: the true point of distinction is as has been stated above.

A sacrament is therefore an ordinance in which the great principles of salvation are enshrined. It is the casket which contains the jewels; “the vessel which holds the new wine; the basket which keeps the loaves and the fishes which are to feed the multitude.” If sacraments have any greater efficiency as means of grace than the preaching of the gospel, it must be because in them the attention is directed to a single point, and that point the most important of all; and because the truths presented by them are brought more close to us, being made, as it were, objects of sense. The relative value of the means of grace, consists in the clearness and fullness with which they exhibit Christ to our faith.

There are two inferences plainly deducible from all this. The first is, that no alteration, not even the smallest, ought to be made in these sacred institutions. Every thing in them is appointed by divine authority, and no unholty hand should be put forth to make any alteration in His ordinances. Every thing in them is deeply significant. To make a change in the symbol, is to make a change in the thing signified. The idea of rendering them more impressive by the addition of ceremonies which are not in the bible, is an impiety. Obedience, strict obedience to his revealed will, is religion. The Roman Catholics have added to the sacraments a multitude of observances, to render them more imposing and efficient, by which they have altered the character of both, so that they are no longer the things they were in the days of the apostles.

The second inference is, that sacraments derive no efficacy from those who administer them. The language of our standards on this point is excellent—“Sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue in them or in him that doth administer them, but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of his spirit in them that by faith receive them.” Much is now done in certain quarters to shew that only priests episcopally ordained, and in direct succession from the apostles, have the power of administering valid sacraments. What is the difference between a valid sacrament and a sacrament that is not valid apart from the faith or unbelief of the recipient, it is not worth while to enquire; neither the idea nor the language is scriptural. When the primitive Chris-

tians met in secrecy, as they often did; to perform an act of homage to him who died for their offences and rose again for their justification, and to feast on the remembrances of his love; it never occurred to them to think, whether the validity of their simple act of duty and gratitude depended on the brother who officiated. The great object in claiming for priests qualifications necessary to render sacraments valid, is to encrease power, and history tells us that to augment the power of the church by making the efficiency of ordinances depend upon her ministers, is to destroy the gospel. It is high time that the institutions of the new economy, at once so sublime and so simple, were stript of every thing like superstition and priestcraft, and observed agreeably to their original intention; as means of presenting the Lord Jesus to the faith and the love of believers.

OF BAPTISM.

The foregoing remarks have been made respecting Sacraments generally. Those that follow respect baptism in particular.

The parties concerned in the baptism of a child are three, the Church, —the parent or parents—and the child. To all three, baptism has an important reference.

I. Of Baptism so far as the Church is concerned.

It has been already stated that baptism, as being a sacrament, symbolizes certain important truths. Without aiming at great minuteness, the truths enshrined in the sacrament may be stated as the two following.

1. The Baptism of a child symbolizes the universal corruption of human nature.

Nothing can more clearly set forth the doctrine of original sin than the baptism of an infant. An infant, it is obvious, can have no sin of its own committing; it is not capable of entertaining a sinful thought, or a sinful wish, or of performing a sinful act. It is, so far as its own personal actions are concerned, an innocent creature, and yet that little innocent needs to be washed. There is about it, something which needs to be removed; and that something can be removed only by the blood which was shed for the remission of sins. (To attempt to explain how sin is in an infant is not at present intended; what we have chiefly to do with is the fact, that all men are by nature corrupted, and that this corruption can be removed only by the atoning blood of Christ. What is matter of fact now, has been matter of fact all the way back to the first birth.) The baptism of an infant is a public recognition of this fact by the church. Were we to search for proofs in support of the doctrine of original sin, where could we find any more conclusive, any more impressive than those which are furnished by infant baptism. These proofs do not partake so much of the nature of arguments, as of facts, which cannot be contradicted.

The doctrine of original sin lies at the foundation of christian theology, and also of practical goodness; and an avowal of it is the first thing done when a person is declared to belong to the family of Christ. The sacrament

of baptism is the ordinance appointed by God for securing its proper importance to this fundamental truth. And what is this original sin to which so great a prominence is given. "Original sin," says Melancthon, "is an inclination born with us—an impulse which is agreeable to us—a certain influence which leads us into the commission of sin, and which has passed from Adam upon all his posterity. Just as there is found in fire a native energy which mounts upwards, just as in the load stone we observe a natural power of attracting steel, just so do we find in man a primary impulse impelling him to that which is evil." In his judgment, "a deep sense of the wretched state to which man is reduced by sin is the foundation on which we must build the teaching of christian theology. This universal evil is the primary fact, the leading truth whence the science takes its departure, and it is this which forms the peculiar distinction of theology from the sciences which work their own advancement by the powers of reason."*

Admitting that, in infant baptism, the fact of the universal corruption of human nature is recognized, it cannot but seem strange that any who deny this fact, should baptize infants. In their system infant baptism has no meaning, it symbolizes no truth,—it is a ceremony without any religious object.

2. The second great truth symbolically represented in baptism is, that provision has been made to wash the guilt and defilement of sin away. The water is a "sign" of the blood of Christ, by which the soul is delivered from the guilt and pollution of sin.

There are two important inferences which will very readily suggest themselves to the reader; the first is that infants may be saved and the second is that salvation must be gratuitous on the part of God. If the baptism of the infants of believing parents be rejected, there is no pledge on the part of God, no direct evidence for the salvation of any, till they attain to the age in which they may become believers. To say that they are admitted into heaven on account of their innocency, will not satisfy those who believe that in Adam all died. If so, what ground have we to believe that they shall be admitted amongst the redeemed, if the only pledge which the word of God contains be disowned?

