

The Christadelphian Lamp

“Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” – Ps. Cxix. 105

Vol. 2.

APRIL, 1875.

No. 6

CONTENTS

Page 2.	A Treatise on The Two Sons of God	Editor
Page 6.	The Gospel of The kingdom	John Cameron
Page 13.	Questions and Difficulties (Enos Jacobs)	Editor
Page 15.	Great Consequences from Little Causes	‘Public Opinion’
Page 15.	The Walls and Gates of Jerusalem	Gleaner
Page 16.	Exhortation on Philippians II	Editor
Page 17.	The Jews and The Press	Jewish Chronicle
Page 18.	The Man of Business	‘Liberal View’
Page 19.	Jewish Items	Jewish Chronicle
Page 20.	The Forgiveness of Injuries	Bro. John Glover
Page 23.	Psalm III (poem)	D.B.
Page 24.	Assyria and Mesopotamia	Gleaner
Page 25.	The Soul of Man and Beast	
Page 25.	The Children’s Columns	
Page 26.	Church Defence Conference at Birmingham	
Page 27.	Dreams of Peace Disturbed	Peace Society Papers
Page 28.	The Genealogy of Christ	A Christian
Page 29.	Letters to The Editor	
Page 30.	The Perverted Parable - The Rich Man & Lazarus	W. Laing
Page 32.	Mount Hor	Gleaner
Page 32.	Extract on Self Deception	Eclectic
Page 33.	Intelligence	

THE duty of the forgiveness of injuries is a prominent feature in the teaching of Christ. From Matthew vi. 15, we learn that it is essential to our own forgiveness. The words of the Lord are: “If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.” In the parable recorded, Matthew xviii. 23-35, Jesus instructs us that this duty should be exercised from a remembrance of the forgiveness which we ourselves have received. His answer to Peter’s enquiry, “How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?” shows that pardon should be unlimited as far as the number of offences is concerned. “I say not unto thee until seven times, but until seventy times seven.” But Christ not only taught this duty by precept, but also by example - unmoved by ingratitude, contumely, and the approach of a cruel ignominious death. Though His life had been crowded with acts of kindness, though He had found His highest joy and constant service in mitigating human woe, and thousands could have borne testimony to His tender compassion and healing power, He fell a victim to the malice of His enemies. Human dogs compassed Him about, they clamoured for His blood, “pierced His hands and His feet” - those hands which had so often ministered to the wants of others - those feet that had walked so many weary miles to preach the gladdest of all tidings, the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; yet even in His dying moments He cried, “Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.”

Isaiah 52:7

“How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, thy God reigneth!”

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

(Continued from March page 4)

CHAP. XIV. - THE AGE OF PEACE.

THE NEW NAME.

“IN the mythology of the Greek and Roman poets the history of the world was divided into four ages, the golden, the silver, the brazen, and the iron; as, for instance, by Hesiod, in his poem, entitled ‘Works and Days,’ and by Ovid, in his ‘Metamorphoses’ (Book i.) The golden age, when Saturn reigned, is represented as having been that of perfect innocence and happiness, from which the others have gradually degenerated - the iron age, or that which now subsists, being the most wicked and miserable of all.”

According to other accounts “the golden age is represented as the triumph of civilization over previous barbarism; whereas the former version seems intended to indicate that the primeval state of man was that in which he enjoyed the greatest felicity. The two statements, therefore, may be taken as expressing two opposite theories or opinions, which have divided speculators upon this subject even to our own day.”

Such is the yearning expression of the heart of mankind in regard to The Age of Peace. One great division had found it in the far-off past; the other expects it in the wished-for future. Speculation, conducted without the aid of God’s utterances, is not of much value upon this interesting subject; it tends, however, to show that man sustains a relation to a better constitution of things, faintly shadowed out in the universal desire for a permanent era of undisturbed tranquillity and happiness; but it entirely fails to give any reliable information as a guide for faith, and as an anchor to hope.

There is a very ancient tradition that, as the creation of the world occupied six days and the Creator rested on the seventh, so the world of humanity was destined to labour and fatigue for six thousand years, and then to enter upon the enjoyment of rest and peace for a thousand years more. This analogy is both natural and pleasing; it appears also, according to certain texts of Holy Writ, to combine the immense advantage of being true, so far as it relates to the thousand years of rest. Rev. v. 10: xx, 6. The same conclusion might be arrived at by inference from the divisions of time by the Mosaic law, and the divine injunctions with respect to those periods. Every reader will understand that we allude to the jubilees. The idea of a Heavenly Millennium pervades the New Testament, especially the discourses of Christ and the letters of the Apostles. “Come unto me, all that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” Again, “the rest that remaineth for the people of God.” While of the wicked it is written, “there is no rest for them.” The words of Jesus go straight to the heart. There is hardly a son or a daughter of Adam in whose breast they have not, at one time or another, met a responsive throb; so admirably adapted to the necessities of the case are the means of the Restorer and Comforter.

From the last to the first of the prophets the golden age is portrayed as a time of material blessedness on earth, not of immaterial “bliss” in heaven. The order in which they describe what they see begins always with their own people, the Jews; from them they pass to the nations, in one or two instances specifying a certain order of rank in which Israel invariably has the preeminence. The character, therefore, of the golden age is not left to imagination and fancy. Whoever will be at the trouble to study the prophets – with whom Christ and the Apostles are in harmony - will perceive clearly what is the nature of that promised universal happiness, though we are not sufficiently informed of its details to be able to follow the occupations of the world from day to day; neither can we do this, except in a very limited degree, with regard to great nations that are past: their history, as it has come down to us, only furnishes a few of the salient features of their life. It is probable, if not indubitable, that the golden age will, in certain respects, resemble the state of things in the days of Christ and the Apostles: that is, it will be a time of the miraculous intermingling with the natural; the lame will be healed, the blind will receive their sight, and, what even seems greatest of all miracles, the dead, perhaps; will be raised to life again. If there was a need, as all will admit, for the performance of wonderful works in the age of Christ’s first sojourn among men, will there not be a greater need for the same benefits upon a scale as wide as the world itself when He returns to take up His final residence with man? The Prophets and the New Testament also conduce to this expectation.

