

The Christadelphian Lamp

"Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" - Ps. cxix., 105.

Vol. 2.

MARCH, 1875.

No. 5.

CONTENTS

Page 2.	A Treatise on The Two Sons of God	Editor
Page 4.	A Word of Wisdom	A Brother
Page 4.	Carnal and Spiritual	
Page 5.	The Temptation of Jesus Christ	
Page 5.	Man's Relation to Sin	
Page 6.	The Reason Why Jesus had to offer for Himself	Bro. William Ellis
Page 6.	Assyria and Mesopotamia	Gleaner
Page 8.	Christ and Melchisedec	"Quiver"
Page 10.	Energy	Editor
Page 12.	Bible Emblems No. IV – Natural Picture. Spiritual Picture.	
Page 13.	What is the True Age of The World?	J.C.
Page 14.	The Fighting Capacity of Russia	"Gentleman's Magazine"
Page 15.	Protestant Churches in Rome	
Page 16.	Observations on Mark IV. 11, and 12	The Christian Observer
Page 18.	The Destroyer of The Devil	Bro. William Ellis
Page 18.	Pharaoh's Heart	Chicago Evening Journal
Page 19.	Mr T Brassy, M.P. on Turkey	
Page 21.	Israel	Gleaner
Page 21.	A Plague	
Page 22.	Elijah and The Priests of Baal	- Croly - Gleaner
Page 22.	The Suez Canal and The Bitter Lakes	Good Words.
Page 23.	The land of Moab	Gleaner
Page 25.	Enoch	M. W. Strang
Page 25.	Children's Columns	
Page 27.	The Signs of The Times	Bro. S. G. Hayes
Page 29.	On The End of The World	Editor
Page 31.	Part of an Extract written by Calvin on The Bible	
Page 31.	The Government of the Tongue	The Christians Pathway of Power
Page 32.	Letters to The Editor	
Page 33.	The Father and The \son	Bro. W. D. Jardine
Page 35.	Review	
Page 35.	Virtue Without Fear	Epictitus
Page 35.	Extract	Talmud
Page 35.	Intelligence	

"I beseech you remember it is an article of your Church covenant that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written Word of God. Remember that, and every other article of your sacred covenant. But I must here withal exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth; examine it, consider it, and compare it with other scriptures of truth, before you receive it, for it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-Christian darkness and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once." – Rev. J Robinson

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." - 1 Thessalonians 5:21

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

(Continued from February page 5)

CHAP. XIII. - THE OLD MILLENIUM.

THE OLD NAME.

FROM the day that Moses stood before the burning bush on “the mountain of God” to that day on which Nebuchadnezzar put out the eyes of Zedekiah was nine hundred and forty-three years, if the generally received chronology be correct. The period is so near upon a thousand years that we have styled it a millennium. Jeshurun was toiling in “hard bondage” in the heavy clay on the banks of the Nile, and over him stood the rigorous “task-master” with his stick, urging the completion of the appointed “tale.” Moses, away in the desert, stood trembling with wonder, “afraid to look upon God,” yet anxious to see why “the bush was not consumed.”

Such were the elements out of which was elaborated the most splendid kingdom under the whole heaven. And of this kingdom we can say what cannot be said of any other, namely, it was a great prophecy as well as a grand historical fact. Moses found it as hard to consolidate this human clay into a political constitution as the Israelites did to mould the natural clay of Egypt into bricks, which clay often required a mixture of straw to give it the proper consistence.

The kingdom passed through an experience more or less common to other kingdoms. From barbarism to conquest, from conquest to untold wealth; then came internal discord, faithlessness of treaties with neighbouring powers; decline, invasion, and overthrow. So far all seems in accordance with the ordinary course of events. But the kingdom was founded on a divine promise, and we may still trace the letters of that promise upon those parts of the mighty wreck which time has cast upon our shores. Differing from all other nations in religion, Israel was monotheistic in worship; and for her one God she claimed greater power than was possessed by all the vaunted gods of the nations round about. Her faith in this respect rested on facts seen with her own eyes, but when their repetition ceased for any considerable period, the remembrance of those things on which her confidence was built quickly faded. Hence she may be truly said to have walked by sight, and not by faith. In this millennium we behold the kingdom of God historically displayed. God Himself governed the affairs of His own kingdom; for although Moses is spoken of as “king in Jeshurun,” this was not to the exclusion of Jehovah, nor was Moses king in the modern acceptance of the word. We know him as Moses, “the servant of God.” We regard him as the visible administrator of the Divine will; but acting in no way as if the kingdom appertained to himself. Moses represents the era of legislation, or law-making; hence he is commonly referred to as the law-giver. He belonged more especially to the foundational period of the kingdom, while his successor, Joshua, is the great representative of conquest.

When the time came for God to establish His kingdom on the earth, the territory on which He had determined to erect it was occupied by strong and numerous idolatrous nations; and we are told that the primary reason of their removal was their abominable practices. So that God did not deal harshly or arbitrarily in setting up His kingdom in the land of Palestine, but He took advantage of the opportunity thus afforded for making room for His own government. No person who is ignorant of the history of Israel can form just ideas concerning the kingdom of God, for, apart from that history there is neither reality in relation to the past, nor certainty as respects the future. The period of the Judges who succeeded Joshua was the time of teaching and consolidation in Divine law. But the nation grew tired of this simplicity and dependence upon an invisible Ruler; and in the days of the prophet Samuel “asked a king like unto the nations round about.” This provoked the displeasure of the Almighty, “who was their king.” It was equivalent to rebellion and deposition, had deposition been possible. Nevertheless, God permitted it, commanding the grieved and protesting prophet to listen to the nation’s desire. But God retained the priority. He selected Saul, and after him David, and for ever established the royalty in David’s family. When we come to the reign of Solomon, we have the plain declaration that “Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord.” This makes David’s throne the throne of Jehovah. All thrones are, indeed, His; and heaven is called His throne, but not in that particular sense in which He claims the throne of David.

Solomon stands before us as the builder of the Temple of God, where, from between the wings of the cherubim, the Deity uttered His voice; “dwelling,” though invisible, “with men.” During this era, the kingdom of God enjoyed great prosperity and peace; the period, as well as the king, is usually considered

typical of a time when it will be said "a greater than Solomon is here." Then we have the division of the kingdom of God into two hostile branches, followed by the Assyrian invasion, and the carrying away of the Ten Tribes, of whom there has yet been no return. Judah's captivity came next, and, strictly speaking, the kingdom of God retained after that downfall no proper existence. The subsequent period of five hundred years was one of "overturning," until settled desolation set in like a long dark winter's night, which, after the lapse of nearly two thousand years, is only faintly relieved by a glimmer of dawn - happy herald of the rising sun. Israel's sun went down blood-red, in a dark and angry sky, leaving behind a mass or inky clouds unlit by a solitary star. But, hark! The murmuring voice of the returning waters breaks upon the ear. The sound comes creeping, like the tide, rustling, and sighing as it lifts and sways the sea weed-beds, and climbs among the giant rocks. Yes, Israel lives, though scattered, and He who scattered will surely gather.

The kingdom of God in the past exhibits nothing akin to the fancies of millions concerning a kingdom of God in the present, or even in the future, it was not some undefined, unsubstantial sacred thing, veiled in flimsy drapery and dreamy adoration. No: it was a politico-religious constitution, comprising millions of human beings, a fine army; a noble hierarchy, a splendid temple, and a more splendid ritual; a vast and varied territory stretching along the Eastern border of the Mediterranean Sea, and far back towards the Arabian desert, its fruitfulness, its richness of scenery second to none upon our beautiful globe. Here was a kingdom of God, truly, solid, and brilliant. From this magnificent kingdom of the past, ideas equally just and exalted ought to be formed of the still more glorious kingdom of the future. This is the Christian's guiding type. Though "not the very image" of the promised rest, it is a bold clear outline, the leading characteristics of which the prophets and apostles enable an intelligent mind to fill in with tolerable accuracy. But nothing is more certain than that neither it nor they point in any other direction for the attainment of the life and inheritance to come. This kingdom was the glory of God who founded it; the pride of the rulers and subjects who possessed it; the admiration and envy of contemporary nations; and the restoration of it was the hope of the enlightened apostles and disciples of the Lord. The best laws of all civilized peoples have been borrowed from its code, and so sure as the prophets are true, will that same code yet become the main feature of "the law which shall go forth from Zion," when there shall be one law and one king.

THE OLD NAME.

We come now to speak of "the kingdom of Israel," not as so much territory, but as composed of millions of human beings incorporated into a grand politico-religious name. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the name which was written upon the nation of Israel was the name of Jehovah. This inscription took place at their passage over the dry bed of the Red Sea. They, by that act, "were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea;" and, as Moses stood in the relation of God to them, they thus took upon themselves "the glorious and fearful name." In looking at Israel after this event we recognise the name of God in a material sense. It is no longer an abstraction or a motto; it lives and moves to and fro in the wilderness of Sinai, and afterwards takes up a long settled abode in the Land of Promise. The consideration of the Divine Name in this aspect we shall find to have been instructive when we turn our thoughts, in a future article, to another view of the same subject, - a view which is connected with our own personal relation to God, both now and for all time.

The politics of Israel, their worship embracing prayer, song, and offerings, were things pertaining to the then existing kingdom of God, and to His name. And here we observe a vast array of imposing realities constituting the civil and religious life of a great people. Now, if these were shadows, as we are apostolically taught, of good things to come, the substance must surely be as real as that which foreshadowed it. This reflection will throw, perhaps, a useful light upon the substance itself.

The dissolution of "The Old Name" resulted from rebellion against God. It had been formed by obedience to His will. When the chosen people forsook Jehovah, His wrath was kindled, and He spake, saying, "The Lord God shall slay thee, and call His servants by another name." This dreadful threat was fulfilled in the overthrow of the kingdom. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the Old Name would have remained undisturbed to this day but for disobedience which mocked at mercy.

This municipal corporation consisted of various orders and ranks of men, from the king down to the porter at the gate. It was a name written in the foreheads of all, from the prince to the beggar. Those who came into it, not of the seed of Abraham, were called proselytes. At the time of the exodus a number of persons joined themselves to Israel in this capacity. The building up of this great and mighty name was not the labour of a day. The energies and patience of Moses and Aaron were many times all but exhausted in the work. From the chronicles of the different prophets we observe the successive steps by which it

declined, and the causes of its ultimate destruction. By Jeremiah it is likened to a rotten linen girdle; its binding and cleaving force had wasted away, and that which had once been an encircling zone of power became “marred” and “good for nothing.” Such, in brief, is the composition, the history, and the end of the nation designed by God “for a name, and for a praise, and for a glory: but they would not hear.”

- EDITOR.

A WORD OF WISDOM.

“NEARLY two hundred and fifty years ago, an aged pastor, who had been driven by the persecutions of his British fellow-Christians to Holland, accompanied a little band of pious adventurers, to the number of one hundred and twenty, to Delftharm, where they were about to embark for New England, in America. Several of them were members of his flock, who had been induced to sell their estates, and go in search of a new home, where they could enjoy an unfettered conscience and worship God without molestation. Before their separation from the rest of their brethren at Leyden, this holy man, the Rev. John Robinson, assembled his flock, to observe a day of fasting and prayer, and took his leave of the Christian pilgrims in the following touching and admirable exhortation:-

“Brethren,- We are now quickly to part from one another, and whether I may ever live to see your faces on earth any more, the God of heaven only knows; but, whether the Lord has appointed that or no, I charge you before God and His blessed angels that you follow me no farther than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. If God reveal anything to you by any other instrument of His, be ready to receive it, as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry, for I am verily persuaded The Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of His Holy Word. For my part, I can sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no farther than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of His will our God has revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it; and the Calvinists, you see, stick where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but, were they now living, would be as willing to embrace farther light as that which they first received. I beseech you remember it is an article of your Church covenant that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written Word of God. Remember that, and every other article of your sacred covenant. But I must here withal exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth; examine it, consider it, and compare it with other scriptures of truth, before you receive it, for it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-Christian darkness and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.”

Such was the parting exhortation of the father of the Independents, nearly two centuries ago, to the pilgrim fathers of New England. The degeneracy of the Wesleyans from the principles of their noble founder has been paralleled in the history of Independency. Let the modern Independents - people, pastors, and professors in colleges - ponder and blush before this wisdom of their pious progenitor!”

The foregoing is an extract from an article entitled, “A history of opinions concerning the death of Christ,” which appeared in the Christian Examiner of December, 1853, edited by the “Rev.” J. Panton Ham, a name, I dare say you are familiar with; but the remarks of the old pastor were so good and so suitable for all Bible readers, and especially for Christadelphians at this period in our history, that I have sent them to you, hoping they may be interesting. - I remain, yours affectionately. - A BROTHER.

CARNAL AND SPIRITUAL.

MY attention has been directed to a paragraph which sets forth that the “animal nature” of Jesus was as much at enmity with His spiritual nature as the carnal mind of man is at enmity with God.

What does this mean? Was Jesus a compound of two antagonistic natures? Is man, also, a compound of natural and spiritual? Paul and Moses agree that man was natural or earthy. His nature was homogeneous. He was a living soul or animal body. This living soul was created with five senses, for the reception of ideas from other beings and from external objects. There was neither antagonism against himself nor against God his Creator. The Creator's law was holy, just, and good, and a suitable regulation for such as the first pair. This law was spiritual, but at the same time, perfectly comprehensible by the natural living souls for whom it was framed. The enmity which Paul refers to is a negative quality; the result of ignorance, and not inherent, as seems to be implied. Whatever is inherent, can be so only by creation. Transgression of law and enmity, resulting from a state of sin, are not inherent qualities of flesh and blood; hence their removal is possible, and we are exhorted to obedience and reconciliation with God. It is said, "Jesus kept His natural mind chained." Where is this testified? He was born related to the law-giver. His obedience was therefore natural and right, whereas the disobedience of the first Adam was unnatural and wicked.

The remark that "The difference was in the chain, not in the thing chained," suggests the reflection that had the chain of the first Adam been of the same kind he would have acted righteously. According to this, Jesus was rewarded because God gave Him a better chain; and the first Adam and all his posterity were punished because they did not do what they had not power to do, on account of the inferior chain the Almighty gave them. "Sin," it is alleged, "stands for that which causes transgression, and is personified as the devil." There is no proof for this statement, if the idea intended to be conveyed is that the natural desires or impulses of human nature are in themselves sinful, and can lead only to the commission of sin. The natural desires were implanted in man by his Creator, and the gratification of them, within the limits which He has prescribed, is right and good. To contend otherwise would be to make hunger; for instance, a sin, and to charge that sin upon the Deity. The distinction between the lusts or desires of our nature, and the effect or consequence of their unlawful indulgence, must be carefully observed.

Transgression of law is a crime. There can neither exist crime nor a criminal as a matter of necessity, without tracing that necessity to the Almighty. This doctrine is God-dishonouring in the extreme.

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

In some remarks on the first act of the drama, there is no allusion to that, which I think constituted the trying-point in the temptation, namely, "If thou be the Son of God." Jesus knew that He was the Son of God, but He had only recently been publicly acknowledged by a most extraordinary accession of power. This power carried Him into the wilderness, and retained Him there until He was famishing with hunger. What could have been more natural than for the thought to arise within Him, If I am the Son of God, why should I perish with hunger, seeing my Father has given me of His power for the purpose of making myself known?

MAN'S RELATION TO SIN.

I stand aghast at the assumption that man is by nature a sinner, that he cannot avoid sinning, cannot do anything but sin. Such a reading of the creation of man, and the introduction of sin, betrays a want of understanding and accuracy, and ought to be revised.

The first Adam was created a perfect natural man. He did not require to sacrifice and confess he was a sinful man, because he was a natural man. Neither did it behove the second Adam to offer for no other reason than that He was flesh and blood. To define the nature of Jesus as "the devil," looks as if Jesus was made the devil, that He might destroy Himself and all His own works.

THE REASON WHY JESUS HAD TO OFFER FOR HIMSELF.

With regard to these words, I would ask, what is meant by “for Himself”? Since it is allowed that His character was spotless, the reference can only be to the substance of His body, and would amount to this: - Jesus offered His body of sin for His body, that He might obtain deliverance from His body, which was the devil. I am satisfied that Jesus possessed the desires and emotions of our common nature, but He did not offer Himself a sacrifice to put away the inherent desires and the sympathetic feelings of His nature. Neither did He offer Himself to atone for the infirmities and passions incident to humanity, but for the sins committed by mankind.

The necessity in the case was not that their nature compelled them to sin, but that, being transgressors, blood must be shed to put away their sin (Heb. ix. 22); even the blood of Him who “knew no sin” (2 Cor. v. 21, 1 John iii, 5.).

WILLIAM ELLIS.

ASSYRIA AND MESOPOTAMIA.

A glance backwards - more than two thousand years - becomes necessary, when we ask what Nineveh was understood to be before the excavations of Botta and Layard. We have two sources of information on the subject, - the sacred writers and the ancient Greek and Roman historians.

From the sacred writings we learn that the long-forborne vengeance of Heaven, overtaking the impious pride of the antediluvian world, had swept from the face of the earth the numerous tribes of Adam; reserving only the family of Noah, to make him the second progenitor of the human race. The three sons of the Patriarch, conscious of the dignity of their relation to the new world, had gone forth to assume other new sovereignties and to people the earth. At this period, within a century after the flood, and while Noah was in the full vigour of his power, his great-grandson, Nimrod, the founder of the earliest postdiluvian cities, is introduced on the historic page.