On the supposition therefore, that infants may be saved, it must be evident that their salvation cannot be of works, it must be by grace. But this is not peculiar to infants, "The pardon of sin and acceptance as righteous in the sight of God on account of the righteousness of Christ imputed," is the same in an adult as in an infant. It is grace in both. This fact is equal in value to the others, or that there is salvation, Were the one not true it would be of little use to talk of the other, for it never could be ours.

*D'Aubigne's history of the Reformation, vol. iii. p 19.

Such, then are the invaluable truths "signified" in the baptism of infants. They are the most important in the Word of God.

The doctrines symbolized in baptism are those on which the *Membership* of the Church of Christ is founded. He who believes that all men are spiritually dead, and who has hope of the forgiveness of sins through the atonement of Christ, and who by his life, gives evidence that he believes them, has those qualifications which entitle him to be received member of the visible church. An association which is not founded on these great principles does not deserve the name of a Christian Church.

When a person would enter the church he must enter by the gate of baptism: The church signifying by this ordinance, that all who are within believe that all men are by nature sinners, and that salvation is only by the blood of atonement. He who enters without believing these commits an act marked either by superstition or impiety or both.

As baptism is the symbol of the Church's faith, and of the ground of the Church's fellowship, and as the administration of it constitutes either a declaration of membership, or is the act by which admission is given, it must certainly be a *church ordinance*, and as such, ought to be administered in the presence of the church. If there be any services which more properly are church services than others, the sacraments are these services.

Besides, the sacraments are intended to edify the church, and therefore to administer either of them in private is to deprive the church of one of the means appointed for her profiting.

Let us suppose that the church understands the meaning of the ordinance of baptism, and regards it with that reverence to which God's institutions are entitled; then, what more natural for a church member when a child is baptized than to say, That reminds me of my state by nature. I was conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity. But God, in the aboundings of his grace, has had mercy upon me. By him I have been brought out of a state of sin and misery and admitted into his family. I who was helpless as a little child have been delivered from the wrath to come and now have good hope through grace. Such are the thoughts which will arise in the mind of an intelligent christian on witnessing the administration of baptism. And these thoughts constitute the material of which the christian life is composed—humility, arising from a consciousness of his guilty origin and sinful living, and gratitude, for having received a free salvation. The one, being the sentiment with which he ought to regard himself, and the other, the sentiment with which he ought to regard God. A Christian is a compound of these sentiments. Every thing about him when he acts as a christian, is influenced by both. The greatest service then that can be done to the Church, is to press on their attention motives to these indispensable qualities; and as baptism is eminently fitted for this purpose, the church must be injured when deprived of an opportunity of witnessing it.

It is much to be lamented, that these emotions are not awakened as they ought to be in the minds of many who witness the sacrament of baptism. Judging from appearances one would be warranted to conclude, that the members of the church are indifferent spectators,—that they do not see in it the symbol of the most interesting of all truths and a means of their own edification,—that they regard it as a transaction between the minister and an infant, and that, as the service is a short one, good manners require that they should manifest no impatience. This must be owing to their ignorance of the nature of the sacrament; and their ignorance may be owing to want of suitable and necessary instruction. To whatever cause the practice is to be attributed it cannot be too strongly condemned.

To be continued.

The Conversion of the Apostle Paul.

Acts ix. 1—23. xxii. 1—17 xxvi. 1—19.

THE conversion of Paul forms an era in the history of the propagation of Christianity. It brought over to the persecuted cause the most talented and energetic of its enemies, and employed in the refutation of Jewish objections the very man who had most effectually employed them.—Paul becomes now the prominent character in Luke's history of the spread of the gospel. Very soon after Paul appears in the field of christian enterprise, he drops all notice of the doings of the rest of the Apostles and confines himself to the labours and trials of this singularly gifted man.

Paul may be styled the first of the Apostles who became a Missionary. When the church which was at Jerusalem was scattered abroad by the persecution that followed the martyrdom of Stephen, the Apostles remained in Jerusalem, and with the exception of a short visit paid by Peter and John to confer the Holy Ghost upon those amongst the Samaritans, who, by the ministry of Philip, had received the Gospel, they continued at Jerusalem a considerable time after Paul had been opening up new and interesting fields of labor.

Paul's known character before he became a Christian, the extraordinary manner in which he was converted, the talents and the learning which he was known to possess, and the bold and untiring zeal with which he prosecuted the ends of his mission, threw a celebrity around his name, which rendered him an object of interest wherever he went.

Wherever Paul laboured, circumstances assumed an extraordinary shape. The zeal which he awaked was an enthusiastic zeal; his friends would, if it had been possible, have plucked out their eyes and given them to him; the hatred that he provoked, was a hatred that could be satisfied only by blood. No wonder then, that the early history of the church is given under the head of the labours of Paul.

In the passages set at the head of this article we have a minute account of his miraculous conversion; among which may be noticed the following things.

1. At the time when his conversion took place, his fierce hatred to Christ and his cause was at his height. The sublime spectacle of Stephen's death; the patience and piety of his victims, had won from him no sentiment of admiration for a cause which produced such valuable results. He still urged on his murderous course; ferociously intruding into houses for the purpose of discovering the Christians, he dragged forth men and women and committed them to prison.— Having succeeded in intimidating and scattering the church, there was little more for him to do at Jerusalem. Flushed with success and impelled by the terrible propensities of his nature, he offered himself to the Sanhedrin, and solicited permission to persecute the Christians at Damascus.