The Position of the Jews. - “He (Messiah) shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former (margin, ancient) years (Mal. iii. 3, 4). The last words of this prediction mark the period. “Yea, every pot in Jerusalem, and in Judah, shall be holiness unto the LORD of Hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them,

and seethe therein; and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the LORD of Hosts” (Zec. xiv. 21). The concluding part of this prophecy goes beyond the present condition of the land and city, which are full of Canaanites, or enemies of Jehovah. “Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth” (ch. viii. 3). “My cities, through prosperity, shall yet be spread abroad; and the LORD shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem” (ch. i. 17). This language finds no adequate response in the history of Israel since the time the prophet wrote: “Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The LORD hath taken away thy judgments, He hath cast out thine enemy: the King of Israel, even the LORD, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more” (Zeph. iii. 14,15). “Behold, upon the mountains the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows, for the wicked shall no more pass through thee; he is utterly cut off” (Nahum. i. 15). “They shall build waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them; and they shall no more be pulled up out of land which I have given them, the LORD thy God “ (Amos ix. 14,15). As the testimonies are numberless foretelling the material blessed of Israel, their holiness, and political greatness, we need add no more; but will proceed to cite several other prophecies, which point out the respective status of Jews and Gentiles in the age of peace.

The position and esteem of the Gentiles in relation to Israel. - “Thus saith the LORD of Hosts, in those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you” (Zech. viii. 23). “Ye shall be named the priests of the LORD; men shall call you the ministers of our God; ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves. Strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vine-dressers” (Isa. lxi. 6, 5). “The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted” (ch. Is. 12). This foreshows universal subordination to God’s chosen nation, a state of things partially carried out in ancient times, so long as they obeyed the Divine commands. This political order will abolish all modern ideas concerning “the balance of power,” an equilibrium which it is impossible to maintain. “Thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet” (ch. xlix. 22,23). It is not unreasonable to infer that proud reflection on texts of this order induced arrogance and self-glorification, and led the Jew to despise the Gentile. It was not the wealth of Israel that was designed to operate their exaltation and refinement.

The Spirit said, “Behold I have refined thee, but not with (margin, for) silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction” (ch. xlvi. 10). The rank of several principal nations. - “In that day, Israel shall be reckoned a third, together with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom Jehovah of Hosts hath blessed, saying, Blessed be my people Egypt; and Assyria, the work of my hands; and Israel, my inheritance. - chap. xix. 24, 25, (Lowth’s translation). Although Israel is here “reckoned a third,” or as in the common version “the third,” the meaning is not that the other two stand higher in rank, for she is immediately spoken of as “mine inheritance;” and in another prophecy it is said she shall have the first dominion (Micah iv. 8), which agrees with the texts before quoted from Isaiah, and with others, to the effect that she will be “the head and not the tail” among the nations of the earth.

The peace and prosperity of the nations. - All the earth sitteth still, and is at rest” (Zech. i. 11). “And He shall speak peace unto the heathen; and His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth” (Zech. ix. 10.) Part of this is a quotation from the seventy-second Psalm. “Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people” (Rom. xv. 10). “O praise the LORD, all ye nations: praise Him all ye people. For His merciful kindness is great toward us: and the truth of the LORD endureth forever.” (Ps. cxvii. 2). “The mountains shall bring peace to the people.” (Ps. lxxii. 3). That is, peace shall be proclaimed from the top of the mountains; or the empires and kingdoms shall speak peace to their subjects. “Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end” (Isa. ix. 7). “And on earth peace, good will toward men (Luke ii. 14).

Religious worship of the nations. - “For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the LORD, to serve Him with one consent” (Zeph. iii. 9). “All Kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him” (Psa. lxxii. 11). “Every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year (to Jerusalem) to worship the King, the LORD of Hosts “ (Zech. xiv. 16). “For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen saith the Lord of Hosts” (Mat. i. 11). “Also

the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the LORD, to serve Him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be His servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people" (Isa. Ivi. 6. 7).

Feasts and Ceremonies. – "O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts: perform thy vows: for the wicked shall no more pass through thee" (Nahum i. 15). They shall "go up to keep the feast of tabernacles" (Zech. xiv. 16). This is a feast of offerings by fire seven days, during which the people live out of doors, in booths of canvas decorated with the boughs and branches of trees, a time of great enjoyment after harvest. This universal feast on the hills and in the valleys round about Jerusalem, will eclipse everything of the kind attempted hitherto. Men of every nation and tribe will be there; every shade of skin, from the fair white European to the inky Nubian; with all their varieties of costume and manners; and the ministers in the services will be able, like the Apostles at Pentecost, to address every man in his own tongue wherein he was born. We may imagine in some degree the general effect of this scene, and the feelings and impressions the visitors will carry away with them to their homes, where they will tell of having seen the King in His beauty, and of hearing the speech of Him, who two thousand years before, was murdered in the same city. Many hearts will swell, and eyes fill; as they hear the stories of their friends. And thus, the years will roll away, till the sound and art of war are forgotten. Man will rest and brighten in the peace and light of Him who is the true Light, and the Prince of Peace; he will pass the boundary that now separates this moral wilderness from that stainless Eden, and hold fellowship with the morning stars and all the sons of Deity.

THE NEW NAME.