“And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord. And the beginning of His kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.” (Gen.x.8-10).

Although the scriptural account of Nimrod, the first monarch on record, is short, yet so much more is said of him than of any other of the immediate posterity of Noah, as to afford ample testimony to his strength of character and superior natural endowments. The Hebrew word, Gibbor which the Vulgate renders “mighty one,” is by the Septuagint translated “giant;” but the subsequent “mighty hunter,” would intimate that he not only sought to hunt wild beasts, but to subdue men also; and Ezekiel is understood by some commentators to give the name of hunters to all tyrants. (Eze.xxxii. 30). Nevertheless, some think that the words “before the Lord,” may be taken in a favourable sense, and Calmet admits that they are commonly understood as heightening the good qualities of any one. It must be allowed that there is nothing in the history of Nimrod which carries an air of reproach excepting his name, which signifies, “rebellion of him that rules,” or according to Gesenius, “extremely impious rebel;” but it is this name which has caused commentators to represent him as a usurper and oppressor, and as instigating the descendants of Noah to build the tower of Babel. The qualifications ascribed to Nimrod as “a mighty hunter,” sufficiently fix his character; and after the separation of mankind he is supposed to have become the head of those who remained at Shinar. He united the people into companies, and by exercising them in the chase, he gradually led them to a social defence of one another, laying the foundations of his authority and dominion, in the same way that the Persians to a much later day, prepared their kings for war and government by hunting. (see footnote 1) The kingdom began at Babel, and as his seat of power became too populous, he founded other cities, thus dispersing his people under the direction of such deputies as he deemed prudent. That he was aided in establishing his power by his brothers Saha, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raahmah, and Sabtechah, (see footnote 2) who were all settled in Arabia, may readily be believed, for without such aid he could scarcely have built cities, and united his people with others under a common form of government. The four cities which are recorded in Scripture to have been founded by Nimrod, Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, were all in the land of Shinar, the southern part of Mesopotamia. That Babel was the original of the subsequently imperial city of Babylon, the identity of

name seems to prove the latter being the same word with the Greek termination. The ruins near Hillah, are still by the Arabs designated Babel. According to Chesney, "Four miles and a quarter north, and twenty miles west of the bridge of Hillah is the Mujellibeh, near which are the remains of the Kasr, and the hanging gardens; and at rather more than six miles from Hillah, standing amidst, and crowning the summit of extensive masses of ruins, is the 'Birs Nimroud,' supposed by Niebuhr, Rich, and others, to be the temple of Belus, which Herodotus tells us was separated from the palace by the river." (see footnote 3)

Erech, Accad, and Calneh, having probably grown up around the frontier fortresses of Nimrod's first realm, the identification of their sites would serve to define its limits, as they existed before the conquest of Assyria had merged the mother country into a superior kingdom. Herodotus, Ptolemy, and Ammianus Marcellinus speak of cities, the names of which, like the Irak of the modern Arabs, are clearly derivable from the Erech of scripture, but do not precisely indicate their position.

Colonel Taylor, the late British resident at Baghdad, satisfied himself that the place formerly called Orchoe by the Greeks, and now known as Werka, is the true site of the ancient city. Werka is situated on the Euphrates, 82 miles south, 43 east from Babylon, and is celebrated for the immense mounds of El Assayah, the Place of Pebbles, which bear also the name of Irka and Irak, and are believed to be the ruins of Erech. (see footnote 4)

In Colonel Rawlinson's recent, "Outline of Assyrian History," he says he has not yet "been able to read with any precision the name of the city, Warka, upon the bricks which have been found there ... This city is sometimes denoted on the bricks by a monogram for the moon, . . . It was celebrated for the worship of that deity. . .

"As Warka, moreover, was a holy city, and as it exhibits at present the appearance of a vast necropolis, there probably," Colonel Rawlinson surmises, "are to be sought the ruins of the tombs of the old Assyrian Kings, which were an object of curiosity to Alexander, and which are laid down in that exact locality in the old monkish map usually called Pentingerian tables." (see footnote 5)

The sight of Accad - or Accur, as the best scholars agree to write it - is assigned to the Sittace of the Greeks, the Akkerkuf, Akari Nimroud, or Akari Babel, of the present day. It is distant about 55 miles north, 13 miles west of Babel. A primitive monument found here is still called by the Arabs, "Tel Nimrud," and by the Turks, "Nimrud Tepasse," both designations signifying the hill of Nimrod. It consists of a mound, surmounted by a mass of building which looks like a tower, or an irregular pyramid, according to the point from which it is viewed, it is about 400 feet in circumference at the bottom, and rises to the height of 125 feet above the elevation on which it stands. (see footnote 6)

Calneh, or Chalneh, is fixed by the concurrence of a great mass of authority, ancient and modern, oriental and European, at what was the ancient Ctesiphon, on the banks of the Tigris, about eighteen miles below Baghdad, the district surrounding which was called by the Greeks, Chalonitis. The site of Chalneh was afterwards occupied by El Madair, among the remains of which travellers find the ruins of an ancient palace called Tauk-Kesra, believed to have been the White Palace of the Persian Kings, the magnificence of which struck the barbarian conquerors from Arabia with amazement and delight.

This site does not agree with that mentioned by Colonel Chesney, who says, "At the extremity of the plain of Shinar, and near the foot of the Sinjar mountains, we find on the banks of the Khabur, near its confluence with the Euphrates, two extensive heaps of ruins, partaking of the same character as those which appertained to the preceding cities. That on the right bank (the presumed Kerkisyah), is crowned with the modern town, Abu Serai (father of palaces), whilst that on the opposite, or left bank, may from its name Calneh, or Chalanne, and the more modern Charchemish, be the fourth city of Nimroud." This surmise is supported by the learned annotator on Calmet, who suspects, as it stands the last city in the order of those built by Nimrod, that this circumstance is denoted in its name Cala, "the completion," nuch, "of settled inhabitants;" as if it were "last built town." Or it might be at the extremity, last district of his dominions, "border town."

The prophet Amos (Amos vi.2. B.C.803) speaks of Calnah as forming, in his time, an independent principality; but shortly afterwards it became, with the greater part of Western Asia, a prey to the Assyrians.

If Nimrod's chief towns are thus correctly localised, his first kingdom - resting on the Euphrates, stretching from Erech on the south to Accad on the north, and guarded in front by the Tigris - must have extended towards the tribes of the East, a frontier of about 130 miles. To the sons of Shem, occupying the other bank of the river, the seizure of the plains of Shinar by the Hametic chieftain, would be a just cause for apprehension; but, with the setting-up of Nimrod's kingdom, the entire ancient world entered a new historical phase. The oriental tradition, which makes that warrior the first man who wore a kingly crown, points to a significant fact. This reign introduced to the world a new system of relations between the governor and the governed. The authority of former rulers had rested upon the feeling of kindred; and the

ascendancy of the chief was an image of parental control. Nimrod, on the contrary, was a sovereign of territory and of men, just so far as they were its inhabitants, and irrespective of personalities. Hitherto there had been tribes, enlarged families - society; now there was a nation, a political community - the state. The political and social history of the world, henceforth, are distinct, if not divergent. - "Nineveh and its Palaces," by Joseph Bonomi, F.R.S.L., pp. 43-48. GLEANER.

Footnotes:

- 1) *Rawlinson's Outline of the History of Assyria in Journ. Roy. As. Soc. 1852.*
- 2) *Ainsworth's Researches in Assyria.*
- 3) *Chesney, Survey of the Euphrates.*
- 4) *Chesney*
- 5) *Rawlinson's Outline of the History of Assyria in Journ. Roy. As. Soc. 1852.*
- 6) *Ainsworth's Researches in Assyria.*

(To be continued.).

CHRIST AND MELCHISEDEC.

"For this Melchisedec, King of Salem, a priest of the Most High God." That which is especially worthy of notice here is, that Melchisedec is the first instance we have of a person specially set apart for the office of the priesthood. Sacrifices, as we know, are part of an aboriginal institution, commencing with the expulsion from Paradise, and surviving the desolation of the deluge. But the persons who offered up the victims in the earlier ages of the world were not priests, that is, were never consecrated to such an employment as a distinctive office, but only performed this, as they did other religious services, in their proper capacity, as heads of families; and, of course, by the act of sacrifice expressing their faith in the great Atonement. Here, however, is the case of one who, though a king, ruling among his neighbours as a king, appears before us as solemnly designated to the office of the priesthood; is regarded by Abraham as entitled to all the prerogatives pertaining to the holy office; is allowed to claim a fixed proportion of the spoils taken from the enemy, not because he is King of Salem, but because he is the priest of the Most High God. All this adds to the eminence of Melchisedec's typical priesthood. He is not one of a line of priests succeeding to the office in a certain family order. He is not one invested with authority by the hands of others, acting under the prescribed rules of any ecclesiastical authority. But he is one who, long before the Levitical priesthood had any beginning, stands alone in a strange country, challenging homage from the greatest saint of antiquity, as an ordained priest of God.

In all this we see at once certain resembling features to the priesthood of Christ. He is not descended from any family line of priests. He receives no imposition of hands from men designating Him to the sacred office. Yet there rest upon Him the tokens of a holy consecration. The opened heavens testify to the indwelling in Him of the power of the Lord's anointed. The Spirit of the Lord without measure is given unto Him, and when He had made His soul an offering for sin, and when He had borne the sin of many, and when He poured out His soul unto death, believing souls did homage at the foot of His cross, and, exercising faith in the great oblation, said, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." And then observe one office of the typical high priest which is here mentioned by the apostle, "Who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. "Surely, this is a work which specially belongs to the true Melchisedec. Benediction seems never to have been off the lips of Christ. With promises of blessing He opened His Sermon on the Mount; with hands of blessing He called little children to His embrace; with uplifted voice of blessing He was borne away on the ascension cloud; and when He shall come again to welcome, and claim, and receive His own, His language to them will be, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Yes, blessing was the first act of the Redeemer, after He had gone back to heaven. Unto you, first, God having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you, and never will He lay down that glorious prerogative till we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Him. Especially will Christ bless us thus after our return from the slaughter of the kings; after victories obtained through His grace over all the potentates and powers of evil. Then, like the Melchisedec of old, will He come forth to meet us as we are laden with spoils, saying to us, "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord, wherefore standest thou without? Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." But observe another act of Melchisedec noticed by the apostle, namely, his receiving a portion of the spoils: "To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of

all.” No question will be raised here as to the offering spoken of being a dedicated religious offering to God. Melchisedec was too rich to need any gift for his own use, and it were an affront to Eastern hospitality to suppose that it was offered as a compensation for his kindness to Abraham and his company. The gift was plainly what the apostle’s argument seems to make it - a recognition by Abraham of God’s hand in his recent successes - a recognition regulated in amount by some traditional standard of the proportion of our goods, which God had a right to, and governed as to the mode of offering by the consideration that it should be directly set apart to the Divine service. Abraham evidently recognised the principle that every man was bound to give of his substance towards the maintenance of a national worship. He had a church in his own house. He commanded his children and his household after him that they should keep the way of the Lord. But leaving to individual or sectional effort to accomplish what it may.

* * *

To a priest by whose personal ministrations Abraham could not statedly profit, he yet gave a tenth part of all. Nor is this reference less noteworthy in its bearing on the general subject of almsgiving, and the proportion of our substance which belongs to God, and which is not at our own disposal at all. Under the gospel we have no binding rule upon the subject. Faith worships by love, and love does not want rules. But there is something in this dedication of a tenth part of their property to religious objects by good men of old time which, to say the least of it, is very striking. You will hear people say sometimes, “This dedicated tenth was part of an abrogated Levitical code; was, in fact, a mere form of Jewish poor law.” Here we have proof that it was no such thing. Four-hundred years before the law was given Abraham sets apart his tenth for Christ; whilst a hundred and fifty years later, but long before the giving of the law, we have Jacob vowing a vow to the Lord, “Of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto Thee.” How carefully the same holy practice - especially after any great successes - was kept up by David and Solomon, and what a lasting blemish is made to rest on the fame of the good Hezekiah for that he returned not unto the Lord according to the mercy which he had received, I need not stay to recite! The practical lesson is one which we can all draw for ourselves. “Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase. If we have been prospered in the work of our hands; if we are returning after a victory over many foes, and hindrances, and difficulties; and if, above all, Christ, our great High Priest, is meeting us with tokens of His benediction, and favour, and grace, let us give Him a part - and a liberal part, too - of these our captured spoils. Let one strength, one grace, one outstretched arm, be acknowledged in our deliverances, testifying that on earth we would lay our successes, even as in heaven we shall lay our crowns, at the feet of Him who is “ordained a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.”

But the parallel between Christ and Melchisedec is pursued further in relation to the mysterious circumstances of their descent. This Melchisedec is declared to “be without father, without mother, without descent; having neither beginning of life nor end of days!” Now, as Melchisedec was a veritable human person, these words cannot of course be understood in their strictly literal sense. Nor does the usage of Jewish phraseology require that they should be so taken. The expression “without father, without mother,” implies no more than that there has been no record of the person’s individual genealogy preserved. The point is insisted on in relation to Melchisedec’s claims to exercise the functions of the priesthood. According to the Levitical rules, such a failure in the family history would have been fatal to him. It was fatal to some who had got into the priest’s office in the time of Ezra, concerning whom we read, “These sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found: therefore, were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood.” Having no descent preserved, they were reckoned us “without father, without mother.” In a similar way we are to explain the language that Melchisedec had “neither beginning of life nor end of days,” that is, that no account has been handed down to us of the time when his office began, or when it ended. Of Moses, of Joshua, of David, and other eminent types, we have such accounts, but none of Melchisedec. He starts up on the page of the sacred record as one exercising the mysterious functions of a royal priesthood, shrouding beneath a veil of impenetrable obscurity all the antecedents of his history, as well as all that relates to the end of his days. The bearing of all this on the apostle’s argument with the Jews we may see at once. He wished to show that Christ’s was absolute, independent, self-originated and eternal priesthood. He owed it to no law of human successions at all. So far otherwise, His human genealogy would have been an insuperable bar to His priestly claims sprung, as He was, from the tribe of Judah, a tribe which, by law, was excluded from the office. His claim therefore, like that of this mysterious priest in Abraham’s time, must have been of some higher and unknown origin. The consecrating unction must have come upon Him direct from

heaven. In Him the successions of Aaron's line were set aside. He was made of God, a high priest according to the order of Melchisedec. And yet let us not fail to notice, in passing, the subtle beauty of adaptation which lies enfolded in these inspired words. See how the very language which we can apply to the typical Melchisedec only with the limitations of a Jewish gloss, may be applied to the true Melchisedec without any limitation or any gloss at all. For, in relation to the great mystery of His incarnation, is He not "without father." In regard to His proper and essential Godhead, is He not "without mother."? Did not Isaiah teach that He was without descent, when he said, "Who shall declare His generation?" And when Micah says, "Whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting," does he not testify that He has "neither beginning of days nor end of life"? Thus, in relation to Christ's priesthood, we may take the sublime description of our text in all its length, and breadth, and depth, and height. That priesthood has no beginning of days, and till the elect of God shall be gathered in, it shall have no end of life. He is the Alpha and Omega. He is the ancient of days. He is the mighty Father of eternity. "From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God." "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."

And this brings us to the last point of the comparison here instituted - namely, that the priesthood of Melchisedec was an intransmissible priesthood; that he had no successor in his office; that a sort of typical perpetuity is attributed to his ministrations because there was no mention in Scripture of the time when they ceased. "Made like unto the Son of God, he abideth a priest continually." And in all this, argues the apostle, He is a fit representative of the true Melchisedec who does abide for ever; who has an unchangeable priesthood; who, in all the might and prevalency and sovereignty of an unshared mediation, ever liveth to make Intercession for us. He is a priest for ever, and a king for ever, and an intercessor for ever; with none second to Him, and none like; with none to co-operate, and none to come after; with no interruption, and no pause. One is our High Priest, and His name one. There is the same blood to cleanse there always was; the same voice to plead there always was; the same emblem of sacrifice is ever in the midst of the throne; and the same censer is still in the hands of the Holy One to receive the prayer of saints. "He abideth a priest continually." Such are a few points of parallelism between Christ and Melchisedec on which the apostle claims our confidence, and rests the title of Christ to our eternal gratitude. Gathering up the argument in a few words, we may observe: In that Christ hath provided the means whereby God may be just, and yet the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, He is the King of Righteousness; in that He is our peace, and hath made our peace, and dissipated all trace of displeasure from the Eternal Father's countenance, He is the King of Peace; in that He hath prepared us an altar, provided a lamb for our sacrifice, ordained a priest to slay - altar, sacrifice, and priest all being found in Himself - He is "Priest of the Most High God;" in that He can challenge all the finite intelligences, whether of earth or heaven, to declare the fathomless mystery of His generation, He is said to be "without father, without mother, without descent;" in that He is now gone back into heaven, in that He now lives a priest on the throne, in that all the prerogatives and powers of an endless life are being now employed on behalf of all who will put their cause into His hands, He is said "to abide a priest continually." And now, what more shall we say? What can we say more to add to the security and comfort of those who worship at the true tabernacle? Our Melchisedec is before the throne. He is exalted there to be a Prince and a Saviour; to give repentance, to scatter pardons, to send down gifts, to encourage faith, to strengthen the tempted in their conflicts, and to uphold the despairing in their fears. The proper scope and tendency of all our recent commemorations has been to show that the whole mediatorial life of our Lord, whether on earth or in heaven, was meant to assure our hearts before God. The cross and the sceptre, the grave and the throne, the fainting and the Almightyness, all that of humanity was kind and pitiful, all that of Godhead was infinite and supreme, must equally and alike conspire to stay our souls on Christ and His work. That work is perfect. None can succeed to, and nothing can supplement, the ministrations of our great Melchisedec. For, as our salvation has been purchased for us by Him, who is both King of Righteousness and King of Peace, so the application of that salvation to us is entrusted to that priest of the Most High God, whoever liveth to make intercession for us, and who, to defend, to sanctify, to save, to bless, "abideth a priest continually." Amen. "Quiver."