When and how the Gospel was introduced into Damascus we are not informed. It may be supposed, that some Jews of Damascus had been converted on the day of Pentecost: and also, that some of those "scattered abroad" had gone thither seeking shelter. In whatever way the gospel may have been carried thither, it is probable that the Christians were considerably numerous. Had it not been so, Damascus would not have been a field of operation sufficiently extensive, for such an enterprising character as Saul.

The reason for his applying to the high priest for letters to the synagogues at Damascus was this. In all the provinces of the Roman empire, the Jews were governed by a senate of their own, and had a chief magistrate elected by themselves, who presided over it. Though living in foreign countries, the Jews were permitted to live according to their own customs so far as could be done out of Judea. "The high-priest and elders at Jerusalem, were regarded by all the Jews as the interpreters and administrators of the law, and the foreign Jews considered themselves as actually under their jurisdiction. In all countries they implicitly obeyed the mandates sent them from the council at Jerusalem; just as, in after-times, the clergy of the Romish communion in every country of Europe, obeyed implicitly the mandates of the Pope and conclave at Rome."* A commission from the high-priest would secure to Paul the ready and willing assistance of all the Jews of Damascus.

* McKnight's Life of the Apostle Paul.

Paul's design appears not to have been kept a secret. Christians had heard by many, that Paul had authority from the chief priests to bind all who called on the name of Jesus, at Damascus; and it may well be supposed, that the Christians were greatly alarmed at the report of his visit.

2. Armed with authority from the high-priest, Paul was hastening to Damascus, accompanied by assistants "equally bigoted and furious with himself," bent on searching out every christian and dragging him to Jerusalem. He was now near the city, and we may well suppose that that harshness of character, those turbulent impulses that hurried him on, were now in a state of high excitement; when all at once, his progress was arrested and his whole character and purposes changed. At mid-day, a light above the brightness of the sun shone round about him and them that journeyed with him. "From fear or reverence" they all fell to the earth. From "the excellent glory" there came a voice to his ear and to his heart, saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me."—Amazed and trembling Saul said "who art thou Lord?" the speaker replied, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," i. e. thou wilt find it hard for thee to accomplish thy malicious designs against me. "Rise and stand upon thy feet." (Acts 26: 16.) Saul rose and beheld before him, the despised Nazarene clothed with a light of inexpressible brightness. What astonishment would he experience at seeing arrayed in light and glory, him whom he hated and scorned. What agony, what heart-rending penitence, what self-condemnation, would pierce his soul! and deeper would these sink, when on the countenance of him whom he had persecuted he saw the beamings of grace and love. Unable to endure the glory with which Jesus was clothed and the agitation of his own feelings, he sunk again to the earth, and from a soul now convinced of its guilt and deeply penitent, he cried "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord said to him, "I have appeared to thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles to whom I now send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified through faith that is in me." (Acts 26: 16, 17, 18.) "Arise, go unto Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do." Acts 22: 10. "The men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice but seeing no man. And when Saul arose from the earth, he was blind: and they led him by the hand, and brought him unto Damascus, (Acts 9: 7, 8,) and lodged him in the house of one Judas."

Leaving him there, we shall pause to study the wonderful change effected in this extraordinary man. "This character, qualified for

great things, but not master of himself from excess of internal power, was an extreme of human dispositions, and, according to the natural course, was prone to absolute extremities. His religion was a destructive zeal, his anger was fierceness, his fury required victims. A ferocity so boisterous did not qualify him for a Christian, nor for a philanthropist, and not at all for a quietly enduring man. He, nevertheless, became all this on his conversion to Christianity, and each bursting emotion of his mind subsided directly with a well regulated and noble character.

Formerly hasty and irritable, now only spirited and resolved; formerly violent, now full of energy and enterprising: once ungovernably refractory against every thing which obstructed him, now only persevering: once cruel now only severe: once a harsh zealot, now fearing God: formerly unrelenting, deaf to sympathy and commiseration, now himself acquainted with the tears which he had seen without effect in others; now well-meaning, compassionate, sympathizing, tender hearted; yet never weak, always great; in the midst of sadness and sorrow, manly and noble. So he showed himself at his deeply moving departure from Miletus. It is like the departure of Moses, like the resignation of Samuel, sincere and heart-felt, full of self-recollection, and in the midst of pain full of dignity.

Thus his mind not only received a different impulse, and his constantly excited irritability not only a different point of action, but his untamed disposition was so brought to a state of equability in all its inclinations and passions, that his great powers became harmoniously blended in a new tone of mind, from the accordance of which his elevated character springs forth.*

It is of importance to state here, that at the time when the Lord bade Saul stand upon his feet, he saw Jesus with his bodily eyes. In proof of this the following passages may be quoted. When Ananias went to remove his blindness, he said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me." Acts 9: 17. Still more distinctly does Paul state what Ananias said to him, "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth." Acts 22: 14. It is stated yet more distinctly by Barnabas when he introduced Paul to the Apostles at Jerusalem; "he declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him." Acts 9: 27.) Paul affirms twice that he saw Jesus with the eyes of his body. "Am I not an Apostle?—Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord." 1 Cor, 11: 1.—"Last of all he was seen of me also." 1 Cor. 15: 8. These passages affirm the fact without specifying the time; but when taken in connexion with those quoted above, no doubt

*Hug's Introduction to the writings of the New Testament, vol. ii. 3336, 39

can remain that they refer to his seeing the Just One on his way to Damascus. The opinion that he saw Jesus when in a trance in the temple, or when caught up into the third heavens, is untenable. "On neither of these occasions did Paul see Jesus with his bodily eyes; the impression at these times, having been made upon his mind by the power of Christ, and not by means of his external senses." *

The point is a material one. An Apostle was chosen to be a witness of the resurrection of Christ. That Paul, therefore, might be an Apostle, it was necessary that he should see Christ after his resurrection, that he might be qualified to testify that he had risen from the dead according to the Scriptures.