The highest aspiration of the disciple of the Lord is the attainment of what is styled in the language of Holy Writ the New Name. Some slight knowledge of this will be foreshadowed by our article in the preceding chapter, entitled the Old Name. A multitudinous aggregate of people bearing the Name of Jehovah was briefly shown to be the idea contained in the writings of Moses and the Prophets. But as that name has been cast off for many centuries, it becomes a question whether it is designed to be restored, and in what manner. Before entering upon the consideration of an answer, it will be in order to say a word about the meaning of Jehovah's name.

First, then, let it be observed that man could not have known by what name to designate the Deity unless the Deity had communicated to him the knowledge of His name. Moses anticipated this when he was about to go to the Israelites sunk in bondage and barbarism. "They will say, What is His name?" We remark, also, that up to a certain epoch the Deity had been revealed to Abraham and others, by the name Almighty, and that, thenceforth, He desired to be known by the name Jehovah. No person, who is really interested and thoughtful in his perusal of the Scriptures, could pass over this passage without pausing to enquire and reflect. He would naturally ask himself, What is the meaning of the name Almighty and what the meaning of the name Jehovah and why was the change made from the one to the other? It would, probably, occur to the reader's mind that in God's dealings with men - with idolaters who trusted in their false deities - the first object on the part of the true God would be to impress them with a due sense of His infinite power. He was, therefore, during a long period known to a select and obedient few as the Almighty - "able to perform all He had promised;" "Is there anything too hard for the Lord?"

This primary and essential lesson being taught and well fixed in the mind of His children, God next proceeded to reveal, not all at once, but "at sundry times and in divers manners," His future purposes; and He chose to do this partly in the significance of the name by which He would be known. It is no new, but yet no unimportant observation that the name Jehovah points to the future. The Jews, to this day, profess deep awe, and, to some extent ignorance too, concerning the name Jehovah. They never attempt to utter it, on the ground that they have no tradition as to the proper pronunciation; how their high priest pronounced Jehovah they know not and so they give to it quite another form and sound, viz., Adonai, the Hebrew word for Lord. But this explains nothing; it leaves the earnest investigator as much in the dark upon the subject as the rendering given by our translators of the name Jehovah, which is, "I am, that I am;" for neither the word Lord, nor the phrase, "I am, that I am," conveys the true sense of the word Jehovah, which signifies "He who will be." The mere confident assertion, "I am," could satisfy no one, nor does it appear that any benefit could accrue from the change if that were all, or if that were indeed what was intended for the name Almighty clearly carried the idea of existence in the most forcible manner. But "I will be," or "He who will be," is very different, and would produce as different an impression on the

minds of those to whom it was made known. Instead of resting vaguely in the present, their eyes would peer towards the future, and the general query would be, Who is this "I will be?" "I will be" what, and when? While this new announcement would keep the watchful anxiously and diligently searching, none would be able to furnish a correct reply until the light of the fulfilment of the assurance broke upon the world; and even then not all who were professedly vigilant perceived that the promise was fulfilled, or rather that the fulfilment of it had begun.

This prophetic and once mysterious name, "I will be," may now, by the clear light of history, and, in consequence of that history, the less obscure light of still unaccomplished prophecy, be paraphrased as follows: - "I, Jehovah, will be to Israel and the nations a Saviour" The rays of this ancient promise streamed through the long pre-adventual darkness, struck upon the manger and the cross, passed shaft-like through the tomb, shot upwards to the heavens, hereafter to burst in one luminous flood over all the earth, ever to remain for the perfect guidance of mankind. In their first transit, the benignant rays revealed from deepest shade one figure - Jesus of Nazareth, - in their final diffusion, a star-like multitude will be beheld, resembling the soft and brilliant canopy of night.

With the advent of Jesus, the time came to begin the manifestation of the name of the Deity to men; not to all, but to his brethren, as David had said: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren." Psa. xxii. 22. Accordingly, He of whom this was written, spake thus, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world" (Jno. xvii. 6.) This declaring and manifesting were one and the same work. In the teaching of Jesus, the restoration of His nation, the punishment and ultimate destruction of the wicked, the resuscitation and immortalisation of the righteous dead, the government of the world by Himself and His disciples, were the burden of His word. These things were, at best, but darkly conjectured in the ages before His proclamation; but by His preaching and that of His Apostles, the Father's name, or purpose, was "declared," manifested," or made easy of comprehension.

The intent of declaring and manifesting the Father's name, may be distinctly seen from the context of the words above quoted: "And they have kept Thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." What those words were which the Father gave to His well-beloved Son, may be certainly known from two passages, the one in Isaiah Ixi. 1, 2, and the other in Luke iv. 16-21. Let the reader peruse and re-peruse this declaration of the prophet, by the light of the gospel narratives, and he will not be ignorant of the name or purposes of the Deity in Christ.

Immediately after Saul's conversion, Ananias was told by the Lord that He had chosen Paul to "bear His name before the Gentiles." Christ's preaching was the manifestation of His Father's name; Paul's ministry was bearing the name before the Gentiles. "When the fulness of the time was come," the purpose of the Most High was to be looked for through that Son who had proceeded from Himself; made of a woman, Jesus took hold of the humanity He was sent to redeem and rule; so that in a visible substantial way the Increate, the Invisible, He whom men could not even hear without one to intervene was seen and heard in the person and voice of His only begotten Son. The Son, therefore, was the visible, tangible attestation, the "Surety" for the fulfilment of the great and precious promises concealed in the self-imposed Name of the Creator of heaven and earth.