ENERGY.

THE word energy is from the Greek *energeia*, and signifies: 1st, Internal or inherent power, capacity of acting, operating, or producing an effect, whether exerted or not; as, persons having energies sometimes suffer them to lie dormant. 2nd, Power efficiently and forcibly exerted, vigorous or effectual operation.

Hence, we must distinguish between energy and active energy. Many men and women of ability and energy have lived and died without doing anything worthy of notice. Power was bestowed to be used, and it must be continually and discreetly employed to become a benefit to its possessor and to mankind. If the mighty energies of nature were always sleeping, as during their apparent quiescence in the winter season, the earth would never again be gladdened with the life, music, and flowers of spring; the warmth and happiness of summer; and the rich variety and provision of autumn. The world would be wrapped in perpetual unproductive sleep.

True Christian life is necessarily marked by active energy; and one of the great drawbacks felt by the warm-hearted and energetic of every age is the procrastination and indolence of professed helpers. "I must work the work of Him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work," are the words of Jesus, spoken in relation to Himself; they condemn the listlessness and apathy of those who merely feign to be busy in the vineyard of Christ, and who only pretend to lament the disproportionateness of the labourers to the work to be performed, while they stimulate and encourage the flagging energies of those who are earnestly engaged.

A chief reason why we should be constantly active is, that in a very few years - perhaps hours - the lamp of life will go out, and we shall then enter upon the know-nothing and do-nothing state, called death. If we remain idle while we live, we appear already to have begun that nonentity which is the peculiar province of the grave; to be, even now, proving that we exist only in name. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Once there, the account is for ever closed.

The one respect in which a dilatory unenergetic life differs from the hopelessness of the tomb is, that time and opportunity for improvement are still vouchsafed. We will not go so far as to say that the malign effect produced by the sluggard upon the diligent, is similar to the presence of an inanimate form in their midst, which they are provoked to find is not, as they supposed, alive and about to stir; but we must give utterance to our own experience that the impression of prolonged listlessness is peculiarly painful and depressing.

The divine portraiture of a militant disciple - and all should be militant in the absence of Christ - is the very reverse of that we have just been viewing. Whether in the character of a runner, or of a warrior, vigorous action is ever the image presented. The racer is pressing forward to the goal, not looking- back, nor slackening his pace; the soldier is fully equipped with the armour of God, wielding his naked sword, ready for defence or attack. There is no likeness of a living disciple fast asleep. Where we see that picture it represents him finally resting from his labours; his work is done; he awaits the sound of "the trumpet" and the honour of reward. In the other case, it is all sleep and no work, to which no reward will be the fitting and awful conclusion.

These are, however, the two extremes; there are intermediate states. The question is, are we doing as much as we can; or, are we wasting part of our time and allowing part of our energies to rust? It is important, too, that we should observe the distinction between labour and excited bustle. Between pushing and rushing there is only the difference of a single letter; yet, how great is the disparity of meaning, and, when applied to the serious business of life, of effect also. If you resolve on work, reading, study, or what not, pursue it with energy, and accomplish what you propose to yourself. If interrupted, begin again as soon as the obstacle is removed. Work makes work; and there is no limit to profitable and pleasing occupation. Always labour with an end in view, and make choice of that kind of work for which, by experience, you find yourself most fitted.

There is no finer example of active energy on record than the Apostle Paul. With death staring him in the face, with persecution dogging his steps; with cold, hunger, nakedness, and stripes, for companions; hindered by years of imprisonment, terrified by shipwreck and the ambush of assassins, his heart never sunk; time was not burdensome to him, he constantly found opportunity to do good and to advance the cause to which he had pledged himself. The motive-power of this unbounded and indomitable energy lay in his vivid perception, and thorough appreciation of the objects for which he laboured. Never was it a question with Paul of "pleasing men," or of men seeking a reward. Christ was ever in his eye; he realized that the promises in Him were "yea and amen." Energy never, perhaps, rose to a higher pitch, was never more sustained and lasting, than in the case of the Apostle Paul. The world has seen wonderful performances under the influence of gold - the most powerful motor on the human heart - but the love of gold never developed such energy and achieved such results as we see accomplished by the love of Christ in the Apostle of the Gentiles. - EDITOR.

BIBLE EMBLEMS, No. IV.

“He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver.” - Mal. iii. 3.

“For Thou, O God, hast proved us; Thou has tried us as silver is tried.” - Psi. Ixvi. 10.

“Thou puttest away all the wicked of the earth like dross. - Psl. cxix. 119.

NATURAL PICTURE.

COME with me and watch a refiner
Purifying his silver and gold;
Mark how carefully he feeds the fire,
Lest the metal grow too cold.

Look, the heavier precious portion
Sinks, while lightly floats the dross,
Which the man collects and quickly
To the heap of waste doth toss.

See him sit, intently gazing,
While the busy furnace glows;
Not content until the metal
His own form reflected shows.

Now no more the heat is needed,
For no drossy scum doth rise;
Clear as in a polished mirror,
His own image he espies.

SPIRITUAL PICTURE.

So He sits, the Great Refiner,
Every child of His must go
Through the furnace of affliction,
Unto joy or unto woe.

For His Name - this is the touchstone
That can lighten every care;
Is there anything of sorrow
That our Brother did not share?

Proving Son-ship when He smites us,
Shall He spare the blessed blow;
Look on us as strangers, bastards,
That for ease would love forego? *

No; we'll hail affliction, sorrow;
Anything that proves us Thine:
Sit and purge us, Great Refiner,
Till Thine image in us shine.

* Heb. xii. 6,9.

WHAT IS THE TRUE AGE OF THE WORLD?

IN round numbers, 6000 years, say those who base their chronology on the Hebrew scriptures. Nay, say those who adopt the Greek version as their guide, the world is upwards of 7400 years old !

A tradition is said, on good authority, to have been current among both Jews and Gentiles of ancient times that the world should exist for 6000 years in a state of evil, to be followed by 1000 years in a state of good. This tradition appears to rest upon nothing more solid than an analogy derived from the six days of creation, followed by the seventh day of rest. It has no foundation in the scriptures, so far as the 6000 years is concerned, which is the essential part of it; as the Millennium, or 1000 years reign of Christ and the saints, mentioned in the Revelation, is not represented as sustaining any chronological relation to the millenniums, few or many, that may have preceded it. Notwithstanding the subject of this human tradition, it still finds favour among writers on prophecy, from its seeming to support the doctrine concerning the 1000 years reign, and from its supposed consistency with the commonly received age of the world, based on the Hebrew Old Testament, as being not yet 6000 years. It has even been elevated to the position of a base-line of prophetic chronology, periods and dates being interpreted so as to suit its dimensions with the greatest nicety.

As there are weighty reasons for thinking the chronology, founded on the Septuagint version, more accurate than that based on the Hebrew I propose to submit a few facts to shew the true state of the case. These are happily of a very simple nature, being for the most part confined to the ages of the patriarchs, from Adam to Noah, before the flood, and from Shem to Abraham after it. Thus reckoning from the birth of one patriarch to the birth of his first-born son, and so down to the 600th year of Noah, there is according to the Hebrew, a period from the Creation to the Deluge, of 1656 years. This period, calculated in the same way, is, according to the Septuagint, 2242 years, being 586 years longer than the Hebrew. Proceeding on the same principle, the period from the Flood to the birth of Abraham is, according to the Hebrew, 292 years, while according to the Septuagint, it is 1072 years, 780 years longer than the Hebrew. The difference is caused in both lists mainly by a number of the generations being just 100 years longer in the Septuagint than in the Hebrew.

Having thus briefly stated the discrepancy between the Hebrew and the Greek chronological data, and shewn in what it consists, I will now mention a few facts to enable the reader to judge for himself on which side the truth is to be found.

First, then, the list of patriarchs, from Shem to Abraham, has one more in the Septuagint than in the Hebrew, namely, Cainan. Moreover he is also included in the genealogy given by Luke, chap. iii. Our common version, which follows the Hebrew, says, "Arphaxad . . . begat Salah . . . and Salah begat Eber," Gen. xi. 12, 14. Luke says, "Heber, who was the son of Sala, who was the son of CAINAN, who was the son of Arphaxad," Luke iii. 35, 36. Here it will be at once observed that Cainan is represented by Luke as the son of Arphaxad, and consequently grandson of Shem. This is confirmed by the Septuagint version, which says, "Arphaxad begat Cainan, and Cainan begat Sala." The absence of this patriarch from the Hebrew text, and his presence in the Septuagint and Luke's genealogy are circumstances decidedly in favour of the superior accuracy, on this point, of the Greek.

In order to explain the mode in which the chronology is deduced from the data in question, it may be mentioned that Adam being, according to the Hebrew account, 130 years old at the birth of Seth, and Seth being 105 years old when Enos was born, making the age of the world at the birth of Enos, 235 years - thus, $130 + 105 = 235$. According to the Septuagint, the age of the world at the birth of Adam's grandson, Enos, would be 435 years, the age of Adam at the birth of Seth being 230, and the age of Seth at the birth of Enos being 205 years.

The omission of Cainan diminishes the age of the world by 130 years, this being, according to the Septuagint, the age of Cainan at the birth of his son Sala. From these two periods, then, the commonly received chronology is diminished by 1366 years, and the world is older by this number of years if the Septuagint is found in this point to be more reliable.

There is another period in which the commonly received chronology is shortened, even when judged by the Hebrew itself. This is the period from the Exodus to the foundation of Solomon's Temple. The marginal dates in the common version make this period extend from 1491 to 1011 before Christ, being a period of 480 years, as indeed it is expressly stated to be in 1 Kings vi.

1. Without entering minutely into this period, I content myself with stating that the data in the book of Judges, as to the periods of foreign servitude, and as to the intervening rule of the judges, taken in connection with Paul's statement of the total period of the judges, contained in Acts xiii. 20, make it

evident that upwards of 100 years are here abridged from the true age of the world. Hence 1 Kings vi. 1, must be erroneous.

There are several circumstances mentioned in the patriarchal history which, but for the lengthened chronology contained in the Septuagint version would be very difficult of explanation. For example, it is said that in the days of Peleg, the earth was divided - Gen. x. 25. Now, the Hebrew, as maybe seen from the common version (Gen. ix. 28; xi. 10-19), makes Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber, all contemporary with Peleg. And not only so, but these five patriarchs all survive Peleg - Noah 10 years, Shem 162, Arphaxad 100, Salah 130, and Eber 171. Whatever is meant by the earth being divided in the days of Peleg (and it must have had an intimate relation to him, seeing that his name is derived from it), that event took place as truly in the days of his great, great, great grandfather Noah, who was not only his contemporary during his whole life time, and outlived him ten years, but must have been looked up to as the most important personage in the world. This anomaly has no existence if the Greek version be followed; Noah dying 520 years before Peleg, Shem 368, Arphaxad 330, Salah 170, and Eber 69. This has at least the appearance of a natural course of events, and leaves Peleg chief patriarch, after the death of his father, for 69 years, whether the division of the Earth took place in his infancy, or during his patriarchate, or at any other period of his life, it may be difficult to determine; but the force of the facts just mentioned remains undiminished, as clearly pointing to the superior accuracy of the Greek version.

Another anomaly may be here mentioned, shewing the extreme unlikelihood of the Hebrew being free from corruption. Abraham was told, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age." And it is recorded that he "died in a good old age, an old man and full of years." Now, according to the Hebrew text Abraham died aged 175, and had for contemporaries - Noah 58 years, Shem 210, Arphaxad 148, Salah 178, Eber 239, Peleg 48, Reu 78, Sarug 101, representing 9 preceding generations, their ages ranging from 950 down to 230 years. Nay, more, Abraham was outlived by Shem, Salah, and Eber, representing respectively the ninth, seventh, and sixth generations of his ancestors. In these circumstances it is difficult to see how Abraham could be said to die in a good old age? On the other hand, the Greek version makes Abraham the survivor of all his ancestors, and thus presents another strong collateral testimony to its own accuracy. At the same time the Greek version shews a more gradual shortening of the life of man than the Hebrew does.

The data contained in the writings of Josephus are substantially identical with the Septuagint version, and this shows, not only that that version is the more accurate, but also that the corruption of the Hebrew text had not taken place until at least the first century; for it can hardly be conceived that if the discrepancy had then existed, Josephus would have preferred the Septuagint without giving his reasons.

As I have referred to the corruption of the Hebrew text, I will only mention here that the most eminent chronologists agree in thinking that the Septuagint and Josephus are correct, and that the Hebrew text has been tampered with by the Jews during the early centuries of the Christian era, in order to escape the force of the arguments of the Christians that Jesus is the Christ, because He had appeared at a time which tradition had indicated.

The age of the world, then, may be said to be in round numbers 7500 years instead of 6000, the traditional millennium of Sabbatic rest being consequently a myth, and already numbered among the years of the past. But the old truth remains - "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power."

That power will yet be exercised in blessing the world with the "REST which remaineth for the people of God."

J. C.

THE FIGHTING CAPACITY OF RUSSIA.

A great and mysterious power looms in the far north. On the 1st of November last a law came into force in Russia by which every Russian subject became liable to military service: and the consequence of this decree will be an enormous increase in the army. It is difficult to calculate exactly what the strength of the future army of Russia will be, because it is not easy to ascertain of what exact number the population of the empire consists, but it may be probably estimated that next year Russia would be able to put into the field 1,500,000 men. These men are excellent soldiers in very many respects. They may not be acute or intelligent, but they are strong, hardy, capable of bearing fatigue, have an intense loyalty to their Sovereign, believe that the Russian Government can do no wrong, and would enter on any campaign

ordered by that Government with all the religious excitement of a crusade. A few writers have attempted to trace the Tartar emigration from Russia, with a view of avoiding military service, as an instance of disloyalty to the Russian Government, and as an example of the disaffection of the people generally to the universal liability to military service; but such an argument can only be put forward by those who know nothing of Russia. The Tartar population has ever been regarded as a foreign ingredient; the existing Tartars of the Crimea are Mahomedans; they are the relics of the days when the Tartars and the Turks carried war regularly into the southern provinces of the present empire of Russia in Europe, and were there deposited and left when the receding wave of conquest was driven back. The fact of the Tartar emigration shows no disaffection or discontent on the part of the Russians; it merely shows that some Mahomedan tribes are unwilling to bear arms in the cause of a Christian government; not that we think that religious scruples have so much to do with the exodus of the Tartars as the dislike to compulsory military service. The organization of the Russian army is simple and well-conceived. The men are tall, strong, and fine; and if properly led, and supplied with good ammunition, the Russian army would be most formidable in any war. Again, Russia holds a peculiarly advantageous position; the terrible example of the First Napoleon still gives a shiver to almost anybody who contemplates the idea of invading her: and though no doubt an invasion at the present time would be a very different matter from what it was at the beginning of this century, it is undeniable that war could not be carried on in Russia as it can in countries where milder climates prevail. An army which would invade Russia could not exist on the system of requisitions. The country is too sparsely cultivated and too thinly populated to allow of a large number of men being fed in this manner. It would be necessary that the great bulk of the provisions and supplies of a force advancing upon Moscow or St. Petersburg should be drawn from its base of communications; and it is extremely doubtful whether any line of communications, even a railway line, will allow sufficient quantities of food to be brought up for a very large army. It stands to reason that a line of communications may become so much extended that the troops requisite to guard the line, and the officers necessary to administer it, consume more of the provisions than the line itself can bring up; and that hence no supplies can arrive at the troops for whose benefit the line of communication is intended. This is, of course, a *reductio ad absurdum*; but it is mathematically true, and it only tends to prove that in future wars it is doubtful whether, considering the numbers of men that would probably be engaged, it will ever be possible to rely on the supply of an army from a base of communications. It is much more probable that all large armies engaged in extensive campaigns must be fed from the theatre of war itself; and as in Russia this theatre of war would not support an army, it would be curious to see how an invader is to carry on his operations within the territories of that country. Russia is thus fortified by nature, and she is also strongly fortified by art. On the Polish frontier there is a cordon of strong fortresses, which will require large forces to be detached from an invading army to blockade or reduce. Her sea front on the Baltic is also strongly protected at the most vulnerable point, Cronstadt; while at Kertch she has raised a fortress for the defence and security of her Black Sea fleet teeming with casemates, bristling with guns, and much more powerful than Sebastopol ever was, even in its most formidable days. — “Gentleman’s Magazine.”

PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN ROME.