3. While Paul was in the house of Judas he seems to have been in a state of great distress of mind. This may be gathered from two circumstances recorded by Luke; "For three days he neither did eat nor drink," and,—“behold he prayeth.” During these three days he had much to think of; but all his thoughts would be absorbed in the consciousness of his enormous guilt in having persecuted Jesus and his friends. After having seen him in his glory, how deeply criminal would seem to him the part he had acted! He might call to mind the words of Job. (42 : 6.) “Mine eye hath seen thee, wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.” The blasphemous words he had spoken against Jesus would burn in his memory, when he thought of the grace and mercy that shone in the face of the Saviour, when he told him, that he had chosen him to be his messenger to bring the Gentiles to God that they might receive the forgiveness of sins.

He would now think of Stephen, and would comprehend the extacy of that holy man when, the heavens being opened, he saw that same Jesus standing on the right hand of God : and would think with deep shame, how he ran upon him, along with his party and while they stoned him till he died, he held their clothes.

The cruel treatment he had given to the Christians in Jerusalem—the parents torn from their children and the children from their parents—the gloom of their prisons—the mockery of their trials—their agonies as they were put to death, and their meekness and patience and animating hope would rush into his thoughts like torrents of fire : and ever and anon he would prostrate himself before God, confessing his guilt and crying for mercy—and then again adoring and admiring the grace and love of God that had saved him from the doom he merited. Who can describe the throes of such a mind as Paul's when torn with penitential feelings ; or the sublimity of his joy when awakened by the love of God to him a chief among sinners ?

It is singularly remarkable, that those great minds employed to act an important part in the church, whose zeal and piety were to give an

* McKnight's Life of the Apostle Paul.

impulse which was to be felt by coming ages, have all had to pass through stages of great mental excitement. Of this, besides Paul, our blessed Lord, Elijah, and Luther, and Zwingli, are well known examples.

4. God will not leave his people to mourn. When he bows down, it is that he may lift up. When he bruises, it is that he may heal. While Paul was thus left to the tumult of his own thoughts, he saw in a vision, Ananias coming in, laying his hands upon him and speaking to him the words of comfort. A corresponding vision had been given to Ananias, who though at first alarmed at the thought of meeting Saul, yet obeyed the heavenly commission and went his way, "and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him, said, (and the language sounds strange) *Brother Saul*, the Lord hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight." Immediately the scales fell from his eyes,—he stood up and was baptized,—and he was filled with the Holy Ghost.

What a change! He who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will had met him and he became a new creature, All old things passed away and all things became new.

5. And now Saul associates with the disciples whom he came to drag to prison and judgment. How interesting to see this once haughty and dreaded man sitting amongst those who had trembled at the report of his visit to Damascus! He heard them talk of a Saviour's love—of the rich consolations of his word—of the blessed hopes which lay before them in a land of pure delight. He saw how the mysterious love of the Saviour bound them in bands of strong affection. All this was new to Saul, but all this was deeply interesting. He was now pushed out of that path which he once fondly hoped would lead him to emolument and honor. A new course was marked out for him, and new companions for his journey. And from this time, none so low in life whom he would not serve and love as a brother, if he belonged to the fellowship of the Gospel.—Saul is among the disciples.

6. But he was not a man to conceal the treasure he had found.—Straightway he preached in the synagogues, and it was soon felt that no ordinary man was among them. He confounded the Jews who dwelt at Damascus, proving that Jesus of Nazareth was the true Messiah. His previous life and studies made him perfectly acquainted with all that the Jews could urge against Christ, and his experience of what had befallen him in the way, qualified him to refute every objection which they could offer.

The amazement of the people was unbounded. "Is not this, said they, he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent that he might bring them bound to the chief priests?"

HISTORICAL AND PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

OF THE HOLY LAND.

No. I.

MANY may read the scriptures; they may read of countries, of tribes, of individuals and of transactions, and yet remain, all but entirely ignorant, of the knowledge necessary for enabling them to understand what they read. Many from carelessness never wish to be better informed, and others are precluded from knowledge by their circumstances. Amid all the knowledge that is pouring in on man the fact remains, inconsistent as it may seem, and injurious as it is, that christians are less informed on the facts connected with their religion than any other body of men associated together to prosecute any investigation, or to maintain any principle. The time was when the people could not get instruction—but that time is gone by,—and knowledge is now, with its thousand tongues, raising a cry for deliverance from every bondage, that she may fly swiftly bestowing her bounties and her blessings on a world ignorant of itself; that she may tell man of the vast resources which are to be found in the past, and of the deep mines of intellectual wealth which have been hitherto unknown and unexplored.

History is one of the Bible's handmaidens, and without some knowledge of it, much that is in the Bible must be to many as a sealed book, though a man should read its pages every day and meditate on the contents every night. He may read, but were the question put to him, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" he would be compelled to reply in the words of the Eunuch of Ethiopia, "How can I, except some man should guide me?" Believing then, that the Bible contains a subject the most important and serious for man's study, it is the object in this, and the following articles on the Geography of the Holy Land to give information, and arrange Scripture statements in such a manner, that this department of Scripture knowledge may be better understood, by those at least, who have not access to the works written on the subject, or by those who have not studied the Bible so accurately as to be able, in many instances, to illustrate one passage by another, or bring geographical facts to illustrate scripture statements.