From these remarks it appears that the name of the Deity and of Christ is presented in the Word under two aspects - doctrinally and substantially. The doctrine refers to the intentions of the Creator revealed from time to time in their gradual development; the substantial refers to the agents through whom those intentions are to be carried to the predetermined consummation. It is this latter view of the great design which agrees with the apostolic labours of "taking out a people for the name." Here it becomes evident that the name is not for ever to be only an abstract purpose, but that it is to be Deity Himself manifested to the world through solid, material, deathless, human forms. The foundation of this was the begetting of Jesus, who was an actual manifestation in flesh of Him that begat, and like unto the "First-born," by faith and obedience are to be made all those "who are the called according to His purpose." Whence it follows that the assumption or putting on of the New Name is perfected through the two-fold action of mental change and bodily transformation. In Jesus Christ the Jehovah-Name began in the flesh common to man; it terminated in spirit, the essential property of God. Thus will it be with the members one and all; they have partaken of the earthy, and they will also partake of the heavenly. So that when men and women who understand and affectionately believe the proclaimed Name, in other words, "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ," and are baptized into His name, they do not merely declare their adhesion to a certain form of doctrine, they take up a position for "the world to come" - life and incorruptibility organised into a ruling power, the head of which is Christ, whose invisible head is God. We have said "organised into a ruling power." The terms with which the name is coupled, the work

assigned to those who are its constituents, all point clearly to such organisation; hence it is plain that the glorified saints are not to spend their time in vague, self-absorbing enjoyments, but that they will be engaged in regular and benevolent, yet "tireless labour." Turn to a few passages. "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is "New Jerusalem" (Bev. iii. 12). Here are the terms "temple," "city," "New Jerusalem." These denote religious and political arrangement. "Temple" points to the ecclesiasticism of the saints, "city" to their municipality, "New Jerusalem" to their metropolitan eminence. Let these things be considered, and it will be seen that there is a real life in the "world to come" far more analogous to this present existence than many religious persons are inclined to believe. And this accords with reason, and the necessity of the case. It is not a question of government or no government, but one of wise rule or misrule. Human authority is unavoidably very imperfect at best. The exaltation of Jehovah's name in all the earth will inaugurate the divine, and, therefore, perfect government of the world. Reader, art thou in the great Name; has it been written on thy forehead, or intellect? Hast thou put it on in baptism? Hast thou been adopted from the family of the first into the family of the second Adam? If thou hast, then there is "now no condemnation" to thee, thou art passed from death unto life; by faith thou hast been translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, and if thou continuest to walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit, thou wilt find thyself endowed with wisdom, and honour, and immortality in the society of God's "jewels" of every age, to go no more out, to cease from every ill which afflicts the flesh, and to exult in an unending career of happiness and power.

"THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM."

I was struck lately by hearing a Congregationalist Minister using the phrase at the head of this paper, "The Gospel of the Kingdom," to denote the common orthodox gospel concerning what is spoken of as the Atonement. I was quite aware that the orthodox have a way of their own of understanding the language referred to; but not having heard it really used till the occasion referred to, it took me a little by surprise; and as a large share of attention is being devoted by the brethren to other topics, it appears to me that, for the sake of such of the readers of the Christadelphian Lamp as may not be, as yet, beyond the position of inquirers, it may not be out of place to devote a few pages to this most vitally important subject.

The commonly received view of the gospel of the kingdom, then, is simply that which is to be believed in order to obtain the kingdom, and not the kingdom itself. And this is understood to be the glad tidings that God has, in the death of His Son, provided a sacrifice for the sins of man; as, for instance, where Paul tells the Corinthians: "I declare unto you the gospel . . . how that Christ died for our sins," etc., and that Jesus is the Christ, that is, the Anointed Prophet, Priest, and King of His church. But it is forgotten by those who hold such views, that Jesus not only preached the gospel of the kingdom, but He preached the very kingdom itself. His own words are: "I must preach the kingdom of God; for therefore am I sent," Luke iv. 43. And He commissioned His disciples to do the same. "He sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick - - - And they went through the towns preaching the gospel and healing everywhere," Luke ix, 2, 6. And so important did He consider this making known "the kingdom," that, when one asked Him to be allowed to go and bury his father, He told him, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and PREACH THE KINGDOM of God." And more than this, the Apostles at that time knew no other gospel, for when Jesus told them He should be killed and rise again, they understood not His words, as we find several times mentioned in the gospel narratives. See Luke xviii. 34. Besides, Jesus is never once called the King of His church. As the Christ, which means Anointed, He is the "King of Israel," under which title He was confessed by Nathanael, with the express approval of his Master. From this it is plain that the gospel, as summarily expressed in the formula, "Christ died for our sins," etc., must be understood with this official sense of the title "the Christ." The Apostles could not preach Christ as a sacrifice for sin at the time when they were unaware that He should die.

But not only did the Apostles preach the Kingdom of God before the death of Jesus, while they knew not that He should die, but they continued to do so after Jesus had risen from the dead and had ascended to the right hand of His Father in the heavens. We have a remarkable proof of this in the Acts of the Apostles, where their preaching is recorded. We are told for example that "When the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning THE KINGDOM OF GOD, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women" (viii. 12). Besides this, there are repeated accounts of Paul preaching the Kingdom to both Jews and Gentiles. And should it be questioned that Philip preached "the things of

the Kingdom” as an element of the gospel, it may be mentioned that the term rendered “preaching” is literally evangelizing, that is, making known as evangel or gospel. The word evangelizing is just the original Greek word in an English dress. Hence fully rendered, the verse should read - “When they believed Philip making known as glad tidings the things concerning the Kingdom of God,” etc.