THE number of Protestant places of worship within the walls of Rome is constantly increasing. Trinity Church, which was recently dedicated, was built by the Evangelical party in the Church of England at a cost of about £8000. It will accommodate 300 persons. An American Episcopal Church, capable of holding nearly 1000 auditors, is being built near the railway station. Both of these are designed for the use of English-speaking visitors and residents. The Waldensians have bought a palace at a cost of £12,000, in which to hold services. The Free Church of Italy has in Rome several preaching places. The Baptist Missionary Society of England employs a missionary, the Rev. James Wall, who has a church of 60 members, called “The Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ in Rome.” The English Methodists have a mission under the charge of the Rev. Mr. Pigott. The American Methodist Episcopal Church has a mission under the charge of the Rev. Dr. Vernon. The American Baptists conduct day and night schools, which are under the control of the Rev. W. C. Van Meter. Dr. Taylor, of the Southern Baptist Church of the United States, is stationed at Rome to superintend its missions in the capital and the provinces. He and his associates have opened a large place of worship in Rome, and have formed churches at Bari, Bologna, Modena, Civita, Vecchia, and Milan. An American Union Church works among the Italian soldiers. A

Young Men's Christian Association has been started by it. Altogether it has been estimated that the sum of £100,000 has been spent upon the Protestant churches and missions in the capital of Italy.

CALUMNY MADE USEFUL. - I am beholden to calumny, that she hath so endeavoured and taken pains to belie me. It shall make me set a surer guard on myself and keep a better watch upon my actions.

— Ben Johnson.

OBSERVATIONS ON MARK iv., 11,12.

OUR Lord being asked by His disciples why He spoke to the multitude in parables, replied, 11. "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without all these things are done in parables; 12. That seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them." There is no material variation from these words in the account given by Luke ch. viii. 10, except the omission of the clause marked by italics.

In both these Evangelists our Lord's design, in using parables is represented to be, that those hearers who had resisted the means of grace should have their understandings darkened and their hearts hardened. So the conduct of our Lord is explained by Dr. Clarke, in his sermon on 2 Thes. ii. 11, "Jesus chose to deliver His doctrine in such a manner that it might be received by those who were sincerely desirous to know and obey the will of God, while the wilful and incorrigible remained deaf to all His instructions." For this comment Dr. Clarke is censured by Macknight, who, in order to set aside the obvious construction of the twelfth verse, renders the word *μήποτε*, not lest at any time, which is its usual and almost uniform signification; but, if peradventure, in which manner it is once rendered in the New Testament, 2 Tim. ii. 25. The text, therefore to him will be, That seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, if peradventure they may be converted. But to give any consistency to the verse thus translated we must understand the expressions seeing they may see and NOT perceive to mean that they may perceive. But where shall we find any authority for interpreting this phrase in so unnatural a manner; as if it denoted a blessing intended for the weak but well-disposed hearers, not a judgment denounced against the inattentive and obstinate?

In Is. vi. 9,10, where it first occurs, and to which, as translated by the Septuagint, the Evangelists manifestly refer, we read a solemn denunciation against a perverse and incorrigible people, "Go and tell this people, by hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand, and seeing ye shall see and shall not perceive; for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed, lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them." This people, to whom the prophet was sent with such an awful message, according to Macknight's mode of interpretation, were well inclined, though weak; who shut their eyes against the truth, not that they might exclude it, but that they might admit such a portion of its rays as was suitable to their feeble and tender organs.

I do not mean to insinuate that Macknight has been so injudicious as actually to explain, or even to translate Isaiah in this manner; but since the same conjunction *μήποτε*, and the same phrase occur in this passage of the prophet, as in Mark iv. 12, it is not easy to assign any satisfactory reason why the construction should not be the same in the former as in the latter.

A similar application of Is. vi. 9, is found in John xii. 40, "He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes and understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." It seems hardly possible to confound this declaration of God's righteous judgment with a gracious purpose of removing the blindness of the people, by withholding plainer instructions from them.

On this mysterious subject it is easier to propose doubts than to resolve them. Should we be asked in what manner God blinds the eyes and hardens the heart of the impenitent sinner, we presume not to answer. It is a wiser part to confess our ignorance than to expose it by vain attempts to explain what is above human comprehension. We know that "the Lord is righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His works." We may, therefore, affirm, with certainty, that, when He hardens the hearts of sinners, He does nothing inconsistent with His own justice and the accountableness of man. But if we endeavour to

discover in what the accountableness of man consists, further than his being endued with faculties and means to know the law of God, and to act according to the determination of his own will, we are presently lost in impenetrable obscurity.

The parables of our Lord were in themselves sufficiently clear, the defect was in the minds of the hearers. If they had heard with that attention and humility which were due to such a teacher, they were capable of understanding His discourses; and this appears to, be the true import of Mark iv. 33, a passage which has been thought hard to reconcile with verse 12, "With many such parables spake He the word unto them, as they were able to hear." In which place, to hear signifies to understand. Thus Jesus said to His disciples, "Blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear;" that is, you understand what you see and hear. The unbelieving multitude did not see and hear, but this arose from no natural impediment; it was the consequence of their perverse and unteachable disposition. They were able to understand, but they heard with inattention, or invincible prejudice, and, therefore, instruction was lost upon them, and the Gospel, which, in its natural tendency, is a savour of life unto life, by their fault became, to the unbelieving multitude, a savour of death unto death. Macknight has given a different interpretation of verse 33, "With many such parables spake He the word unto them as they were able to hear;" as if this mode of teaching was graciously accommodated to the state of his hearers, who, perhaps, would have refused to hear more direct and plain discourses.

I do not deny that the expression, as they were able to hear, is ambiguous. My objection to this explanation is, that it makes the thirty-third verse inconsistent with the eleventh and twelfth verses. To avoid this inconsistency he was driven to that forced and unnatural comment upon the eleventh and twelfth verses, which I have endeavoured to confute in the beginning of these observations. If anyone, who interprets the eleventh and twelfth verses in their obvious sense, should approve of Macknight's manner of explaining the thirty-third, he must suppose that these two passages relate to different classes of hearers, the former perverse and obstinate, the latter weak but teachable. To this supposition I have only one objection, viz., that no such distinction is intimated by the Evangelist. In Matthew, our Lord's answer to His disciples is in the following words, xiii. 11-14, "Because to you it is given etc." From the thirteenth verse, Macknight observes that the blindness of the Jews was the reason of Christ's teaching them by parables; whence he concludes that our Lord's teaching them by parables was not the cause of their blindness. That it was not the only cause I readily admit. No doubt the immediate cause was their inattention and neglect of the means of reformation; yet, at the same time, the withholding from them plainer instruction was a judicial cause of their continued and increasing blindness. This is directly affirmed in verses twelve and thirteen, "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them, it is not given; for whosoever hath to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance, but whosoever hath not from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I unto them in parables," that is, they whose hearts are disposed to receive the truths of the Gospel shall be blessed with full and clear communications of my doctrine. But men of perverse minds shall suffer loss from that which should have been their gain. The word which is adapted to enlighten the mind shall increase their darkness, and that which should have converted shall only harden their hearts; and in this the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled.

Some commentators contend that the expressions in Mark iv. 12, "that seeing they may see and not perceive, may hear and not understand," denote nothing but the effect. But without sufficient reason; for, since that effect was foreseen, it came to pass according to the divine purpose. God sent His prophet Isaiah to preach to the multitude, though he knew and foretold that his preaching would increase their blindness and hardness of heart. And our Lord made use of parables that they who were without might see and not perceive. Nor shall we wonder at this dispensation if we reflect that the greatest crime which ever was committed by man, even the crucifixion of our blessed Redeemer, is traced up in the Scripture to the divine counsel. "Him," saith Peter, "being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and with wicked hands have crucified and slain." And again, "Of a truth, Lord, against Thy holy child Jesus, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the people of Israel were gathered together, to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel determined before to be done."

If the crucifixion of Christ was thus foreordained of God, why should we refuse to believe or endeavour to explain away our Lord's declaration, - "To them that are without all these things are done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest at any time they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them"? - J. - The Christian Observer, Dec., 1803, pp. 712-715.

THE DESTROYER OF THE DEVIL.

“For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” Heb.ii, 14.

DEATH is an effect, of which sin or the transgression of God’s law is the cause. The removal of the effect from any transgressor does not of necessity remove the cause. The children of God referred to in the first clause of the verse, in addition to being flesh and blood, were related to the cause of death. Him or that having the power of death is the devil or accuser. To vanquish an accuser, slanderer, or devil, it is necessary to illustrate and prove that the accusation or slander uttered by him was without any proper foundation. The slander uttered at the foundation of the world by the serpent, “Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” Gen. iii. 4, believed by Eve, and afterwards by Adam, was the cause of death in him, and all his descendants. The children of God were those who believed that God would show by a seed of the woman that the slander was a wicked insinuation against His character. So the apostle states that as they were flesh and blood descendants of Him who believed the slander, God Himself likewise took part of the same, i.e., flesh and blood, that, through subjecting His Son to death, He might vanquish the slander which had existed from the foundation of the world.

Some have supposed that flesh and blood, is another name for sin; but this cannot be the truth as flesh and blood, or mankind existed before sin. Neither is it correct to say that sin is another name for the devil; for the “devil sinneth from the beginning,” and it would be absurd to say that sin sinneth from the beginning. Sin is an effect of which lust is the cause. And although lust exists in flesh and blood, it is not sin until it lusts after what God has forbidden. It is therefore sinful to say that either lust or desire is sin, or that flesh and blood is sin, or that any law made by the Almighty is sin; because all these were created by Him. What then, it may be asked, is that which required to be vanquished? Paul answers, it is the devil, accuser, or slanderer. John says, the accuser sinneth from the beginning. The first accuser was the serpent, which said, ye shall not surely die although you disobey God. This one died without redemption, and therefore left no literal progeny, so that neither the serpent nor the serpent’s seed in the literal sense have sinned from the beginning. The next accuser was the woman who was beguiled by the expectation of being like the gods or angels who visited her and her husband, and who in all probability had partaken of the tree forbidden to Adam and herself. Adam was not deceived, says Paul, and therefore he must have disobeyed with more deliberation than his wife. When charged with his crime he coolly accused the Almighty of giving him a wife who gave him and he did eat. Thus the first man sinned and blamed God for giving him a wife that caused him to do it, and all Adam’s descendants that have yielded to their own lust have invariably accused the Almighty in one form or other. Jesus Christ, who was in the flesh and blood of the accuser though not lineally descended from Him, never obeyed his own lusts or desires in preference to the will of God, and therefore vanquished by His obedience unto death even the death of the cross that which was the cause of death in the first. The cause of death being thus proved to belong exclusively to the lawless indulgence of the first man, and as Jesus Christ had never in the slightest degree yielded to such indulgence, even when subjected to temptation more severe; He magnified God’s law and proved that transgression was a crime, and by His submission unto death, the just for the unjust, He also proved His approval of the sentence of death against the unjust as well as His gracious disposition to open up a way of deliverance. The cause being removed there can be no consequence, or rather where there is no cause there is no consequence. Thus it is to those who are in Christ Jesus, there is no condemnation.

- W. ELLIS.

PHARAOH’S HOST.

The Egyptian Loss and Where it Occurred - An Interesting Discovery.

BIBLICAL students will be interested to learn the striking results of investigations made by Henry Brugsch-Bey on the subject of the Exodus. This gentleman is Vice President of the free schools at Cairo, and is one of the most learned and careful of Egyptologists. He has spent a long time in studying ancient records and in examining the country in order to test the Bible account. According to the record given by

Moses, that leader, having obtained permission from Pharaoh to take the children of Israel into the desert to offer sacrifices to the Almighty, conducted them out of Raamses, and thence by several short journeys to the sea. The effort of Brugsch-Bey has been to find the city of Raamses, to trace the journey, and to discover a point where the passage could have been made without supposing an absolute miracle.

In the museum of Liege a letter was found in which the writer reports that he has obeyed an order to distribute grain to the "Hebrews employed upon the stone for the great fortress of the city of Raamses." Other documents show that the city was built by Kaamses II. A poet has written an enthusiastic eulogy upon the city, and on the reverse of this writing is an account rendered by the masons appointed to see that the Eprion (Hebrews) make every day, under the supervision of brutal soldiery, the number of bricks required of them. Raamses is now certainly recognized in the gigantic ruins of the ancient Tanis, called Zan by the Egyptians and Zoan by the Hebrews. This explains, by the way, two verses in the seventy-eighth Psalm:

"Marvellous things did He in the sight of their fathers, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan. "He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through; and He made the waters to stand as an heap."

The city of Raamses, then, was situated upon the Tanitic branch of the Nile, then a very large stream, and was the key to the passage between Egypt and Asia. It was near the fortress of Migdol, where the Israelites made a halt, and is not far from another district of which the capital, Pithone, was one of the "treasure cities" built by the Hebrews, according to the book of Exodus. These several districts, as also Goshen, which the Pharaoh of the time gave to Jacob, were inhabited, not by Egyptians, but by the Khalon, a mixed race which ruled over the Phoenicians and the Bedouins of Arabia, and which even now occupies the borders of Lake Menzaleh. The journey of the Hebrews from Raamses to Migdol, is exactly that followed, according to a papyrus in the British Museum, by a man charged with the duty of pursuing and recovering two slaves who had escaped from the service of some great lord of the Egyptians. These slaves also tried to reach the desert, fleeing from Raamses to Succoth, thence to Khaton (the Etham of the Scriptures), and to Migdol. If Moses took this route and did not enter at once into the land of the Philistines, it was because Raamses II. had with that people a treaty, the text of which, engraven upon a monument, yet exists at Thebes. By this treaty Raamses and the Prince of the Khetians, the most powerful of the rulers in the land of Canaan, mutually bound themselves to return all persons escaped from the service of the other into their own territory. In consequence of his knowledge of this treaty, Moses led the people of Israel more to the north, and crossed not the Red Sea, but, at the lower coasts of the Mediterranean, the lake anciently called Sirbonis.

The high tide which overtook the troops of Pharaoh Meneptah, son of Pharaoh Raamses II., in whose reign the exodus took place, is a common occurrence in these parts. Both Strabo and Diodorus Siculus cite facts which go to show that in the regions called "the gulfs" sudden swellings of the water are observed, and at such a time King Artaxerxes, who was leading an expedition against Egypt, lost his whole army by drowning. The account, of the journey of the Hebrews under Moses is entirely inconsistent with these facts and this theory. They followed the wilderness of Shuy, which is situated between the Mediterranean and the Gulf of Suez. The bitter waters of Marah are the brackish waters of the Suez lakes. Elim, where they made a halt, is today called E' in Musa. It was only after they had crossed the isthmus that they turned and came to the wilderness of Sinai. By a comparison of the Bible with ancient documents and geographical facts, Brugsch-Bey has been enabled to offer a reasonable, simple and positive explanation of an event which biblical commentators have for more than eighteen centuries badly comprehended and wrongly interpreted. He does not reject the theory of Divine intervention for the relief of the children of Israel, but he does show where and how a certain natural phenomenon might have come to their relief, especially if Moses had happened to know the curious freak of nature at the point where he crossed. - Chicago Evening Journal.

MR. T. BRASSEY, M.P., ON TURKEY.

THE hon. member for Hastings, Mr. Brassey, who has been on a cruise in his yacht, the Sunbeam, has published a series of letters relating to his voyage. Dating from Constantinople, he writes, relative to the Government of Turkey: "The authorised civil list of the Sultan is about £1,200,000, and by means of various more or less arbitrary grants it is actually little short of £2,000,000 a year. All along the shores of the Bosphorus vast palaces and elaborate kiosks occur in succession at a distance of a little more than a mile apart. Some of these buildings are furnished in the most costly style. The daily dinner of the Sultan

- he always dines alone - consists of 94 dishes, and ten other meals are prepared in case it should be his fancy to partake of them. He has 800 horses, 700 wives, attended and guarded by 350 eunuchs. For this enormous household 40,000 oxen are yearly slaughtered; and, according to Murray, the purveyors are required to furnish daily 200 sheep, 100 lambs or goats, 10 calves, 200 hens, 200 pairs of pullets, 100 pairs of pigeons, and 50 green geese. Between the profligate luxury of the establishment of the Sovereign and the miserable poverty of too many of his subjects, the contrast is truly melancholy. The incomes of the principal ministers of State are such as would grievously shock the radical reformers of our own country. The salary of the Grand Vizier is £30,000; of the Minister of Finance, £15,000; of the Minister of Public Works, £11,000; and so in proportion for the other principal Ministers.” Referring to the relative positions of the Christian and Mohammedan population, Mr. Brassey remarks that if the same justice were done to the former as to the latter, the regeneration of the empire might be accomplished so effectually that the prospect of disintegration would become indefinitely remote.

ISRAEL.

THE history of the Jews is the most characteristic, the most important, and the most sublime in the world. For to this people alone were given the primitive knowledge of the Almighty; the trust of preserving it unstained while the earth was bowed down in idolatry; and, finally, the magnificent privilege of dispensing it, in the appointed time, through all the families of mankind.

For the declared purpose, at once of enabling the nation to fulfil this high office, and of distinguishing the Divine commission, the whole existence of the people affords the most total contrast to that of all other nations. It differs from all in its origin, its religion, its civil construction, and its historical career. The origin of the chief nations of pages antiquity is proverbially lost in fable, acts of impossible heroism, transformations of imaginary deities, and dynasties of imaginary kings. At the point to which history ascends, they were simply gatherings of rude wanderers, formed into tribes by force or famine, and seizing upon territory by emigration or the hand of the strong.