The country called the Holy Land has been variously named in different ages, and these names have been given either from some tribe, or from some of the remarkable circumstances connected with it. In Scripture we find it called "The Land" by way of eminence. The Jews were exceedingly attached to it, and it was the scene of many remarkable events in their history, and therefore it was above every other part of the earth, *their* land, The Land.

It has been called the Land of Canaan. This was the most ancient name given to the whole country. In the IX. chap. of Genesis we see that Noah called his second son Ham, sometimes by the name Canaan, in reference it is to be presumed, to the numerous tribes which were to spring from him; but properly the name is derived from Canaan the grandson of Noah, and youngest son of Ham; who after the confusion of Babel settled there and divided the country among his three children, the descendants of whom became large families, then separate tribes, and ultimately distinct nations. There was one tribe at the time of Moses and Joshua called the Canaanites, but when we read of this country called by this name we are not to suppose that it all belonged to one nation. Before their overthrow, these descendants of Ham were widely distinct, the tribes had broken the bonds of affinity, and were entirely dependant on their own resources as petty kingdoms, or chief-tancies. We may illustrate them by our Indians. In all likelihood the Indians of this northern continent were from one common origin, but as the families increased, they divided; some one or two families sought for a new hunting ground, they increased, they became a tribe, and they gave themselves, or got from others, a new name; and no more were the Canaanites one tribe than the Indians, now, Canaan, means properly a level or low country, being situated along the coast, in opposition to Syria, a high country.

It is called the "Land of Promise," from the promise God made to Abraham when he was passing through it, that his posterity should yet possess it, and as his descendants were also called Hebrews, it got the name of the "Land of the Hebrews." It is called the "Land of Judah." When this name was first given it referred solely to the part allotted to, and occupied by the tribe of Judah, but afterwards the whole land went by this name on account of the pre-eminence of that tribe over the others. In the last benediction of Jacob, Judah was constituted superior to his brethren, and in the march they had the first place, and at the division of the country they had the largest territory. When the ten tribes separated, the land of Judah and Benjamin were formed into a separate dominion, and called the land, or kingdom of Judah, or as we find it called in the New Testament, Judea. This name it retained as a province, while under the Romans.

It is called the "Land of Israel" from the descendants of Jacob, or as he was afterwards called, Israel. This name when used embraces the whole country on each side of the Jordan, and contained all the places visited by our Lord, with the exception of Egypt.

It is called the "Holy Land." This is the familiar name by which it is known in our day by all Christians. The reason why it has this name must be obvious. It was there God chose the seat for his worship, he, in a peculiar manner consecrated it by his presence. "In Zion he had his tabernacle, and he had his seat in Israel." Thither he sent his

son Jesus Christ, there he wrought his miracles, there he preached, there he suffered and died. There, the holy Patriarchs lived, there the Prophets taught, and there the Apostles began their labors. There Christianity had her birthplace, where she struggled, and where she grew : Thither again will the ancient people of the Lord return with songs ; and thence shall yet come the clearest evidences of the truth of divine revelation. For these reasons it may be justly called the Holy Land, but we have authority in Scripture for the name. After the Babylonian captivity Zachariah applies it thus : Zach. II. 12 ; "The Lord shall inherit Judah, his portion in the *holy land*." After this it appears to have been a common name, and is to be met in ancient history, and in some of the Apocryphal books. The Jews divided the whole world into two parts. The "Land of Israel" and the "Land of the Gentiles." All except their own land they considered unclean ; but there were portions of their own land which they esteemed as having more than ordinary sanctity. The parts beyond Jordan, "In the way of the Gentiles" were less holy than those on the other side. Walled towns were more holy than villages, because no leper was allowed to enter, or to dwell among them, neither did they allow the dead to be buried within the gates. They supposed that neither the Shechinah nor Sacred Spirit dwelt even on a prophet out of this land. The Rabbins (those who were skilled in the law and traditions) divided Canaan into three countries. Judea, the region beyond Jordan, and Galilee ; thus excluding Samaria, which they considered unclean by reason of its inhabitants ; because, though Jews, they had departed from the Jewish worship, and intermixed with the Gentiles from Assyria. They carried their ideas of purity to an extreme length. The very dust of their land was dear to them, and they determined that the dust of the Gentiles or neighboring countries should not pollute it. When any of them returned from a heathen country, they halted at the boundaries and wiped the dust off their feet. They even carried this so far, that they would not allow shrubs, or herbs, to be brought from other lands, lest any earth should remain on the roots, and thus pollute their holy inheritance. It was likely to this custom that our Lord referred in Mat. X. 13, when the disciples in leaving any house or city where they were not received, should wipe the dust from their feet as a testimony that they regarded them as heathens, (even though they were Jews) rather than the people of God. In reference to this distinction between holy and unholy places, and people, it is likely the Apostle refers in I. Cor : I. 28. It is remarkable that when they were so zealous for the purity of their land, they were not very zealous for the purity of their ordinances ; but it is not uncommon to find many now, stoutly defending the customs and forms of the church, and yet indifferent about religion in the heart ; brushing the outside of the tabernacle, but never going within.

The last name by which it is called is *Palestine*. The whole land appears to have gone by this name in the time of Moses, for in the XV. chap. of *Exodus* when the Israelites were praising God for their deliverance from Egypt, they referred to what would be accomplished, "sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of *Palestine*." *Palestine* means a stripe of land, and this was fact, for the land of the Philistines, or the Palestines, which it originally refers to, was about sixty miles long, and from fifteen to twenty miles broad. Its name is derived from the Philistines, descendants of Mizraim, second son of Ham, who came from Egypt and settled here on the shore of the Mediterranean; expelled the inhabitants, and became so powerful as to give their name to the whole country, though in reality they possessed only a small tract.