One other instance of preaching the Kingdom, after the ascension of Christ, may be given from the preaching of the Apostle Paul. In recounting his labours to the elders of the Ephesian Church, he says: “None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify THE GOSPEL OF THE GRACE OF GOD. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone PREACHING THE KINGDOM OF GOD, shall see my face no more.” Here it is plain that “testifying the gospel of the grace of God,” and “preaching the kingdom of God,” are viewed by the Apostle as identical, expressing the same thing in different words; the former, general; the latter, specific. Verse 31 shows that this preaching the Kingdom of God among the Ephesians continued for “the space of three years;” and chapter xix. verse 8, shows the first three months of this preaching to have been in the Jewish Synagogue, the subject being there again expressly described, “disputing and persuading the things concerning THE KINGDOM OF GOD.” That this was Paul’s invariable usage may be further seen from the account of his two years’ residence in Rome, contained in the last chapter of the Acts, where “the Kingdom of God” is twice mentioned as the subject of his preaching. See verses 23 and 31.

Now, whatever sense the so-called orthodox may choose to impose upon the language “Kingdom of God,” they must accept the responsibility of correctly ascertaining the Scriptural sense, or confess their inability to make known to their hearers the gospel preached by Christ and His Apostles. And, if they do not proclaim something bearing the name by which the gospel was exclusively designated during the personal ministry of the Lord, that of itself is sufficient to convict them of ignorance of the very first principles of the gospel of Christ. Now, the fact is that they do not profess to preach anything as the gospel of salvation to sinners which can by any means be termed “THE KINGDOM OF GOD;” their preaching of the gospel being confined to the sacrifice for sin, offered to God in the death of Jesus.

But leaving the preachers of the popular theology to settle this question as best they may, let us now inquire as to what Christ and His Apostles preached, when they made known the things concerning THE KINGDOM OF GOD. The common idea is, that the Church is the kingdom. I have already stated that Christ is commonly understood to be the King of His church. The Confession of Faith, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, with the assistance of Commissioners from the Church of Scotland (1643), makes formal declaration of the popular doctrine, as follows:-

“It pleased God in His eternal purpose to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus, His only begotten Son, to be the Mediator between God and man; the Prophet, Priest, and King; the Head and Saviour of His Church; the Heir of all things; and Judge of the world.” - CHAP. viii. SEC. i.

This Protestant Assembly, in this paragraph, simply expressed the doctrine concerning the Kingdom of God, which had been handed down to them by the Roman Catholic Church. This may be seen in the notes contained in the Roman Catholic English version of the Bible. For example, Dan, ii. 44, “And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed,” etc., the Roman Catholic version has this note - “A kingdom, viz., the Kingdom of Christ in the Catholic Church, which cannot be destroyed.”

This Popish idea of the Kingdom of God was thus inherited by our Protestant ancestors, pure and simple, as it had been held for a thousand years prior to the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The following extract from the “Dictionary of the Bible,” by John Eadie, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, will show that, in our own day, this is still held as a prominent sense of the Kingdom of God:-

“Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the Kingdom,” Luke xii. 32. Kingdom - the precise import of this term can usually be determined by its connection. In the New Testament it generally denotes either the spiritual reign of Christ over the hearts of individuals, or over the church collectively.

“Kingdom of God,” 1 Cor. xv. 50. “Kingdom of Heaven,” Matt. iii. 2. These expressive terms sometimes denote the state of glory beyond the grave, 2 Pet. i. 11. More generally, they denote the gospel dispensation, under the Messiah, in distinction from the typical kingdom of the Jews, Matt. iii. 2; xxi. 43; xxv. 1; Luke x. 9, 11. And sometimes they signify the gospel exerting a reigning power over the hearts and minds of men, Luke xvii. 21; John iii. 3, 5; Rom. xiv. 17.

Dr. Southwell, in his Universal Family Bible, on Luke i. 32, 33, says: - "The Jews believed that the Kingdom of the Messiah was never to have an end, and this notion they formed in consequence of not distinguishing between the letter and the spirit of the prophecies - - - That kingdom is of a spiritual nature, and no way connected with the affairs of this world."

It will be observed that Dr. Eadie speaks of the kingdom denoting the state of glory beyond the grave."

This seems, also, to be the idea of the Westminster Assembly, as contained in their compilation, entitled the Shorter Catechism, a work well known in Scotland, whatever may be its popularity in England. In answer to question 102, "What do we pray for in the second petition?" that is, of the Lord's Prayer, the Assembly replies: "In the second petition (which is, Thy Kingdom come) we pray, that Satan's kingdom may be destroyed, (1) and that the kingdom of grace may be advanced, (2) ourselves and others brought into it, and kept in it (3) and that the kingdom of glory may be hastened." (4)

The Scripture proofs given by the Assembly are these, placed according to the clauses marked in the answer:-

(1) Psalm Ixviii. 1, "Let God arise; let His enemies be scattered; let them, also, that hate Him, flee before Him."

(2) Psalm li. 18, "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem."

(3) 2 Thess. iii. 1, "Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified, even as it is with you." Also, Rom. x. 1, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved."

(4) Rev. xxii. 20, "He which testified these things saith, Surely I come quickly, Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus."

The distinction between the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory, here maintained, is embalmed in the Scotch Paraphrase-hymn on the Lord's prayer -

For ever hallow'd be Thy name,
By all beneath the skies;
And may Thy kingdom still advance,
Till grace to glory rise."

I conclude the extracts by one from an anonymous Baptist preacher, who presented the Scriptural argument for the popular doctrine in the following terms: -

"Is the Church of Christ ever called a Kingdom?" Rev. i. 9. "I, John, your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the Kingdom of Jesus Christ," Col. i. 13. "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son." There are numerous other passages to prove the affirmative; but these two are sufficient to settle the question. - - - The Kingdom of Christ may be divided into two departments: its state of grace, in the present dispensation; and its future state, in the dispensation of glory."

Now, we have, in these extracts, a formidable array of authority for a present phase of the Kingdom of God in actual existence; extending from the Bishop of Rome, since the time of Constantine, in the fourth century, down to a humble Baptist minister, in the nineteenth. How true the saying that "extremes meet!"