But the Jews, like the first dwellers in the earth, were the descendants of one pair; their descent registered by the clearest and most authentic of all records; their ancestors leaving their original place of birth, neither urged by necessity nor tempted by the desire of possession; those ancestors wholly alien in their habits to war, and in their persons wholly excluded from earthly sovereignty; living and dying in the acknowledgment that they were “strangers and pilgrims upon the earth,” though looking forward to mysterious promises mightier than the world could fulfil; and the people, when at last they came into possession, openly acknowledging that the triumph was gained, not by their own prowess, but by the hand of Heaven. In the pagan world, religion was a tissue of traditions, without authority and without effect; important to the priest as a matter of maintenance, and interesting to the people as a source of festivity or display; but secretly despised by the philosopher, practically disregarded by the government, and performing altogether an obscure and secondary part among the general impulses of society.

But in the Jewish system religion was the grand object of the national existence, the prime mover of the whole machine of state; its ministers holding the highest rank, its observances forming the habitual occupation of the people; its influence shaping their minds, their manners, and their fortunes; the national prosperity declared to depend on the public reverence for its principles, the national ruin involved in its desertion. Its conception was lofty, pure, and spiritual in the highest degree, while its ceremonial exceeded in strictness and splendour all that mankind has ever seen of worship - a whole tribe was devoted to the attendance of the temple - the whole people stood among nations as a general priesthood; religion, the unrivalled, perpetual, and inspired impulse of the dominion of Israel.

The contrast is not less distinct in the polity of paganism. The codes of the most civilised nations were the result of time, accident, and the common necessities of public and personal life. Beginning in a few maxims, they grew with the exigencies of growing society, until they accumulated into substance, and were shaped into form. But the defects of their birth adhered to them still; and their purest legislation exhibits barbarian cruelties, violent transgressions of right, and a general rude inadequacy to meet the claims of man in his intercourse with man.

The political history of the pagan world is an exclusive display of human agency. Man is always in front. States rise by his virtues, and perish by his crimes; human energy, genius, and passion are the

universal instruments of national change. The hand of Heaven is seen only when it comes to write the sentence of empire, and then seen only in clouds.

To the eye of the pagan, the vicissitudes of nations formed scarcely more than a game of chance. Beyond a few principles, all was conjecture. The clearest foresight was circumscribed by the events of the day. No intelligence, however vigorous: could securely penetrate into the future fates of empires.

In all these essential features the distinction of the Jewish people was entire, and was Divine.

Their law was no tardy, obscure, and jarring compilation; it was a system; at once authoritative, adequate, and complete; transmitted with a grandeur of circumstance which pronounced it the work of Heaven; and fixed in the national mind by every motive which can bind men or nations; by the promise of prosperity and the dread of suffering; by the awe of the senses, the homage of the heart, and the conviction of the understanding.

In the career of the nation Divine Providence is the guide, the sustainer, and the sovereign. The popular fortunes are openly moulded by its will. Man looks on, while the mightiest events make their progress before him, scarcely more governed by his influence than the tides or the thunder-storm. Heaven holds the scale; man is but the dust of the balance. Battles are lost and won, conquests are achieved, and national punishments of the deepest kind, amounting to revolutions, which extinguish the hope of Israel, are the work of Providence, openly proclaiming its resolves in total contradiction to human expectancy, and as openly fulfilling them in total independence of human power.

Two great agents wholly unknown, but by name, to pagan antiquity, miracle and prophecy, are the especial instruments of the Divine government among this extraordinary people. From the beginning of their existence, in the person of Abraham, the faculties of nature and man are placed under palpable control. The patriarch and the people are protected, tried, and delivered by miraculous interposition. From the earliest period, their future existency is displayed with the clearness of history; and yet, with that sublime consistency which in its broadest displays of power and wisdom wastes nothing, each successive illumination is distinctly adapted to the necessities of time. To Abraham, the founder of the race, the prediction gives an out-line of the fortunes of his descendants until their liberation from Egypt. To Jacob, with whom another era of the national existence began, as the father of the twelve tribes, the prediction is renewed, but further extending over their possession of the promised land. To Moses, with whom a third era began, in the redemption from Egypt, the prediction extends further still, comprehending the whole period of conquest, possession, and decay; and reaching even beyond the fall of the nation, into the vast and obscure region of time when Judah was to be hidden in the oppressions and conflicts of Gentilism.

- "Historical Description," - Croly. GLEANER.

A PLAGUE.

"The Disestablishment of the Churches of England and Scotland is," Mr. Alien observes, "in all probability, but a matter of a few years . . . In the days of Bishop Cotton, I do not suppose the idea of organizing a Liberation Society for India ever entered the mind of anybody; for Bishop Cotton was first a Christian and then a Churchman. But since the advent of Bishop Milman the 'Church of England in India' has been changed from a sister among sister Churches into a wilful and overbearing step-mother, determined to have all her own way, and recognize nobody but herself. This high-handed Ultra-Churchism of Dr. Milman has forfeited friends outside his section of the Christian Church, and stirred up strife among his people such as India never saw before. The Bishop of Calcutta and his brother of Bombay are the greatest promoters of Disestablishment that have come to India. But of course the bishops do not intend to disestablish the Church of which they are overseers; neither did Napoleon III. intend to disestablish the Empire of France." - Indian Daily News.

This extract reveals the secret of the enemy's strength and of our own weakness. Would that our bishops could realize the exact position to which Romanism and Ritualism have reduced the Church of which they are the overseers! and then, perhaps, they might agree as to some plan of concerted action for stamping out the plague. There will be no peace within our borders till this is done; and as to Disestablishment, it will soon be here unless we adopt a totally different method of protecting ourselves against it. - The Rock.

ELIJAH AND THE PRIESTS OF BAAL.

Of the three great scriptural scourges, war, pestilence, and famine, the last is palpably the most fitted to enforce on a people the necessity of a moral change. War is a whirlwind of all the fiercer passions, a tumult of fear and flight, of hot revenge and mad exultation, a fever and a frenzy of the land. Pestilence sweeps the soil with such tremendous rapidity, that it leaves no room for thought, or no thought but of terror; or even generates in the survivors a reckless licentiousness from mere despair; "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But famine, slow, searching, and terrible, while it wrings every sense, gives the heart time to feel.

When the land had been thus smitten for three years, Elijah appeared the second time before king Ahab, publicly arraigned his guilt as the source of the national calamity, and challenged the whole idolatrous priesthood, the "four hundred prophets of the groves and the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal," to meet him alone, and decide, in the presence of the nation, whether Jehovah or Baal was the true God of earth and heaven.

The scene of this great trial was palpably chosen to give the most complete openness to the whole solemn transaction. It was neither in temple nor in palace, in forest nor in field, but on the bold promontory of Carmel, where all must be visible to the multitude below; that multitude, gathered from all Israel, serious and subdued by long privation, and anxious for the decision on which might depend the national existence. The vastness of the assemblage, the royal pomp, the wild and mystic pageantry on the mountain's brow: even the natural magnificence of the scene, the noble mountain range the boundless sea, the sky un-shadowed with a cloud, or only tintured with the colouring of a Syrian sunset, were well calculated to prepare the heart for the still mightier impressions of miracle.

At length, at the hour of evening sacrifice, that sacrifice so long intermitted by apostate Israel, the solitary man of God advances; he builds his altar, the fire from heaven descends, the sacrifice is consumed in the sight of all; the idolatrous priesthood, in astonishment and terror, see their doom; and the air is rent with the thunder of the thousands and tens of thousands shouting, "The LORD, He is the God, the LORD, He is the God," 1 Kgs. xviii. 39.

- Croly.

GLENER.

THE SUEZ CANAL AND THE BITTER LAKES.

ERE we reached Ismailia, a tumble-to-pieces summer-house on the top of the bank, with broad steps leading down to the water, was pointed out to us as the place where the grand ceremony of opening the canal was performed by the assembled crowned heads of Europe - by all, at least, save England. Looking on that dismal, ghostly spot, it was hard to conjure up a vision of the bright and brilliant company who then thronged those stairs. The only sign of life about the place was a caravan of sad-coloured camels, with dirty Arab drivers; poor, poverty-stricken wretches they looked. A little further we met a large flock of meek Eastern sheep, with long, pendulous ears, following the tall shepherd, who walked on before them, clad in picturesque Arab cloak. Towards sunset we steamed into Lake Timseh, whose clear, bright blue waters are alive with fish - its banks of white and yellow sand dotted with dark vegetation. The flourishing new town of Ismailia lies outstretched along the shore, making the prettiest picture we had yet seen. Groups of good French houses, half veiled by shrubs, tell of the gardens that have sprung up since the arrival of abundant fresh water; and, conspicuous above all, the palace of the Viceroy, built for that one great day of festivity, and never used since then. We were told that already it is literally falling to pieces, notwithstanding some slight occasional repairs. [Since the above was written the palace has been completely restored.] Of course, on the occasion of that great ceremony, the accommodation of the town was vastly increased by immense encampments - thousands of tents overspread the plain, and the surrounding desert echoed the unwonted sounds of festivity, while unbounded hospitality was freely showered on all comers. The whole scene must have seemed strange indeed in the eyes of the assembled sons of the silent desert, beholding the city of fixed habitations, which had sprung up, like some wondrous fungus of rapid growth, in the midst of the desert, and which, as if by magic, they saw peopled by unknown races from distant lands, brought thither by innumerable vessels, which now for the first time sailed into the lonely desert lake, hitherto known only to (or at least visited only by) themselves in their restless wanderings. Now, those blue waters reflected the stateliest ships that ever gladdened sailors' eyes, all decked with gayest flags - beautiful ships of all nations, peacefully anchored, while smaller craft plied

to and fro with incessant motion. In out-of-the-way corners of the lake were ranged the old dredgers which had done so much good work, and which (as someone observed) appeared in the midst of that gay scene very much like groups of navvies in working-dress in a brilliant ball-room. Still more startling to the Arab mind must have been the scene after night-fall, when suddenly the darkness was illuminated by a wondrous blaze of coloured fires - every house in the new city, every tent, every ship, even every dredger, was brilliantly lighted up. Every ship was marked by lines of vivid light and festoons of lamps, so that the whole lake gleamed with long reflections. Then followed a brilliant display of fireworks, and for the first time the wondering Arabs beheld hissing rockets rushing heavenwards, while many coloured fires burst from land and water. Stranger than all in their eyes (had they been admitted to behold these mysteries) would have seemed that brilliant ball where the Viceroy entertained his guests, and where beautiful European women danced with unveiled faces to the newest and gayest music, the echoes of which were wafted far and wide, as the night breeze floated lightly across the silent desert. Now, all was well-nigh as still and peaceful as in the old days before the creation of the great new highway; and a sense of unwonted repose stole over us as we anchored for the night in the first of the Bitter Lakes, ere the golden glory of sunset had faded from sky and water. Then the brief twilight gave place to the full glow of moon and stars; and there was great calm in earth and heaven. We tasted these bitter waters, and found that they justly deserved their title, being intensely briny. It is said that a layer of salt, well-nigh two feet in depth, lies at the bottom of the lake, produced by perpetual evaporation beneath that burning sun, while the supply pouring ceaselessly in, of course, continues for ever accumulating

- Good Words.

THE LAND OF MOAB.

(Continued from February page 28)

The ascent of the pass of the Arnon we calculated at 1,900 feet, 250 feet lower than the other side. While daylight lasted it was a lovely ride, with the views changing at every turn, and the path comparatively easy.

Nearer the top, the path, though free from the basalt boulders which encumber the South side, was perilous enough in the dusk. We could not make way as we had calculated. Dismounting, and leaving our horses to find the path, while we held on to their tails, we debouched on the bleak plain, a few hundred yards West of Ara'ar, the desolate heap which marks the Biblical Aroer. Bitter and cold swept the wind; shelter there was none; but here we must camp. The mules were an hour behind, and must get over the precipices as best they might, by the aid of a young moon, which had happily just risen. No water, no wood. No fear of our horses straying now; they are too tired. We left them to themselves. Out with our knives, we cut such little brushwood as we could, scraps of Poterium, none of it more than three inches high, groping for it in the dark with our feet. Sheikh Zadam, who was with us, soon kindled a fire on the waste, and, quick as thought, plucked, split up, and broiled a freshly-shot partridge. Then, going to the brow, we fired occasional signal guns, and, one by one, the mules appeared. First came our cook with a lamb, which he had bought in the morning, across his saddle-bow. He threw it down: the active young boy, Sahan, seizing it, killed it, skinned it, and, in a few minutes, offered us with his fingers, delicious broiled liver and heart. In two hours more the last donkey arrived, and not a canteen was missing.

Before striking camp, I went a little to the eastward to examine the ruins of Ara'ar (Aroer), just overhanging the brow, and to take a good survey of the country. The ruins of Ara'ar are featureless, and I could find no traces of Roman temples, though several arches are still standing, and there are the usual number of wells and cisterns.

While we stood on the edge, looking down into that noble rift, the great birds of prey were sallying forth to forage. The griffons circled and soared from their eyries lower down, till lost to sight in the sky: the buzzards lazily flapped their heavy wings as they crossed and re-crossed: but, grandest ornithological sight of all, a pair of lammergeres (*Gypaetus Barbatus*), the largest on the wing of our raptorial birds, kept sailing up and down, backwards and forwards, quartering the valley, and keeping always close to the brow, the sinuosities of which they followed without a perceptible movement of their wings; only their long tails gently steering them in and out, as each time they passed us, easily within gunshot, on a level with our eyes. They were perfectly fearless. In the morning sunlight their brown tails and wings gleamed with a rich copper hue, and their ruddy breasts shone brightly golden.

Reluctantly we turned from the brow of the Arnon. Turning due north across a bleak and dreary plain, we reached Dhiban, the ancient Dibon, in exactly half-an-hour. Our road was across a hard plain, without a gully or a wady the whole way.

Dhiban is quite as dreary and featureless a ruin as any other of the Moabite desolate heaps. With its waterless plain the prophecy is fulfilled, "Thou daughter, that dost inhabit Dibon, come down from thy glory, and sit in thirst; for the spoiler of Moab shall come upon thee, and he shall destroy thy strongholds" (Jer. xlviii. 18). Singularly appropriate, too, is the denunciation on Aroer in the next verse, when we stand on its site just by the edge of the arterial highway of Moab, and look down on the pass of which this place commands so complete a view, "O inhabitant of Aroer, stand by the way, and espy; ask him that fleeth and her that escapeth, and say, What is done?"

Like Kiriathaim and so many other Moabite towns, Dibon is a twin city, upon two adjacent knolls, the ruins covering not only the tops, but the sides, to their base, and surrounded by one common wall. Close under both knolls, on the west, rises a little wady, in which, after the late rains, we found a puddle of water here and there; and beyond the wady the even plain ceases, and the country becomes rocky and undulating. All the hills are limestone, and there is no trace of any basalt, but what has been carried here by man. Still there are many basaltic blocks, dressed, and often with marks of lime on them, evidently used in masonry; and we found a few traces of carvings on other stones. The place is full of caverns, cisterns, vaulted underground storehouses, and rude semi-circular arches, like the rest.

This basalt would seem to have been the favourite material of the earlier Cyclopean builders, as in Bashan, and then to have been used up by the constructors of the later town, which cannot be much earlier than Roman, at least in the portions above ground.

We went to see the spot where the famous Moabite stone or monolith of King Mesha was found. It is quite within the old city walls, and near what, we presume, was the gateway, close to where the road had crossed it. Very near this spot it was afterwards buried, when the dispute about its proprietorship arose among the Hamideh, and it was then, as is too well known, broken by one party of the rival claimants. From all we heard from Mr. Klein, its first discoverer, and, alas the only European who has ever seen it entire, and from what was pointed out to us of its position, it seems to me highly improbable that the stone has been for 2,500 years exposed to the light of day, still less that it could have been originally set up in the spot where Mr. Klein saw it lying, with the inscription uppermost.

I do not presume to guess where "Korcha" was, nor where the stone was laid by King Mesha; but, seeing that all the basalt blocks must have been brought here from some distance, and there are many others at Dhiban many times the size and weight of this tablet (for though it has been called "this huge block of basalt," it only measured three and a half feet); it seems most reasonable to conjecture that it had been removed from its original position, and used up as building material by the Romans or some of their predecessors, who were ignorant of, or indifferent to its import, and that after lying embedded and secure for ages, it has, through the progress of dilapidation, or by earthquake, been thrown down, or fallen from its place, and the carefully-preserved inscriptions been again brought to day. (* see footnote)

We must bear in mind that the original Moabites disappear from history after the sweep of Nebuchadnezzar's conquests. With them probably disappeared the knowledge of the Phoenician character, for we find abundance of Nabathæan inscriptions of a date apparently older than the Roman conquests, but scarce any unquestioned Phoenician. It would be strangely out of keeping with Oriental habits and ways, if the new comers had had any reverence for the lapidary records of their predecessors, still more so, if, unable to decipher these records, they had respected them.

On the top of one of the knolls there is still a block of masonry, apparently the keep or castle.

In hunting about the ruins one of our party distinguished himself by discovering a new Moabite stone. It was a block of basalt, two feet five inches high, hollowed and perforated inside to the shape of an hour-glass, and with a massive boss protruding on either side. Its use was not at first divined; but, not far off, he afterwards found, in the bed of the wady, the stone which had fitted into the upper cup, and which proved it to have been an oil-crushing press. The upper stone was also of basalt . . . There was no inscription on it.