The extent of the country. To speak in general terms, the boundaries were, on the west, the Mediterranean, or as it is rendered in scripture, "the great sea," on the east, Arabia; on the north, Syria; on the south, the desert of Sin, and Egypt. Its extent has been variously estimated by travellers. Some say that it does not exceed 170, or 180 miles in length, (from north to south) and about 140 miles in breadth; and at the south part, only about 70 miles. From the latest accounts it would appear that it was 200 miles in length, by 80 in breadth; and where it widens or narrows, 15 miles more or less. Perhaps it may be better to compare it with some country with which we are acquainted. Scotland for instance is 80 miles longer, and 30 miles broader. Ireland is 90 miles longer and 50 miles broader. Or let us compare it with a part of this country. Suppose Lake Erie to be the Mediterranean, or "Great Sea." If we make that the base, we will have nearly its dimensions and shape, by drawing a line from the head of the Niagara river to Amherstburg, thence to Goderich, then to the township of Caledon, thence to the head of the Niagara river. The country of the Philistines lay, as we may suppose a tract 60 miles long and 15 miles broad along Lake Erie shore from the eastern point westward. When we compare it thus, it is but as a fraction of this country. The population of this country, not including the different tribes which were to be expelled, must have been immense. We are told that the number, among whom the land was to be divided, was six hundred and one thousand, seven hundred and thirty, and these were numbered from twenty years old and upwards, and the strong, almost certain probability is, that that number only included males; so that the women from that age and upwards would exceed the males; to these we must add all below twenty years of age, to these again we must add the Levites who were not included in the census of the tribes, because they had no inheritance. Their number was twenty-three thousand—all males from a month old and upwards. The proportion of females among these again has to be added; so that their number when they entered Canaan would be upwards of two millions inclu-

ding women and children. In the covenant which God made with Abraham the original grant of land was, as recorded in Gen. XV. 18, "from the river of Egypt, unto the great river, the river Euphrates." It is unnecessary to describe minutely the boundaries as mentioned by Moses. It may be remarked, however, that there is a mistake in our English translation. It is said, "and this shall be your north border, from the great sea you shall point out for you, *Mount Hor*," but literally it is *Hor, ha, hor*, thus distinguishing it from Mount Hor which was on the southern frontier. That mount hor-ha-hor means the "dereble mountain," or as the Septuagint renders it; the "mountain beside the mountain," or as we now call it, Mount Lebanon, which was the northern boundary and divided it from Syria. This "double mountain," consists of two great parallel ranges, running from Sidon to Damascus, and called Libanus and anti Libanus, or commonly speaking, the mountains of Lebanon. In the XXXIV chap. of Numbers, Moses describes its full extent, but the Israelites did not get immediate possession of all this. In their first expedition under Joshua they subdued the south, and in their second expedition they subdued the north. These expeditions took five years, but though they subdued the whole, they were not able to drive the remnants of the tribes from the land. It was not until the time of David that they were fully masters of the land, and it was not until the time of Solomon that the promise of God to Abraham was fully realised. According to modern names this may be its boundaries. On the west through its whole extent, it is bounded by the Mediterranean, on the east by the Euphrates, dividing it from Persia, on the south, by Arabia Petrea, and the river of Egypt; and on the north by the mountains of Lebanon, at the extreme south was Beersheba, at the extreme north was Dan, and hence we find the expression, "from Dan to Beersheba," which means, the extreme length of the land. The "river of Egypt" spoken of as a boundary is not the Nile as many suppose, but the Sichor, a river much farther to the north, were it the Nile then the Israelites would have been in Canaan while captives in Egypt, for Goshen where they dwelt was to the east of the Nile. The distance from the Red Sea, to the nearest part of the promised land was about 300 miles.

R——T.

MORALS OF UNIVERSALISTS.

Matthew Hale Smith, for twelve years one of this sect, says:—

Among these who composed the societies of Universalists, I have ever found a general dislike to religious duties and serious things. This seemed to be the uniting bond. To cast off fear and to restrain prayer.

was the great thing to be gained by a profession of Universalism. In the congregations with which I have had an acquaintance, I never found a family that observed the reading of the Bible as an act of devotion, or had regular family worship. And I have never found settled religious principle among those calling themselves Universalists. Not only have I never found devout reverence springing from the system, but none can live in it. I have observed it a fact invariably occurring, that, when a Universalist becomes serious and thoughtful he will at once leave the Universalist meeting. And when a pious man embraces that system, he will abandon his habits of devotion in changing his faith. Men peculiar for their habits of private and family prayer, and for a serious study of the Bible, if they embrace Universalism, become at once as peculiar for the neglect of these religious duties.

The great purpose of those who unite in Universalist societies, is not to make themselves better, and to throw around themselves new restraints; it is not that the Sabbath may be the better observed, and men reformed, and made holy. But the great purpose is to put down Orthodoxy. All preaching that gives satisfaction tends to this, and all effort is directed to this point. If a minister, in place of preaching against religion, preaches against the sins of his people, he is at once censured as having "travelled out of the record."

Few make the daily reading of the Bible their dependence; few rely on its teachings for the support of Universalism. All its believers place great reliance upon the periodicals devoted to Universalism to defend the system, and to explain away difficult texts. I have long been of opinion, that no people, not even the Catholics, take their opinions so much upon trust as do the Universalists. Every where I have found a looseness of principle, or a disposition to ridicule serious things, that shocked my mind. Men seemed to value Universalism for the license it gave; for its power to cast off restraint, and remove from the conscience the sanctions of religion. When settled in Salem, I once attempted to persuade a member of my congregation to join the church. He declined. I urged him to do so, on the ground that for many years he had been a professed Universalist, and, as such, believed that all had a right to commune. His reply was emphatic: "For me to join your church would be carrying the joke a little too far!"