Leaving out of view in the meantime the Kingdom of Glory which is, on all hands, assigned its place in the future, or at least "beyond the grave," the only other view really maintained is what is called a spiritual Kingdom, - the influence of "the gospel exerting a reining power over the hearts and minds of men."

Now, it is perfectly true that the truth exercises a powerful influence over the minds of men. But it is just as true that this is never once in the Scriptures termed the Kingdom of God. Why then contend for this as the Kingdom?

Again, Jesus came, proclaiming the approach of the Kingdom, saying, "Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand." The Kingdom Jesus preached was thus not in active existence at the time of His preaching. In precise accordance with this, He taught His disciples to pray, "Thy Kingdom come." But, down to the close of His ministry, it did not come; for we find Him then telling His disciples of certain signs by which it should be known that "the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand," Luke xxi. 31. These signs are placed subsequent to the times of the Gentiles, and although the duration of those times might not be known to those He addressed, they are now known to be still running; and the kingdom still future. I am not aware that any advocate of a present kingdom has contended that the signs are fulfilled.

But, if Jesus preached a future kingdom, it follows inevitably that it could not be the so-called spiritual reign of truth in the hearts of the faithful, for this was in active existence at the time of the preaching. The fact is, that the reign of truth had never been suspended from the days of Abel to the present, and was in active exercise in the persons of many at the time Jesus was announcing the approach of the kingdom. The aged Simeon, Anna the prophetess, Zacharias and Elizabeth, the parents of John the Baptist, Joseph of Arimathea, who is spoken of as "WAITING FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD," are examples of the power of intelligent faith in the divine promises, and true subjects of that influence which so many choose to designate the Kingdom of God.

Besides these first century examples of the power of faith, the eleventh chapter of Hebrews presents us with a roll of worthies, whose biographies extend over a period of four thousand years, during which the so-called spiritual kingdom continued in existence. Can we believe, with these facts before our eyes, that Jesus merely preached a continuance of this spiritual kingdom? The question naturally arises here, Was there no other kingdom in the circumstances in which Jesus came preaching the kingdom of God? Observe, then, here, that the people to whom He preached were chiefly that portion of God's ancient people, Israel, who belonged to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with a portion of the priestly tribe of Levi. There had been a kingdom established among this people by God Himself, and He was their king. The throne upon which David and Solomon sat was the throne of Jehovah (I Chron. xxix. 23). In verse 11 we have the words of David - "Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all." Thus the throne and kingdom were the Lord's, and this is the only kingdom of God which ever existed on the earth. The popular theology entirely ignores the possibility of the kingdom of God in the nation of Israel having any relation to the preaching of Jesus and His apostles. Let us, therefore, inquire whether there is any evidence to establish such a relationship? first, note the fact that Jesus preached the kingdom of God among the people of Israel, without giving any express definition of its nature. Had He intended to convey to their minds an idea of the kingdom different from what they already possessed, we cannot conceive that He would thus have left them in the dark.

Second, the people among whom Jesus preached derived any knowledge they then had of the kingdom of God from the literal understanding of their own prophets, as recorded in the Old Testament.

Third, they expected the restoration of their own kingdom under the Messiah. This is admitted by all. Fourth, Jesus knew all this, and the only conclusion which can be legitimately drawn from this is that the restored kingdom of Israel is the Kingdom of God, preached by Jesus and His Apostles.

But, here it might be objected that the kingdom of Israel could not be the subject of restoration, as preached by Jesus, seeing that it had never ceased to exist. It might be said - Did not Herod occupy the throne of the kingdom of Israel? And were not the chief priests and rulers engaged in administering the Divine law, as given through Moses? Did not they sit in Moses' seat, as Christ Himself acknowledged and to whom he enjoined obedience on the part of the people? But what saith the Scriptures? The kingdom of Israel, after having subsisted for several hundred years under the rule of the House of David, was brought to an end on account to the iniquity of both rulers and people, in the reign of Zedekiah. The divine judgment concerning this is in these terms: - "Thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end. Thus saith the Lord God, Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more until He come whose right it is, and I will give it Him" (Ezek. xxi. 25-27). This overturn of the kingdom of Israel has continued since; for, although there was a partial restoration of the people to the land, no son of David ever occupied the throne. Herod, who was king of Judea when Jesus was born, was both a foreigner and a usurper, reigning only by favour of the Roman emperors, who had reduced the country to a Roman province, and only tolerated, with certain limitations, the law of Moses, according to their usual practice with the conquered.

Besides, the Jews themselves did not consider their kingdom to have an independent existence, as may be seen from the question put by the Apostles to our Lord - "Wilt thou at this time RESTORE AGAIN the kingdom to Israel? And the wise men who, UNDER DIVINE GUIDANCE, came to Jerusalem, enquiring "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" afford another proof that the kingdom of Israel, in the active sense, had no existence. "He whose right it is" had "come to His own," but "His own received him not;" and this rejection of Him led to delay in His receiving the kingdom as predicted by Ezekiel; hence now the necessity of His second appearing. His claim to be the Christ - the Anointed for the throne of David, resulted in His death. But God raised Him from the dead, and exalted Him to His own right hand, from henceforth expecting till His enemies are made His footstool. He now awaits the times of restitution of all things spoken by the prophets, when God shall send Jesus Christ whom the heaven must receive until the arrival of those times. (Acts iii. 20, 21.) There cannot be a doubt that this restitution includes the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel.

It is evident from these considerations that it cannot be held that Herod occupied the throne of David, or that the Divine law of the kingdom could be enforced by the sanctions and penalties attached to it, seeing that God had suffered a foreign power to usurp the supremacy originally claimed by Himself; although it was still the duty of the people to obey it as far as practicable. How, then, could the Kingdom of God have a real existence? And where is the difficulty in understanding the coming kingdom preached by Jesus to be this veritable kingdom of Israel restored?