The identification of Dibon and Dhiban cannot be questioned. The place was known to Eusebius and Jerome under the name of Dabon or Dibon, and is spoken of by them as *κώμη παμμεγεθής παρά τόν Αρνώναν*. That Jerome meant on the North side of the Arnon is clear, for he adds, that it was in that country originally Moabite, then taken by Sihon, and wrested from him by Israel. The fact of its being three miles retired from the brow of the valley, when we note that there are no intervening features, is not sufficient to raise a difficulty from the expression, "by the side of the Arnon." The name was first recorded in modern times by Scetzen, the pioneer of Moabite exploration. From some passages in Scripture, where Dibon is mentioned (Is. xv. 2; Jer. xlviii. 18), "come down." etc., it would seem to have

been “a high place,” yet Burckhardt observes that “it is situated in a low ground of the Koura.” But, looked upon from the East, it is on high ground, though low from the western ridge, and being placed on two hills, the first that rise from the East, the cry, “come down” would be exceedingly applicable. A similar discrepancy occurs in the description of Medeba, said, by a very careful and accurate observer, who did not visit it, but saw it from the West, to be in a hollow, whereas it is really on a hill. - The Land of Moab. By H. B. Tristram, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., pp. 129 - 137. - GLEANER.

Footnote: - * *From the appearance of the ruins near, and from the replies of the Arabs to my inquiries, I cannot but believe that the exposure of the celebrated monolith dates only from the earthquake of 1st January 1837.*

This earthquake was the most destructive of ‘any on record in Syria, and caused a fearful sacrifice of human life at Safed in Galilee, where several thousand persons were buried under the ruins. As far as we can trace it, the axis of disturbance must have passed very near Dibon. Many of the Arabs remember a terrific earthquake which occurred when they were children, and which overthrew many columns and arches in the old cities. Considering the comparative freshness of the inscription on the Moabite stone, it may probably have been exposed for not more than the last thirty-five years.

ENOCH, Gen. v. 24.

“Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him” - C.V.

The Septuagint version of this verse reads: - “He was not found, because God had translated him;” and this version seems to be quoted in Heb. xi. 5, “Enoch was translated that he should not see death.” . . . It will be observed that in our version, “was” is in italics, indicating that our translators supplied it to fill up what they deemed the sense. But did they supply the right verb? that is the question; any English reader can easily judge for himself. I submit that they did not.

This chapter is the world’s first death-roll. Of each of the ancients there mentioned it is recorded in turn that “he died.” This word runs through the whole chapter. Adam, “and he died;” Seth, “and he died;” Enos, “and he died;” and so on, with one exception: Enoch, “and he . . . not”: supply, not was but died.

And so the record stands “Enoch died not, because God took him.” Surely, this will commend itself to every Bible student, as being in strict accordance not only with the rest of the chapter, but also with other Scripture teaching, which is thus relieved from the charge of making reference to life and death in terms of ambiguous import. Whatever confusion may exist in the language of traditional religious teaching, the Word of God is guiltless of confounding two such very different things as dying and escaping death. -

- M. W.STRANG. Bible Echo, Vol. 1., p. 281.

CHILDREN’S COLUMNS.

STORY OF A GREAT CAPTAIN AND A LITTLE MAID - Continued.

Now, you are going to hear what a great deal of good came from the little servant-maid speaking of the holy man of God who lived in her own land. Someone told the king what she said. He was very anxious to have his captain cured, so he said at once, “I will write a letter to the king of Israel.” Then Naaman’s chariot and horses were brought, and he started to go to Israel’s king, taking a letter with him, and a present of much gold and silver, and ten beautiful suits of clothes. When he came to the king of Israel, and the king had read the letter, he was much grieved to think that this great man had made such a long journey to ask him to take away his leprosy. He said, “Does he think that I am God, and that I am able to save people from death?” Now, this was a wise question, for it is only God’s power that can kill or keep alive, though He sometimes lends this power to other people to use for Him. He had not chosen to lend this power to the king of Israel; but He had lent it to Elisha, for that was the name of His prophet.

As soon as Elisha had heard that Naaman had gone to the king, he said, “Let him come to me.” So Naaman rode up to Elisha’s house. And Elisha sent out a messenger to tell him to go and wash in the river Jordan seven times, and then all the leprosy would go from his flesh. This message made Naaman very

angry. In his own land he was a great man, and so he thought that everybody ought to show him a great deal of respect. He thought Elisha would have come to him and would have called upon God in a long speech, like they did to their idol gods in Syria. But Elisha knew that the God of heaven did not want long, loud prayers. If we wish very much for anything we do not go to our Father and make a long speech. We ask in a few words, but earnestly, and we always believe that He can give us what we ask. You know that Jesus Christ said those who prayed to His Father must not be like the heathen, for they thought they "should be heard for their much speaking." And you know, too, that it would want a very, very long speech indeed to make an idol of gold or silver hear.

I dare say that Naaman thought, too, that it was a foolish thing to have come all this long way to wash seven times in the Jordan, for he said there were beautiful rivers in Syria; why could he not wash in those? So he turned in a great passion to go back to his own land.

But his servants came near to him, and, speaking very kindly and respectfully, advised him to try the remedy that Elisha had told him, as it was a very easy thing to do. At last, Naaman consented, and went to the Jordan. He dipped himself in its cooling waters – once – twice - three times - four times; still he was not cured. No, he had not yet done all the prophet had told him.

We often meet with the words seven times in the Bible. They are used to show perfection; anything done thoroughly, or entirely. So when we are told to forgive our brother until seventy times seven, it means forgive him thoroughly, entirely, as often as ever he offends you. Don't say, "I forgive him, but -," or, "I will forgive him if - ." Forgive him quite, and leave the "ifs" and "buts" to God. Now, if Naaman wished to get the blessing, he must obey the command entirely, and in Elisha's way, too. If you are very ill, and the doctor sends you a bottle of medicine, he writes upon a label on the bottle just when and how you must take it. How very silly we should think you were if you said, "Well, I don't see that it can matter, if I take it at all, how or when I do so; so I'll just try one drop, and if I don't like it I'll take no more, or I'll drink it all off at once." The doctor would be very likely to say that if you thought you knew better than he did, you must cure yourself, for he would take no more notice of you. And if God tells us to do something, and how He wishes it done, shall we say, or even think, we will do it, but we will do it in our own time and in our own way? If He were to say I wish you to go right down into that water, should we think "Well, it can't matter much if I use the water whether I go into it or put it on me, so I'll just pour it over me?"

No, even Naaman knew that half-obedience is not obedience at all, so he went down five, six, and seven times; and then, I'm sure he must have been ready to shout with joy, for all those hateful, hideous, painful scars had gone, and his flesh was just as fresh, and soft, and clear as a healthy child's.

Ah, Naaman did not mind the long, tiring journey now; he was not proud and haughty now, nor angry with Elisha; he was only very happy and thankful. He felt more than paid for all his troubles.

Just so, my dear children, will you be the first moment you feel the joy of having obeyed perfectly the commands of God.

The chief part of human vice is obviously the result of allowing the sensual faculties to predominate over the moral and intellectual. Man, indulging in the immediate enjoyment, in neglect of the nobler but more remote, habitually learns to substitute passion for duty, and earth for eternity. But, to elevate him into the power of self-control, what could be conceived more effectual than the idea of an Omnipotent Being, sustaining, impelling, and governing the whole course of man and nature; incapable of being resisted or deceived; reading every motive, and viewing every moment of human life with the eye of a father and the justice of a sovereign; yet in all this vast and vivid activity of providence, Invisible. - CROLY.

OPINIONS. – Neither accept an opinion, nor except against it, merely on the score of its novelty: all that is new is not true, but much that is old is false - - ZIMMERMAN.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

NOTHING is more characteristic of the times in which we live than religious agitation. It prevails not only in this country but also on the Continent of Europe, and is mixing itself more and more with politics, thus drawing the attention of statesmen to ecclesiastical questions and compelling them to legislate in these matters whether consonant to their views and wishes or not. Such a ferment as exists in the religious world at the present time has not been known for many years past. The priest party are everywhere busy, and are asserting their pretensions with an amount of arrogance and intolerance which reminds one of the dark ages. There has been unusual activity at Rome, especially since the publication of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the "Vatican Decrees," which seems to have fallen into the Romish camp like a bombshell. Attempts have been made by two or three Catholic notabilities to frame a reply, with the result of making admissions most damaging to their own cause, while the main points of the author remain unanswered. Argument failing, recourse has been had to anathema, of which latter commodity the Romish church has ever been prodigal. Of this pamphlet it is reported that 150,000 copies have been sold. Whether the number stated be strictly accurate or not we are of course unable to say, we only mention it to show how wide-spread is the interest taken in the subjects discussed by the ex-premier.

The self-styled "Prisoner of the Vatican," though stripped of his temporalities, still wields enormous spiritual power, which has made itself felt in this country. The adverse vote on the Irish Education Bill, which mainly caused the downfall of the late Liberal ministry, was brought about by instructions from Rome; all the Catholic members in the House surrendering themselves to the bidding of the Pope. Recognised "Head of the Church," as he is by nearly two hundred millions of people, the great bulk of whom are as ignorant as they are superstitious, the Pope, through his numerous bishops and priests, cannot but have great influence over the masses, and through his officials he is able seriously to embarrass the ruling powers. In no country is this influence creating more perplexity and trouble than in Germany, where the Government and the priests are at open war, and several bishops have already been imprisoned for contumacy. The Civil Marriage Bill, just passed, which takes all power out of the hands of the clergy and makes the marriage of a monk or a nun equally legal with that of any other person, is a terrible blow to priestly domination. It has been carried rapidly through the German Parliament, in spite of tremendous opposition to its numerous clauses, and by a large majority has become law. A similar measure was not long since passed in Austria. In England the Public Worship Regulation Act, which title sufficiently explains its nature, became necessary on account of the prevalence of ritualism in the Established Church. It is doubtful if it will have much effect in checking the practices complained of. Prosecutions in the Ecclesiastical Courts have to a great extent failed, and in all likelihood further legislation with reference to these affairs would be attended with similar results. Gaudy vestments and pageantry, which appeals to the outward senses, will always find admirers among the unthinking multitude, and render ritualism popular. Last year the Catholic mind was amused and excited by pilgrimages to Lourdre and other places, and the present is made famous by the proclamation of a jubilee, with special Papal blessing and plenary indulgence for "the faithful."

Truly "Darkness covers the earth and gross darkness the people."

"When the Son of Man comes, shall He find the faith on the earth?"

Another proof of the ferment that has arisen not only in religious society, but among numbers who do not profess to belong to it, is the openly expressed desire on the part of many influential persons for the disestablishment and dis-endowment of the State Church of England, as witness Mr. Bright's recent speech at Birmingham, in the presence of thousands, which was loudly cheered. Agitation on this question is decidedly on the increase and is a sign of the times.

The most notable event in the political world is the accession of a King to the throne of Spain, in the person of the young Prince of the Asturias, by the style and title of Alfonso the 12th; he is son of the ex-Queen Isabella, and cousin of Don Carlos. After a most flattering progress through Valencia and Barcelona, the new King made his triumphal entry into Madrid, on a magnificent white charger, gorgeously caparisoned, and, amid the plaudits of the assembled multitude, took possession of his kingdom. His first public act on entering the capital was to proceed to the Cathedral, and do homage to the Virgin "Mother of God" - a necessary preliminary to the exercise of his functions in such a country as Spain, and at the same time a good stroke of policy without which he could not possibly win the favour of the people, nor retain the support of the priests. He has further conciliated the latter class by granting them full pay from Jan, 1st, leaving the arrears, which have accumulated since 1868, for future settlement. In the midst of the rejoicings and religious ceremonies the foreign creditor has not been forgotten. An arrangement has been effected through Mr. Roger Eykyn for the liquidation of the overdue interest on the

Foreign Debt, and this is another prudent measure on the part of the new Sovereign or his advisers, with a view to the commercial credit of the country, and no doubt also with an eye to the raising of a loan to replenish an exhausted exchequer. Thus far all has gone prosperously, and the restoration of monarchy in Spain is a significant and interesting event to the student of prophecy, inasmuch as that distracted land once more resumes its normal position as one of the ten horn kingdoms; but a glance at the situation will fill one with doubts and fears as to the stability of the new order of things, and cause one to feel more of pity than of gratulation for the boy King (he is but seventeen) who is placed on an elevation at once so trying and so perilous. The ardour and enthusiasm of youth will do something, and able advisers, should he surround himself with such, much more, but the task of giving peace and prosperity to Spain is one of immense difficulty, and will tax to the uttermost the energies of the wisest statesmen and financiers that can be found. First and foremost comes the Carlist insurrection, which has already existed for two years, and though not gaining much ground is certainly very far from being suppressed. It was at first supposed by some that the proclamation of a legitimate King of the Bourbon line would cause the Carlists to lay down their arms, and abandon what they must be now aware is a hopeless struggle, but if we are to judge from what is reported of Don Carlos, this is by no means the case, and the contest must be fought out to the bitter end. I contemplate (says Don Carlos) with profound sorrow the attitude of my cousin Alfonso, who with the inexperience of his age, consents to be the instrument of the same men who expelled him from his fatherland, with his mother, overwhelmed with insults and outrages. Notwithstanding, I do not protest. My dignity and the dignity of my army permit no other protest than that uttered by the mouths of our cannon. The proclamation of Prince Alfonso, so far from closing against me the gates of Madrid, opens to me, on the contrary, the way of the regeneration of our beloved country."

This certainly sounds very warlike. Again in answer to questions put to him in respect to the present posture of affairs, he is reported to have replied, "I was in the field first, I am at the head of a well-disciplined and victorious army. I cannot forget its bravery, its abnegation and fortitude under the most trying circumstances. I cannot forget the blood that has been shed, consecrated in my cause, and I cannot consent that all this should go for nothing simply because my adversaries, finding my power daily increasing, hope, as a last resort, to bar my progress to the throne by placing my little cousin upon it. The fight must go on against his Government, as that of Serrano. I do not regard my cousin as an adversary at all. It is the men behind, using him for a shield, who are my adversaries, and these are the same men I have always been combating. I have precisely the same enemies to deal with I had before, and this is why I do not look upon the political situation materially changed. I regard this attempt to set up Don Alfonso simply as a sort of homage and aid to myself as well as the monarchical aspirations of the Spanish people. I will venture to predict that, before three months elapse, Don Alfonso's throne will be tottering. I do not think the new Government, if beaten, can continually recommence the struggle, because it will have other enemies than the Carlists to contend with. It will be sapped, mined, and betrayed, by the very men who have set it up. As to surrounding us, hemming us in, and simply exhausting us, it cannot be done. If our enemies do not take the offensive, we will. We must renew the attack on Bilbao and Irun. We must take Hernani; and Pampeluna, if not soon relieved, will fall. They will be obliged to attack us in positions of our own choice, which are impregnable, and against which they know that they exhaust themselves in vain. As to the Pope, his Holiness will undoubtedly recognize the new Government as he recognized Napoleon; as he would recognize me, did I ascend the throne; as he would recognize any other de facto Government. Since I have taken to the field, I have seen three Governments crumble before me - the monarchy of Amadeo, the republic of Castelar, and the dictature of Marshal Serrano! There is no reason why a fourth should give me any uneasiness." All this seems to indicate a prolongation of the conflict, of which it is impossible to predict the end. We shall watch the development of events with deep interest. It must be admitted that Alfonso has much in his favour, he is, so to speak, "the man in possession," which lawyers say is "nine points" of the game. He is, it is alleged, on the eve of being recognized as King by the great powers of Europe, and has already received the Papal blessing, and further it may be noticed, money appears likely to be forthcoming with which to carry on the Government. Bismarck, it is true, talks about Protestant toleration, and asks for a guarantee of some kind before acknowledging the new Government. There is an awkwardness about this, certainly, in Catholic Spain, but possibly the skill of diplomatists may readily solve the difficulty, and thus secure the favour of the redoubtable German Chancellor. After all, if peace cannot be restored to unhappy Spain by force of arms, there is a hint of the possibility of the belligerents coming to terms by an "Amicable Convention." Such an event is not without precedent,

Should Alfonso XII. be able to effect for Spain what Napoleon III. accomplished for France, there will indeed be no cause to regret his elevation to the throne of his ancestors.