The fact that many of my ministerial associates professed to have little confidence in the truth of the system, or in its good moral tendency, was another source of difficulty. In private and social meetings, ministers do confess to each other that there are objections to Universalism that they cannot remove. I have heard old men point out the sophistry of an argument used in defence of the system by a young man, and then employ the same argument, when preaching on the same subject.

Often have I heard a zealous Universalist say, "Our Orthodox friends do not know our weak points so well as we know them ourselves."

Among them also was a great deal of skepticism. Some denied the existence of angels: some a future life. Others rejected a part of the Old Testament and a part of the New. The idea that God answers prayer was scoffed at. Many observed the form in public service, because it was common so to do; while all admitted that it was the most difficult part of the exercises. A student of Universalist divinity was asked by his father, who was a Christian, if he prayed. His reply was, "No sir, not yet. I shall begin to preach soon; and then, I suppose, I must come to it."

Many preachers, those the most popular, allow that they preach for money; and that, unless well paid, they would not preach at all. A near relation of mine, a Universalist minister, has confessed to me that he preached for his bread; that his preaching did not reform men, neither did he expect it would; that he was well paid for his preaching, and sometimes his hearers were pleased, and sometimes they were offended, and swore. But they paid him promptly, and the rest was their concern.

Among no body of men can be found, I presume, so much ill-will, jealousy, and bad feeling, as may be found among the advocates of Universalism. They profess great love for all men; and for each other, in a special manner. But it is needful to go behind the curtain, to become familiar with the character of this good-will which preachers bear to each other, and of the brotherly love found in their borders.

Although associated with them twelve years, I never heard the subject of personal religion introduced in a meeting of Universalist teachers as a theme of conversation, or any topic designed to improve the understanding or mend the heart. But impure and indecent jests, low and offensive stories, remarks that would rule a man out of any respectable drawing-room in the country, together with petty scandal, and criticism of no friendly character upon some absent brother, make up the conversation of Universalist preachers when in company with each other. Some few of us used to regret this state of things and talk of it. But any attempt to check it would only have brought us under the suspicion of all who were engaged in it.—*New York Observer.*

Baptismal Regeneration.

We have no doubt that many delusions still exist, through the old leaven of past ages, in reference to the efficacious grace of the sacraments. It is an essential heresy of the Papists, and it has always been opposed, as the cardinal error of the Anglican Prelatists. One of the insuperable barriers to the coalition of the original Puritans and their Non-conformist successors with the Prelatical State Church, which boasts to be the suc-

cessor of the prior Romish Hierarchy, is this, that in the baptismal ordinance, the English Prelates and their subordinate Priests do boast, that by virtue of Baptism, administered by them and the Jesuitical Priests of Rome, the subject, whether an adult or an infant, is made a partaker of all the benefits of the new covenant; and that the privileges thus conveyed are irrevocable and inalienable, insuring them the title of Christian adoption here, and the reversionary inheritance among the sanctified. The evangelical party, so named—Romaine, Beveridge, Newton, Vena, Top-lady, Haweis, Simeon and Scott, with their consociates, always denied that dogma, and strove to demonstrate, that the Liturgy did not convey Anti-Christian principle. But it has ever been conceded, that the maintainers of that heresy were most consistent with their Prayer Book. Whether those dead worthies are exonerated from all participation in that “strong delusion,” is of no importance—but that the present combatants on behalf of semi-Romanism, or whole Popery disguised, defend that soul-destroying fallacy, is manifest, from the formal declaration of the New York Churchman of September 17, 1842. The editor expressly affirms, “We hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. *The baptised infant with us is a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven!* This is made by a sacrament! a mysterious and inscrutable means of conveying God’s grace, the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit. This is no figure, no rare symbol, no signifying that which may be or may be not—but a saving ordinance, a reality ten-fold more real than any phenomenon that is presented to us either in time, or yet in space.”—*Christian Intelligencer*.

The Established Church in Glasgow.

In Glasgow, overtrading has shown itself fully as much in Church-extension as in any other line. St. Ann’s parish church, after being tenanted for some time by the Chartists, has now passed into the hands of the Socialists.

Return of let and unlet seats in the ten city churches, June, 1842 :

Seats let,	6,684
Unlet,	5,938
	12,622

Unlet seats in different years—1837, 3,692; 1838, 3,929; 1839, 4,261; 1840, 4,829; 1841, 4,605; 1842, 5,933.

The above return shows that the number of unlet seats in the city churches is still on the increase, and that the attempt to stem the current by a reduction in the rents has proved a total failure. No exertions have been spared to increase the number of adherents to the Established Church—rents have been reduced to an exceedingly low point—expenses for

heating apparatus, painting, and other means of adding to the comforts of sitters, have been accumulated—the pulpits have been, with only two exceptions, filled with non-intrusion ministers. All, however, would not do; and year after year, we find a regular falling off going on, until the consequences threaten to become of a most serious nature to the funds of the corporation. The church-building spirit, which, it was hoped, would crush Dissent, has recoiled upon the heads of its projectors, who, besides thinning the pews of the city churches, find themselves encumbered with a number of fabrics, which cause them no slight trouble. St. Ann's parish church, after being tenanted for a time by the Chartists, has now passed into the hands of the Socialists. Dr. Chalmers's church, as we learn from the proceedings at the last meeting of the Presbytery, has now been vacant for ten months, and no steps have been taken for the appointment of a minister; and, in the case of another vacant charge, we have heard of certain curious negotiations with the congregation, to which we may, perhaps, at a future time, direct attention. These are somewhat ominous symptoms, when viewed in connexion with the decline in the city churches, and will probably induce our church-builders to consider whether, after all, it may not be better to find occupants for the vacant pews now at their disposal, previous to erecting additional unnecessary fabrics. Nearly one half of the sittings in the corporation churches are at present standing empty.—*Glasgow Argus.*

Puseyism in India.