Let us notice now the texts adduced by the Baptist preacher to prove the Church to be the Kingdom. Reverting to his statement already quoted, as regards “grace” and “glory,” or according to the shorter Catechism, “the kingdom of grace” and “the kingdom of glory,” it is remarkable that if there exists such a distinction, there is no mention of it in the Scriptures. We never there read of a future phase of the kingdom - the kingdom of glory - as distinguished from a present phase - the kingdom of grace. Why, therefore, make a distinction, which the Bible does not make?

Again, it is perfectly true that the disciples of Christ - the Church - are absolutely subject to His authority.

But they are never once spoken of as the SUBJECTS of His kingdom; they occupy a higher position than this, and are more than once termed the “heirs of the kingdom” - even “joint heirs with Christ” Himself. And, on the other hand, while Christ is repeatedly called the Head of His body the Church, He is never once spoken of as its king. But if the church be really the kingdom in a present phase, it is strange that there is no instance of the application of the term kingdom, to designate the body of Christ, in any clear or unmistakable manner. The terms are in no clear instance interchangeable, as they should be if the church is the kingdom. Thus, as we have shown, the Apostles preached the kingdom, but it is never once said they preached the church. The Apostles wrote letters to the CHURCHES in various places; but we never read that they addressed any of their letters to the KINGDOMS of Galatia, or to the KINGDOMS of the Thessalonians, etc.

But this brings us to the proofs advanced on this point, which are alleged to be “sufficient to settle the question.” And it is remarkable that neither of the two passages cited expressly declares the church to be the kingdom. It is assumed, from the use of the present tense in Rev. i. 9, that John, calling himself the companion of the disciples in “tribulation and in the kingdom,” that the kingdom as well as the tribulation had an existence when John wrote the words. But the present tense does not always denote present reality. We have an example of this, out of many that might be cited, in 1 Pet. v. 1, “The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.” Now, would anyone maintain from this passage that “the glory” had a present existence at the time Peter wrote, merely because he uses the present tense regarding three things, two of which were really in existence, while one clearly was not. True, “the glory” is spoken of as future - “shall be revealed” - while in Rev. i. 9, the kingdom is not. But it is this very circumstance that explains the passage in Revelation, for Peter declares, as strongly as John, that he was a present partaker of a future blessing. And if the kingdom is expressly declared in other passages to belong to the future, just as ‘the glory’ is in Peter’s letter, where is there any difficulty in one case more than in the other? Why should John not speak of himself as the companion of the disciples in a future kingdom, as appropriately as Peter could call himself a partaker of the future glory?

But what is the direct teaching of Scripture as to the true relation of the “tribulation” to the “kingdom” as regards time? The answer is, the one present, the other future. In the very nature of things they cannot exist together. Thus, in Acts xiv. 22 - “Confirming the souls of the disciples and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of God.” Mark, here, the entire absence of the idea that “tribulation” and “the kingdom” are in any sense co-existent, or that the tribulation is endured in “the kingdom of grace” preparatory to entering “the kingdom of glory.” But it was in the church, which, while in the present evil world, shall have tribulation.

How, then, could John and his disciples be companions in the future kingdom? Simply in being joint-heirs with Christ, the Anointed King, who, when He comes the second time, shall share His kingdom with the faithful - as Peter intimates in the passage already quoted, “When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.”

Let us now look at Col. i. 13. Great stress is laid on the word “HATH” - “Hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son.” The phrase “hath translated” is in the perfect tense in our English version, but the original word is not in the Greek perfect tense. There are other two verbs in this verse, rendered by the English perfect, namely, “hath made meet,” and “hath delivered.” These three verbs are all in the Aorist tense, which is indefinite in regard to time. This may be seen from the definition of the word Aorist given in any Greek Lexicon. Dunbar defines it thus: - “Indeterminate, undefined, vague, loose, indefinite (a tense in grammar), unlimited.” Dr. Moses Stuart, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the

Apocalypse, page 197, says, "Homer, Plato, Euripides, Demosthenes, and others, employ the Aorist (and also the perfect) to designate with intensity the certainty of future events. Kuhner has given abundance of examples to illustrate this. §443, 2. The Aorist is even more intensive than the perfect for this purpose, inasmuch as it denotes completed action in distinction from continuance, which the perfect more appropriately attaches to itself as an adsignification. Virtually, do we find the same use of the Aorist in John xiii. 31; xv. 6-8. Whatever difficulties may have existed among critics in time past with respect to such usage, it would seem that there is now no more occasion for them." In addition to the foregoing, the authority of Professor Alexander might be quoted, who, in his "Elements of Greek Grammar," p. 115, treating of the Aorist, says it is employed "in speaking of a contingent action which it is wished should be done and concluded, and which the mind naturally conceives, and therefore expresses, under this particular view."

Now, let these rules be applied to the case in hand, and observe how they operate. Stuart says, "the Aorist is used to designate with intensity the certainty of future events;" while Alexander says it is employed "in speaking of a contingent action, which it is wished should be done and concluded." The translation of the faithful disciples into the kingdom of God's dear Son is that "future event," and that "contingent action." Its certainty and its desirableness will be admitted by all, but the question now is - Can this text, after these considerations, be quoted to prove its present existence? I think not.