The irrepressible EASTERN QUESTION, in some aspect or other, continues to menace the peace of Europe. Very recently the source of trouble was in Roumania, now it is in Montenegro. In spite of

treaties and capitulations, the former principality has succeeded in establishing diplomatic representatives in the chief European capitals, of course with the connivance of the powers, and Turkey is helpless to prevent it. In fact, Roumania is independent in all but name. An outbreak at a place called Podgoritz threatened, for a while, to lead to war between Turkey and Montenegro, but the last news that has come to hand conveys the assurance that the Porte has withdrawn her demands and that the danger is over, at all events, for a time. Of the immediate cause of the disturbance it is by no means easy to obtain definite information, nor is it indeed a matter of moment in itself. Nothing but the jealousy and interferences of other States, and especially of Russia, make such disputes matters of consequence. Montenegro is an insignificant spot of earth, barely containing 80 square miles of territory, with a population not much exceeding 100,000 souls. It is its proximity to the Russian and Turkish frontiers which occasion all the trouble and makes it a focus of intrigue for promoting the ambitious designs of the Autocrat on the "Sick Man," and, consequently, when a disturbance occurs between the Montenegrins, who are Greek Christians under Russian protection, and the Turks, Russia is sure to espouse the cause of the former. Moreover, it appears that His Highness Prince Nicholas Petrowich, who rules the Montenegrin principality, enjoys a subsidy from St. Petersburg, which is more than equal to the revenues of his duchy. The inhabitants are a hardy race of mountaineers, trained to guerrilla warfare from their youth, animated by an undying hatred of the Moslem, from whom they differ both in race and creed. Of the two it is difficult to determine which is the more fanatical, or the more savage. Bloody feuds between them are of frequent occurrence, in the course of which the greatest atrocities are committed on both sides. Austria has a large population of Greek Christians among her subjects, so that so far as her influence extends, it is exerted on the side of Russia, and between the two, Turkey has little chance of enforcing her demands, whether just or not. Indeed, Montenegro may be said to be an outpost of the Muscovite Empire. Thus war has once more been averted between Russia and Turkey, but the same circumstances will undoubtedly recur ere long, and when Russia feels herself strong enough for the encounter, she will strike and Turkey must fall.

As to France, people on this side the Channel are becoming weary of the long and angry debates of rival parties in the Assembly, producing no other result than that of intensifying the hatred between the opposite factions, and well nigh rendering all legislation impossible. The Marshal President, though disgusted with the conduct of the deputies, clings to the Septennate with desperate tenacity. What is to be done when no agreement can be arrived at as to the form of Government that is to prevail in France either temporarily or for a permanence? Dissolve the Assembly, say some, or suspend its sittings, for six months say others. But how is this to be accomplished under existing circumstances? There is just now a fine opening for a man like Louis Napoleon to seize the reins of power by a coup d'état, and thus bring the turbulent deputies to their senses, and educe order out of the present chaos. Spain having now become monarchical may possibly infect France. Monarchical she must be at last, but for the moment the country seems divided between Republicanism and Buonapartism. In spite of existing difficulties the army continues to increase both in numbers and efficiency, and the same remark holds good of all the great powers of Europe. The enormous cost of warlike armaments is crippling the resources of the wealthiest among them, but it still goes on, and can only eventuate in war on a gigantic scale, which will prepare the way for the establishment of that kingdom which can alone bring about an enduring peace.

S. G. Hayes.

ON THE END OF THE WORLD.

"If the body's death seems to teach the lesson, that modesty is becoming to the scientific speculator, what shall we say as to the prospects of that material frame which is beyond ourselves – the general orderly frame of the universe as we see it around us? People would suppose, from the way in which you hear men talk now, that there was not the slightest chance of any great organic change ever coming across the outward world in which we live. No doubt God works by fixed laws. No doubt the world goes on morning and evening, and summer and winter; but what reason have you to suppose that it will so go on to infinity? Have no great catastrophes befallen the world before now? Does not physical science itself speak of these catastrophes? What is there to prevent other catastrophes, produced by the operation of laws of which at present we are very ignorant, coming athwart the globe on which we live, and a complete change taking place in the relations in which things even in the outward world stand at present, so that in the scriptural sense of the word there may be an end to the world, as there is certainly to be an end of our

earthly life? To be sure, things have gone on for a long time in the same way, but is that any proof that they are to go on in the same way for ever? You arise morning after morning in good health and strength, and seem to say to yourself for a time that this will last for ever; but one morning something happens, you cannot explain what; but something has happened that lays you on a bed of sickness, and in two days sends you off to your grave a corpse. Will the experience of the reality of the way in which everything has gone on since you were young, till you have attained maturity, save you from that great mischance? Again, men for centuries have ranged over the mountains in Campagna, they thought that all would go on there, herds and flocks feeding, and vineyards growing as they had done for centuries; and suddenly there was a strange sound heard, and a volcano burst forth, and the greatest philosopher of the age came to look at it, and lost his life while he was looking. But neither he nor any of the men who had speculated with him ever expected that these great cities were to be swept to destruction, and their beautiful pastures to become for a time an arid wilderness I do not say such instances explain or tell us distinctly that such catastrophes will befall the whole globe, but, at all events, I think they ought to make us modest, seeing that the wisest know so very small a portion of the laws that regulate God's creation. Surely we may not dogmatically assume that such catastrophes are beyond the range of possible or probable events. It is true, I say, that things have gone on for a long time, and men say, "Where is the promise of His coming, for all things continue as they were from the beginning of the world?" But still with Him, with whom one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day, there may be changes maturing which no philosopher of the present or of any previous age has ever dreamed of, which will bring this great catastrophe to the globe which will answer, on the whole outward creation, to something as great in change as in our passage from life to death, and what is beyond it. I do not think there is anything fanciful in such an expectation. I believe that a man of that modest mind which is the characteristic of true science, will hesitate before he pronounces with any assurance that such a change may not come over the world as has been distinctly predicted in the Scriptures." - Archbishop of Canterbury in Macmillan's Magazine.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, who, we saw in a former number of the Lamp, holds the pagan doctrine of the soul's immortality as clearly pronounces himself in favour of the complete destruction of the material earth. He tried to cause his readers to infer this catastrophe from known great changes, as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions.

But do those physical changes support that idea? We think they give it no force whatever. It is a fact that no disaster has destroyed any part of the earth, but, on the contrary, the earth has, for the most part, been improved by the great physical revolutions that have taken place. It seems, therefore, that in so far as any inference can be drawn from these things, it is against the idea that the earth will one day be blotted out of existence. This prelate talks as though the death of the body were a sort of analogical proof. Because a healthy man feels as if he should be always so, but is suddenly overtaken by death; so the earth, which appears solid and permanent, may just as suddenly and unexpectedly be destroyed. In reality, however, there is no parallel. Man knows by experience that he must die, and may die at any moment; but there is no such knowledge or experience to lead us to look for the annihilation of the globe. Strangely enough, the head of the Church bases his conclusion on the words of the Apostle Peter, and joins this dreadful event to the coming of Christ: - "Where is the promise of His coming?" Would he really have us believe that the return of Christ will be "the end of the world" in that sense? If so, how are the numerous prophecies to be fulfilled which speak of the earth becoming the everlasting inheritance of the Saints? The previous destruction of the world by water is no sign that a future destruction by fire awaits the earth. It was the ungodly who were drowned, and if the prediction of a fiery destruction applied to a future event, it could not be fairly argued that the physical world was to be burned up. The archbishop had got his school notions before his mind, instead of reasoning fairly from the Scriptures. In so far as his Grace of Canterbury represents the national religious views on the nature of the human soul and the destiny of the earth, England is clearly at variance with reason and the Word of God; but we suspect that archbishops make it their business to maintain, for the most part, what they found on being raised to position. The time is surely drawing nigh when, in relation to these questions, either archbishops will be out of fashion or out of harmony with current belief.

- EDITOR.

PART OF AN EXTRACT WRITTEN BY CALVIN ON THE BIBLE.

FOR this is life everlasting to know our only true God and Him whom He hath sent, Jesus Christ, in whom He hath appointed the beginning, midst, and end of our salvation. This is Isaac, the well-beloved son of the father which was offered in sacrifice and yet gave not place unto death; this is the vigilant shepherd Jacob, which had so great care over the sheep which he had in keeping; this is the good and merciful brother Joseph, who, in his glory, was not ashamed to acknowledge his brethren, were they never so base and abject; this is the great high priest and bishop Melchisedec, who made an everlasting sacrifice once for all; this is the excellent law-maker Moses, who writeth his law in the table of our hearts by his spirit; this is the faithful captain and guide Joshua, to conduct us into the land of promise; this is the noble and victorious king David - smiting down with his hand all rebellious power; this is the magnificent and triumphant king Solomon, governing his kingdom in peace and prosperity; this is the strong and valiant Samson, who, by his death, overthrew all his enemies; and, last of all, every good thing which heart can think or desire, is found in this only Jesus Christ. He humbled himself to exalt us, He became servant to make us free, He was impoverished to enrich us, He was sold to ransom us, He was imprisoned to bail us, He was made the curse for our blessing, an offering / or sin for our righteousness, He was disfigured to fashion us, He died for our life. Insomuch that by Him roughness is smoothed, anger appeased, darkness lightened, unrighteousness justified, weakness strengthened, discomfort comforted, sin bridled, despite contemned, fear boldened, debt paid, labour eased, sadness made glad, mishap goodhap, hardness easiness, disorder ordered, disunion united, ignominy made noble, rebellion subdued, menacing menaced, ambush discovered, assault assailed, battle beaten, war faughten, vengeance punished, torment tormented, damnation damned, depth drowned, hell chained, death dead, mortality immortal, and, to be short, mercy hath swallowed up all misery, and bounty hath overcome all evil.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TONGUE.

OUR intercourse with others resolves itself mainly into government of the tongue. I do not know which of these things is the most astonishing – the unexpected importance of the place assigned to this duty in Holy Scripture, or the utter unconcern even good men feel about it. Unless a man takes the Concordance and looks out in the Bible all the passages which have reference to this subject, from Proverbs and Ecclesiastes to James, he will have no idea of the amount of teaching on this head, nor the actual quantity of that single volume which it engrosses. Still less will he realize the strength of what “inspiration teaches. . . It is enough to suggest to each one this question - “Is the amount of scrupulous attention which I am paying to the government of my tongue at all proportioned so that tremendous truth revealed through James, that, if I do not bridle my tongue, all my religion is vain?” The answer can hardly fail to be frightening and humbling. But how is this government of the tongue to be practised? The very detailing of the evils will suggest the remedies. Listen to an hour’s conversation in any professedly Christian community. How much of it turns, almost of necessity, as it would seem, on the actions and characters of others! The meaning of judging others appears to be this: - The judgment seat of our Divine Lord is, as it were, set upon the earth. But it is empty. It is waiting for Him. We meanwhile, unmannerly and unbidden, keep ascending the steps, enthroning ourselves upon His seat, and anticipating and mimicking His judgment on our brethren. To put it in this way brings home to us the wretchedness of what we are doing. It will also surely assist us in endeavouring to cleanse our conversation of so much unnecessary canvassing of the motives of others. Yet, for the most part, we have gone far along our road in devotion, and done ourselves many an irreparable mischief, before we bestow half the carefulness on the government of our tongue, which it not only deserves, but imperiously demands. - F. - ‘The Christian’s Pathway of Power.’

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Mr. EDITOR, - Dear Sir, - I shall feel obliged if you will allow me a small space in the "Lamp" to correct some misstatements made by your correspondent, Mr. James Martin, in his letter to you this month. I was not a little surprised when my attention was called to the fact, that I was figuring before your readers in a not very enviable character, without the slightest knowledge of it, and represented as saying and admitting, what I neither said nor admitted.

The conversation between Mr. Martin and myself was of the shortest description, and I am certain that not more than a third of what he gives passed between us, and the chief part of that which was really said he has altered considerably. Mr. Martin said (and this was while I was walking away from him), "The Adamic race were born in the bonds of iniquity, and in the gall of bitterness; Christ not being a member of the race by human begettall, having God for His Father, was not a sinner, and therefore not worthy of death."

At the conclusion of these words, I said, "I believe that, and so do all our brethren, and you know that." I made no reference whatever to the "Swansea brethren" in particular, but said what I have given above. Mr. Martin, in reply, said "I know better; but that if that was my faith, he and I were not far removed from each other."

Not a word passed about the "brethren in Swansea," "you as their representative," etc. If the above are the facts of the case, and I can vouch for their correctness, I ask, Mr. Editor, why your correspondent should take such liberties to put into print what he ought to know is not the truth; and also, without any qualification, what he hears only by report? And why should he try to detract from my "moral courage" upon such evidence?

Your correspondent's informers, whoever they were, that told him that Mr. Goldie has repeatedly told the "Neath brethren that he believes with them," has "repeatedly" told what is not the truth, for I believe that Christ was condemned, though not in the sense the "Neath brethren" put it. Paul says that the "Scriptures were fulfilled in condemning Him." Acts xiii. 27. Having said so much, I will not occupy more of your space, and shall thank you for an insertion of the above. - I am, dear Sir, yours very truly, RICHARD GOLDIE.

We cannot allow this letter to pass without a remark. We are not concerned with how much or how little of what Mr. Goldie said and admitted to Mr. Martin, as reported, is correct or incorrect; not being present at the interview, we can only hear what each affirms. But it is to what Mr. Goldie says in this letter, we wish to direct our reader's attention.

"The Adamic race were born in the bonds of iniquity, and the gall of bitterness. Christ, not being a member of the race by human begettall, having God for His Father, was not a sinner, and therefore not worthy of death." Thus spoke Mr. Martin.

Now, hear Mr. Goldie. "At the conclusion of these words, I said, 'I believe that, and so do all our brethren, and you know that.'"

Here Mr. Goldie plainly tells us that he himself and all his brethren believe that Christ was not, like the children begotten by Adam, born in the bonds of iniquity, and the gall of bitterness; and the reason Christ was not in this case was, that he was not a member of the race by human begettall. It was very natural, on hearing this, for Mr. Martin to say, "If that was my faith, we are not far removed from each other."

For our own part we are glad to hear Mr. Goldie say this; but sorry he should at the same time disown and oppose those who say the same things. After this it is puerile to quarrel about the mention or no mention of Swansea; but how can he tell us he "made no reference whatever to the Swansea brethren," when he has just informed us that "all our brethren" as well as himself - and he was saying this in Swansea - believed the statement made?

Now, about the Neath brethren, Mr. Goldie says, "I believe that Christ was condemned, though not in the sense the Neath brethren put it. Paul says that the Scriptures were fulfilled in condemning Him. Acts xiii. 27." Mr. Goldie does not tell us in what sense the Neath brethren do "put it;" but by quoting Acts xiii. 27, he insinuates that the Neath brethren do not agree with that. This will not do. It is very paltry. The wicked Jews condemned Christ, and so fulfilled the prediction of the prophets; but this is a very different "kind of condemnation from condemnation in birth, or condemnation in bodily nature. The Scriptures plainly foretell the first, but are silent about the last. When brethren are of the same faith they should dwell together in unity. - EDITOR.

Dear Bro. Turney, - I am pleased and edified with your articles on "The Two Sons of God." If we, as Christadelphians of to-day, believe that the Devil of to-day is in the human breast, and that "we are tempted by our own inordinate desires, being drawn out and allured." James i. 14. [From Diaglott]. Why not with all reason, believe that the Devil in Eden was the same "inordinate desire that having conceived, produced sin; and sin being perfected, brought forth death"? My brother, I would not expunge even a word of Chapter x., or of any other chapter, even if it was my prerogative.

My desire is here, not to correct but to remind. - Since the appearance of the article referred to in Lamp No. 2, Vol. 2, there has been a query as to how Bro. Turney disposes of that part of the sentence pronounced on the serpent, recorded in Gen. iii. 14. "Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Now, the conclusion that I have arrived at is this; that the propensities in man seem to have been created for a higher purpose than the use to which they were put on their first trial, and because they had been perverted, and ensnared the woman; from that time, as it has been ever since, these propensities have been grovelling, low, earthward, as it were, eating dust - instead of being elevated by high and holy aspirations, to which state we seem to arrive at only by grace.

You refer to it on page 52, second col., as being "the moral and legal degradation of Adam and Eve." Now, if the above interpretation, which is humbly offered, coupled with your own, assisted others as well as myself to understand this allegory, why keep it under a bushel? but rather let it give light to all that are in the house of believers. - S. D. WELSH, Bucyrus, Ohio.

THE FATHER AND THE SON.

UNDER the above title there appear in the last number a few remarks requiring notice.

1st. The proper antecedent to the pronoun "He," in Hebrews ii. 16, is said to be God, not Jesus Christ.

This cannot be sustained by the context. For example, in the 14th verse, it is clearly stated that Jesus "also Himself likewise took part of the same" flesh and blood the children partook. The antecedent to the pronoun "He" in this verse is certainly the "I" of the 12th and 13th verses, and also the "He" in the last clause of the 11th verse; and if there is any unintelligible peculiarity in the 16th verse it is as native to the 14th as to the 16th. Does the 16th verse imply that the children had to be in existence first, ere they could partake of flesh and blood, and must the clause following that pertaining to the children, mean that Jesus could not partake of that, which the children partook, "for the best of all reasons, namely, there was no such person in existence" until He was born?

The peculiarity of the phrases is evidently idiomatic, originating, it may be, from the ancient notion which long and widely prevailed, viz., that of the transmigration of souls, and may be classed with the following from 1 Cor. xv. 38. Speaking of the vegetable seed, the Apostle says, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body." Now, what may the antecedents be to the pronouns it and his in the verse. Are we to assume that the seeds are in existence, transmigration-like, before God giveth them bodies? And when they have got their bodies, suppose we pick out one, say a mustard seed, and affirm of it, it took not hold of the nature of wheat, but it took hold of the nature of mustard, we would but affirm a parallel to that of Jesus in Heb. ii. 16, and that of both Jesus and "the children" in Heb. ii. 14.

2nd. - Whatever the writer, who first penned the phrase, "Jesus Christ as a whole," may have meant by it, it is difficult to say, but the phrase is scriptural enough in idea and exact enough in words if we take into consideration that Jesus Christ is the Head and His brethren the other members one Body, and this Body is made perfect at the marriage of the Lamb. Then will appear in the fashion of a multitudinous man (or body corporate) "Jesus Christ as a whole," see Ephes. v. 23, 30, 32; iv. 12, 13, etc.