The India papers state, that the Secretary of the High School, Calcutta, has been dismissed from his office by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese for entertaining Puseyite opinions. Much injury has been done to the cause of Christianity in India by the introduction of the Puseyite perversions.

Presbyterial Notices.

REV. D. COUTTS admitted a member of Presbytery.

At a meeting of the Gore Committee of the Missionary Presbytery of the Canadas, held in West Flamboro', in October last, the Rev. David Coutts, of Esquesing, being present, intimated his desire to be connected with the Missionary Presbytery. The Committee knowing that Mr. Coutts was licensed by the United Associate Secession Church, and being satisfied that he approves of her principles, and also with the manner in which he has acted, agreed, unanimously, to receive him.

Shortly after, at a meeting of his Congregation held in Esquesing, the majority of his people who were then present, resolved to adhere to him

as their Minister, and to consider themselves as being connected with the Missionary Presbytery.

An event of this kind is to be classed amongst those things that do good. Few things are more fitted to injure the interests of truth, and to give her enemies ground for rejoicing, than the keeping up of unnecessary divisions.

Ordinations.

ST. CATHERINES. On Wednesday, the 7th December, the Gore Committee of the Missionary Presbytery, met by appointment, in St. Catharines, for the purpose of setting apart Mr. John Porteous to the pastoral care of the United Secession Congregation in St. Catharines.

The Rev. James Roy, St. George, East Dumfries, commenced the services, and preached a most appropriate sermon from 2 Cor. vi. 1, "We then as workers together with him beseech you :—" in which, besides many important and impressive matters, he depicted in forcible language the arduous nature of the duties of the pastoral office. The Rev. Mr. Ritchie, West Dumfries, who presided on the occasion narrated the steps which had been taken by the Congregation and Presbytery—put to Mr. Porteous the questions of the Formula, and after receiving satisfactory answers, set him apart by prayer and the imposition of hands to the office of the Ministry, and to the pastoral inspection of the Congregation of St. Catharines. Mr. Ritchie then addressed Mr. Porteous and the congregation in a masterly style.

Mr. Porteous has been set down in a very destitute district, and it is hoped, by the blessing of God accompanying his labours, that he may be the means of doing much good.

ERAMOSA. On Wednesday, January 4th, the Gore Committee of the Missionary Presbytery met at Eramosa, and set apart Mr. Wm. Barrie to the pastoral inspection of the United Secession Congregation there. The Rev. D. Coutts, of Esquesing, preached an excellent and appropriate sermon from 2 Thes. iii. 1. The Rev. James Roy, who presided, narrated the steps taken by the Congregation and Committee in regard to Mr. Barrie's settlement; after which he proposed the usual questions to Mr. Barrie, and then by prayer and the imposition of hands, set him apart to the office of the holy ministry and the pastoral charge of the congregation. Mr. Roy then gave the charge to Mr. Barrie and the Congregation in his usual clear, forcible and pointed manner. The audience was large and seemed deeply impressed.

On the day following, the Committee inducted Mr. Barrie to the pastoral charge of the United Secession Congregation in the Irvine Settlement, township of Nichol. The Rev. Mr. Ritchie, of West Dumfries, preached an excellent sermon from Luke 14 : 23, "Compel to come in." Mr. Roy again put the questions of the Formula to Mr. Barrie, offered up the induction prayer, and gave a solemn and impressive charge to

him and the congregation. The services seemed to produce a deep impression.

Mr. Barrie enters upon a very extensive and interesting field of missionary labour; and it is devoutly hoped that, by the blessing of God, his services in the gospel of the grace of God may be crowned with abundant success.

Poetry.

Verses composed by Zwingle when sick of the Plague.

AT THE BEGINNING OF HIS SICKNESS.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1.
Lo! at my door,
Gaunt death I spy;
Hear, Lord of life,
Thy creature cry!</p> | <p>3.
Yet, if to quench
My sun at noon
Be thy behest,
Thy will be done.</p> |
| <p>2.
The arm that hung
Upon the tree,
Jesus, uplift—
And rescue me.</p> | <p>4.
In faith and hope
Earth I resign,
So cure of Heaven—
For I am thine!</p> |

WHEN HIS SICKNESS WAS AT THE HEIGHT.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1.
Fierce grow my pains:
Help, Lord, in haste!
For flesh and heart
Are failing fast.</p> | <p>3.
In Satan's grasp
Hell's dark brink
My spirit reels—
Ah, must I sink?</p> |
| <p>2.
Clouds wrap my sight
My tongue is dumb,
Lord, tarry not,
The hour is come!</p> | <p>4.
No, Jesus, no!
Him I defy,
While here beneath
Thy cross I lie.</p> |

WHEN HE HAD RECOVERED.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1.
My father God,
Behold me whole!
Again on earth
A living soul!</p> | <p>3.
Though now delayed,
My hour must come,
Involved, perchance,
In deeper gloom.</p> |
| <p>2.
Let sin no more
My heart annoy,
But fill it, Lord,
With holy joy.</p> | <p>4.
It matters not;
Rejoicing yet
I'll bear my yoke
To Heaven's bright gates.</p> |