Such a multitudinous man we have a specimen of now in the Romish Antichrist. This one body corporate consists of the Pope as the head, and the cardinals, bishops, and all the "faithful" as the other members of his body.

3rd. - The failure to see the correctness of the statement that "the Holy Spirit dwelt in the vile body as in a temple, with the materials of which it could not combine," arises from the meaning which I understand the word "combine" to possess. We may put sand in water, and mix the two, but these will never combine, because they are not compatible, as for example, sugar and water are; yet for a purpose they may be made to co-operate. Now, "corruption cannot inherit incorruption." They may go hand in hand, but they never can combine. Jesus, while in the flesh, subordinated the will of a corrupting nature to the will of an incorruptible Spirit. The Holy Spirit, while Jesus was in the flesh, though in Him, was always separable from Him, and it did forsake Him before He died. But could the Holy Spirit forsake

Him now? No. Why? Because His body, after His resurrection was changed from an animal-nature body to a body of Holy Spirit-nature - a body from which Holy Spirit is inseparable. The action of two individual powers may be combined, while the individuals themselves are not. This is partnership, and it may be dissolved at any time the individuals may please. But marriage in its proper aspect cannot be dissolved while man and wife are both alive, and this is an example of the combination of two individuals. They are both one flesh. Now Jesus, while in the flesh, was in combined action with the Father. His will and His Father's will were both one, nothing else; but after the change of Jesus' body the Father and Son became one in nature, and hence one in everything. I must remark that Jesus, while in the flesh possessed two spirits, - one belonging to Himself as a man (common to all mankind); the other belonging to His Father, by which He manifested the Father or Deity. The latter He received at His baptism, and it forsook Him while He was on the cross. He, however, did not die at this moment, He lived a little time after, and then gave up His own spirit. But in the objections I am replying to, these two spirits seem to be confounded.

4th.- I have not anywhere said that it was necessary for Jesus to die in the sense that death was necessary in the process of changing the natural or animal body into the spiritual. What I have said is that it was necessary for Jesus, in the circumstances in which He was placed, to die, in order that He might secure (not effect) this change as the reward of His work.

It is admitted that Jesus was obedient unto death. This admission implies that Jesus had received a command to lay down His life. It is admitted also that sin, in a responsible sense, is a transgression of law. Now, Jesus being under a command to lay down His life, it follows He had the freedom of His own will to obey or not obey, otherwise He would have been under compulsion to obey, and in such a case there would have been no merit in His obedience. Well, as Eternal Life lay before Him on the condition of obedience, so also did Eternal Death lie before him in the event of disobedience. Hence, it was as absolutely necessary for Him to avoid the result of disobedience and therefore die for Himself to gain the reward of Eternal Life as it was to die for others.

5th. The exception taken to the following proposition, namely, "As it was not until after His Baptism He began to manifest God, it could only have been at this period He became the "Word made flesh," or God in flesh made manifest," as based on the assumption that the premises are false, is just enough, but the question arises, ARE THE PREMISES FALSE? This should have been proved first, before the exception was set forth. The reasons I have given to support the proposition are not in any wise taken notice of, and the argument adduced to show the "absurd nonsense" of the proposition defeats itself. The objector seems to think that the manifestation of God and God Himself are one and the same, or that manifestation is the result of a change of the thing to be manifested into its manifestation; at least so I understand him; otherwise, why say, "something must exist before it can undergo a change," etc. John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," hence if this Word, namely, God, was changed into flesh, there must have existed after the change no God save that "made flesh."

If God fulfilled His purpose and promise, that He would raise up a prophet like unto Moses, and an Anointed Son of David to sit upon David's throne, the day on which He fulfilled this was the day on which He set forth that promise or word of His in flesh, by the filling His only begotten Son with His own Spirit, as if He had said, I promised you so and so, and now here He is before you. Here I give you the realization of that promise in flesh. This is David, my son, in whom I am well pleased. But had this realization been "God made into flesh," then the same God could not have afterwards forsaken Him and left the flesh into which He had been changed on the cross.

It is quite as easy to overrate a matter as underrate one, and as regards Jesus Christ, the former fault has been the more universal, and the origin of the greatest heresies. I do not underrate the fact concerning the birth of Jesus. I have said "it was an important fact, a most important fact, as important as any in Scripture," and by no means as alleged, either directly or indirectly, have I rendered it of secondary account. That "the existence of Jesus Christ as a living man was in itself a greater manifestation of God's power than any Jesus Christ gave during His ministry," is undoubtedly true, is beyond dispute, and so also was the creation of the world, but this has nothing to do with the question at issue. The question is, not as to God Himself manifesting His own power, it is as to JESUS CHRIST MANIFESTING THE POWER OF GOD. In Jesus Christ at His Baptism was concentrated all the power of God, in the scheme of salvation, and thence beginning at Galilee there issued forth from Him to the world, the manifestation of God's power to save. Nothing of this sort began either at Bethlehem or Jerusalem. True, the Gospel was preached from the foundation of the world, but never man spake as this Man. His words were spirit and life. - W. D. JARDINE.

To be continued.

REVIEW.

We have been favoured with a copy of Bro. Jardine's Second Letter to the Editor of the "Christadelphian" on "Mere-Manism," "God-Manifestation," "Sacrifice of Christ," and have read it through. We have not been asked to express an opinion about it; but think it would be almost unjust to let it pass unnoticed. The Letter is, to our thinking, excellent. It utterly destroys the positions it attacks one after another in a clear, cool, and masterly style, without the least display of ill-temper. Its exposure of the opponent's "misquotations" and "misrepresentations" is withering by its very calmness and simplicity. Nothing has been said or written which has more ably advocated the doctrine that Jesus was not sold under sin. "The microscopic view of things," which the opponent affects to ridicule as a defect in the writer of this Letter, is turned to capital account. The "microscope" of the author develops the utter worthlessness of his antagonist's position; but the naked eye was quite sufficient to perceive its bitterness of spirit and badness of manners. We shall give no extracts, for it seems nearly all good alike. We hope every reader of our paper will procure a copy; should any still have a desire for something more to be said in substantiation of our main position, we think they will find all they could wish in this Second Letter.

VIRTUE WITHOUT FEAR, - When, upon mature deliberation, a thing is fit to be done do it boldly; and do not affect privacy in it, or concern yourself at all, what impertinence censures or reflections the world will pass upon it. For if the thing be not just and innocent, it ought not to be attempted at all, though never so secretly. And if it be, you do very foolishly to stand in fear of those who will themselves do ill in censuring and condemning what you do well. - Epictetus.

EXTRACTS.

From the "Talmud Article" - Quarterly Review.

"In the Talmud are some of those very laws of the Medes and Persians (which altereth not, Dan, vi, 8) hidden away in its labyrinths."

"Turn it, and turn it again (says the Talmud, speaking of the Bible), for everything is in it." How like our "Search the Scriptures," etc., of the New Testament.

"613 injunctions (says the Talmud) were given by Moses to the people, David reduced them to 11 in the 15th Psalm, Isaiah reduced them to 6 (xxxiii. 13), Micah to 3 (vi. 8), and Amos to 1 (v. 4)."

"The Talmud says that the Resurrection is to take place by the mystic power of the Dew of Life in Jerusalem - On Mount Olives, add the Targums."

"Scripture ordains that the Hebrew slave, who loves his bondage, shall have his ear pierced against the door-post. Why? Because it is that ear which heard on Sinai the words - "They are Thy servants, not servants' servants." And this man voluntarily throws away his precious freedom - pierce his ear."

"Commit a sin twice, and you will think it perfectly allowable." - TALMUD.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - Dear Bro. Turney, - It is my duty to inform you that during the past month we have been working steadily for the truth's sake, and although Birmingham has been labouring under the revival sensation of Messrs. Moody and Sankey, we have the satisfaction of seeing our audiences augmented so far as to give us very good hopes for the future. Week by week we endeavour, by setting forth the Word, to effect the deliverance of our fellow creatures from the law of sin and death, and to glorify our Heavenly Father. The lectures for the last month have been, - January 10th, "The Jews: their restoration to their ancient glory," Brother Henry Turney of Stourbridge. January 17, "The Moody and Sankey Mission: Is it from Heaven or of men," Bro. W. Ellis. January 24th, "The great question of life in Christ examined," Bro. Edward Turney, of Nottingham. January 26th, Tuesday, "An attack on the doctrine of Hell torments," Bro. Edward Turney, of Nottingham. These two last lectures were well attended, considering

the bad weather and counter attractions: no doubt good will follow. January 31st, "The new birth," Bro. W. Ellis. February 7th, "The destruction of the kingdoms of men, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God," Bro. Henry Flint. - Yours fraternally, CHAS. JENNINGS.

THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY AND CHRISTADELPHIANS. - To the Editor of the Morning News: Sir, - I trust that in fairness you will allow a reply to Mr. G. S. Dowling's letter in today's issue of your journal, containing as it does so much misrepresentation and abuse of the Christadelphians. Christadelphians certainly do feel annoyed at being classed at any rate with Atheists believing, as they do so heartily, in the inspiration of Scripture, and being ready to stand or fall by its teaching. In declaring so boastfully that the committee of the Christian Evidence Society "has searched them (the Christadelphians) out, and by the light of God's truth driven them back into retirement," your correspondent must be understood simply as expressing his own hopes. The fact is, the Christadelphians met the warriors of the Christian Evidence Society on their own battle ground week after week, for the purpose of defending their faith; and it was only when they saw that their opponents seemed more devoted to the throwing of mud, in the evident hope that some of it would stick, than to proving their doctrines from the Bible that they reluctantly discontinued their visits. They are quite as ready as ever to meet the Christian Evidence Society, provided they will adhere to the Word they profess to value so highly. Mr. Dowling charges us with denying certain Christian doctrines. It is quite true that we do not believe that Jesus Christ existed before he was born in Bethlehem, for the simple reason that we believe the Scriptural testimony that He was the Son of God. Mr. Dowling and his coadjutors are no doubt satisfied to accept the doctrine - as they do many others - without understanding it. To say, however, that we deny the doctrine of the atonement is a gross misrepresentation, as it is one of the cardinal points of our faith that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin" those who believe and are immersed into His name. Mr. Dowling is equally at sea in his definitions of "earthly, sensual, devilish." In those definitions he puts the Scriptures out of court altogether, and stamps with his condemnation some of the fundamental and elementary doctrines of the Bible. He evidently does not believe that the Messiah is yet to reign in Jerusalem before his ancients gloriously (Isaiah xxiv. 23). In his charges he accuses us of having no conception of spiritual existence apart from matter." We should like to know what other conception of spiritual existence he possesses, and also where he derives his conception from. The Scriptures show that the angels (whose spirituality even Mr. Dowling, I suppose, will not deny) can eat and drink, and can perform the various functions of a material organization. In relation to future existence,

"If he says there is no matter,
It does not matter what he says."

In conclusion, I would remark that if the Christian Evidence Society have made no greater progress in their warfare against Infidelity than they have against Christadelphianism, they have but spent their strength in the past for naught. - Yours, etc. January 8, 1874. J. BUTLER.

EXETER. - Bro. Martin, writing from this place, mentions the obedience to the gospel by baptism of Mr. Townsend, of Brightlingsea, Essex. It was through Bro. Martin's lectures in the Isle of Man, that Mr. Townsend's attention was turned to the truth, which he afterwards obeyed at Mumbles. This fact is an encouragement to sow beside all waters, for we know not which shall prosper - this or that.

LEICESTER. - We continue to lift up our voices, not exactly in the streets, but in a building abutting upon one of the main thoroughfares of this populous town, endeavouring to persuade men that they are not in possession of inherent immortality, but that they may be brought into a position favourable to the attainment of so glorious a consummation, and be made ultimately partakers of the Divine nature. I am gratified to be able to say that the interest in our efforts continues not only unabated but increasing. I have, moreover, the further pleasure of asking you to record in the Lamp the addition to the household of faith of Francis William Kemp, 17, who was immersed by Bro. Handley, on Friday, the 12th instant. Brother F. N. Turney, of Stourbridge, gave an address here on Sunday evening, January 24th, his subject being "Scripture teaching concerning God and His Son, shown to be opposed to both Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines." Bro. Handley, on the 31st, dealt with that old enemy of the Truth, "The immortal Soul" doctrine, under the title of "Death, the Wages of Sin; Life a gift, in and through Christ only;" and on the 7th February he showed that the saying of Jesus, "No man hath ascended up to heaven," was in harmony with His other sayings, and with the teachings of prophets and apostles, and out of harmony with the teaching accepted for Truth by the multitude. - CHARLES WEALE.

NOTTINGHAM. - There have been two immersions during the month, viz., Mrs. Squires, a near relative of Brother and Sister Smith, formerly a member of the Wesleyan body, but for the last three or four years an attendant at the meetings of the Christadelphians; and Edwin Brierley, warper, aged 35, formerly Campbellite, brother in the flesh (and now also in the spirit) to our present Bro. Brierley. Mrs. Storer has

requested us to correct an error which inadvertently crept into our account of her immersion; "It is true (she says) that I was formerly a member of the Church of England, and mistress of the National School; but it was at Lambley, near Nottingham, not at Wolverhampton. But it is not correct that I relinquished that post for the truth's sake; notice was given to me because the managers wished to engage a master, not because they would not allow me to teach the doctrines we hold. Indeed, I think they knew nothing of them. Of course I have shut myself out of the profession as far as Church Schools are concerned, but that is a very different thing from the impression likely to be made by the notice in the Lamp." Bro. W. Lewin reports the Sunday School to be prosperous and increasing in numbers. There is however a lack of teachers, the present staff being unequal to the demands made upon them by the different classes. The brethren and sisters of the Ecclesia will please to bear this mind, and render all the assistance in their power to the important work of teaching the young the elements of the truth, as well as disabusing their minds of the false notions they may have imbibed. We have much pleasure in reporting that Bro. Handley (late of Maldon) has taken up his residence in this town, together with his wife and youngest daughter. The brethren generally feel much cheered and strengthened by Bro. Handley's presence among them, being fully aware of his great activity and perseverance in the cause of the truth. The following have been the subjects of the Sunday Evening Discourses since our last issue: January 17th. "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of God," Bro. Hayes. January 24th, "Hell, a place of rest," Bro. Handley. January 31st, "Death the wages of sin; not eternal torments." Bro. Turney. February 7th, "A time of trouble: the Eastern question and its solution as foretold by the Hebrew prophets," Bro. Turney. February 14th, "A refuge from the storm," Bro. Turney.

STOURBRIDGE. - Charles Powell, the person I spoke of last month, having been found intelligent in the Truth, was immersed on Monday, January 18th. We have had Brethren Ellis and Handley over during the month. The former lectured on Monday, January 24th, subject: "The day of Redemption;" the latter spoke last Sunday (14th), subject: "Hell: A place of rest." The attendance has been very fair - although we have not advertised as much as formerly. Last Sunday our morning meeting was somewhat enlivened by the presence of Brother Handley and several brethren and sisters from Birmingham. - F. N. TURNEY.

SCOTLAND. BANK BY NEW CUMNOCK. - I am happy to inform you I have been, by the help of your Lecture, able to affirm, either by tongue or pen, that you have converted me. I was wrong upon the nature of Christ. I am happy to thank you as being the means of freeing my eyes from dust. It is my duty to confess, and I am thankful to do so. I can now see that Christ was not in Adam, because God was His Father. The beauty of Christ is veiled by any other teaching than this. I do hope, brother, that many more will see it to be their duty to set forth the truth in its beauty, either by diagram or chart. - WM. WALLACE.

PAISLEY. - We regret to record the deaths of Sister Callum and Sister Gilmour. The former died on the 19th December, but the news did not reach us; the latter, January 25th, at the age of 81. Both expressed a firm confidence in the hope of a resurrection to eternal life.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

BUCYRUS, Nov., 1874. - We have had the pleasure of witnessing the immersion of S. Welsh and wife, also Mrs. Perritt. It has taken them years to learn that they were "without God in the world;" but they now rejoice that they are "made nigh by the blood of Christ." [We hope our new brethren will be able to hold fast the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. - Ed.]

BUFFALO. - Bro. James Elliott sends us a suggestive letter on the signs of the times. He thinks it may be a mistake to pay too much attention to Russia and Turkey and so little to Papal Europe. The last power, it is thought, will be more terrible before the end. Bro. Elliott says, "I must thank Bro. Ellis for the able and satisfactory answers he gave to my former questions. "Speaking of Bro. Jardine's pamphlet he adds "If Jesus was a natural sinner, then His Father must have been the same."

MILWAUKEE. - Bro. R. Harper, under date January 19, (after transmitting orders for Lamp and Treatise) says, "I am glad you have published so readily those articles of Bro. John Coffman; and your observations, which were very proper, brought out his explanation, which, I think, was needed. Your endorsement, with summary of the main points arrived at in his article, is gratifying to us. I am glad that you impress upon your readers the importance of always discussing so profound and exalted a subject in a proper spirit, free from dogmatism. The subject is not by any means exhausted, and although, in your admirable Treatise on the Two Sons of God you present the subject of the Christ in some of its many attractive forms, they are not yet all brought out. Wishing you success in your endeavour to make the Lamp the medium of communicating light unmixed with the darkness of error, and to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints, I am, yours faithfully in the Christ, ROBT. HARPER."