But not only is a different rendering possible, it is absolutely necessary to the correct understanding of the Apostle's meaning. By the common version he is made to affirm at least one thing which is not true, namely, that the disciples were already made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. Who will affirm that meetness for the glorious inheritance can be predicated of any one while in the mortal condition? Is it moral (that is, spiritual) meetness that is intended? That is progressive all through the present life: "perfecting holiness in the fear of God." Is it physical meetness? That is attained only in the "spiritual body," for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." So self-evident is this, that Dr. James Macnight, in his translation of the Epistles, renders the first of the three verbs by the present tense, which has practically the effect of leaving the time indefinite, "who maketh us meet for the inheritance," etc.

Now, if Paul cannot be understood as affirming that the disciples are now made meet to be partakers of the inheritance, who will presume to say that, in the same sentence, he affirms that they have been translated into the kingdom?

Again, Paul's words: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," are often quoted in support of the so-called spiritual nature of the kingdom. Cobbin's note is, "His reign within." But why not rather in accordance with the coming kingdom? Thus: "The Kingdom of God, the glad tidings of whose future establishment you have believed, is not meat and drink, but righteousness," etc. The Apostle had just been writing about the comparative insignificance of meats and drinks, observance of days, etc., and he here appeals to what distinguished them as disciples of Christ, as a reason why "they should not let their good be evil spoken of," (verse 16) and adds (verse 18), "He that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of men." The King of that coming kingdom, is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, being by interpretation. King of righteousness and King of peace. The enforcement of these principles shall be productive of joy. And it is surely fitting that the joint heirs of such a ruler should seek to qualify themselves for their future position, by cultivating, in the present life, those principles which shall characterize the administration of such a kingdom. And this, rather than wasting time, energy, and temper upon the contention about meats and drinks, days, etc. Another passage, often used to prove that the kingdom is in the heart, is Luke xvii. 21, "The Kingdom of God is within you." That is, taking Paul's words to the Romans, just commented on. Righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, are in the hearts of you Pharisees. For it must be borne in mind that it was His bitterest enemies, the Pharisees, who "demanded of Jesus when the Kingdom of God should come." This of itself is sufficient to set aside the common interpretation. The full answer of our Lord, however, is a complete refutation. He said, "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there! for behold, the Kingdom of God is among you." The marginal reading substitutes "among" for "within," and is of equal authority with the text. This reply is evidently framed on the understanding that the Pharisees were expecting to see some indications of the COMING of the Kingdom. These they could not see, either in Jesus, the claimant of the Messiahship, or in the city of the great King - Jerusalem. But "the Kingdom COMETH not with observation," says Jesus; not, however, implying that when it is come it shall not be observable. "Neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there!" That is, they shall not have time to speculate as to whether this or that event is a certain sign of His coming, saying, Here is something, or there is something, indicating its approach; "for, behold, before you are aware of it, the Kingdom of God is among you." And, as He said on another occasion, "As

a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth.” Luke xxi. 35. But again, it is urged that Jesus said to Pilate, “My Kingdom is not of this world;” and that, therefore, the locality of the kingdom cannot be on the earth. This argument might be tenable if Jesus had said, My Kingdom shall not be in this world. But why should the words of Jesus be considered in the least inconsistent with the future existence of His kingdom upon the earth?

“Not OF this world” more fully describes the character of the Kingdom, considered in relation to the source of its authority and power. This is clearly intimated by Jesus in the remaining words of the verse, “If my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews.” As if He had said, If my Kingdom were to be established by the same means as “the kingdom of men,” then should I gather an army, and by the power of the sword, in the hands of mortal men, put down “the powers that be.” “But now is my Kingdom not from hence.” My Kingdom is the Kingdom of God; and it is by Divine power it shall be established. And it is only when the “Lord God Almighty takes to Him His great power and reigns, that the KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD become the Kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ.” This takes place when “the seventh angel has sounded,” and at “the time of the dead that they should be judged, and rewards given to the servants of God, and the destroyers of the earth destroyed.” Rev. ,xi. 15-18.

Does anyone imagine that when the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdoms of Jehovah’s Christ, they are transported to another planet, or cease to have an outward national existence on this earth? Or that they are transformed into religious corporations called churches of some particular order - Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Independent? Nay! The vision of the prophet shewed that nations as such are subjected to the rule of the Messiah and His saints. “I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven . . . And there was given Him dominion and glory and a KINGDOM, that all people and NATIONS and languages should serve Him.” Dan. vii. 13, 14. And this “under the whole heaven,” verse 27. And yet this shall be a Kingdom “not of this world,” being “set up by the God of Heaven,” governed by His laws, under His Anointed. Jesus gives us a remarkable illustration of the possibility of being “not of this world,” and yet in this world. He said, speaking of His disciples, “The world hath hated them because they are NOT OF THIS WORLD, even as I am not of this world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them OUT OF THE WORLD, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are NOT OF THE WORLD, as I am NOT OF THE WORLD.” John xvii. 14-16. Here Jesus and His Apostles are in the world, and yet not of the world; and why may not His Kingdom be in this world, and yet not of this world?

The quotation from the Shorter Catechism may be safely left to the consideration of the reader, as it will be seen by comparing the clauses of the answer with the alleged Scripture proofs appended, that there is no real relationship between them. Thus while the word kingdom occurs four times in the answer, it is not once mentioned in the five proofs.

In view of these considerations, I submit that there is no difficulty in understanding that, the Kingdom of God preached by Jesus and His Apostles was the veritable Kingdom of God which had previously existed in the Holy Land, and whose restoration was predicted by the prophets. Neither is it necessary to put a figurative interpretation upon the numerous passages in the Bible where this restoration is promised; and these in the New Testament as well as in the Old. Take for example Luke i. 32, “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end.” And Matt. six. 28, “In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” This could not have its fulfilment in the Church; for, although Jesus was exalted to His Father’s throne in heaven, this is not “the throne of His glory” here spoken of. This is evident, from His own declaration as to the time when He should sit on the throne of His glory. (Matt. xxv. 31.) “WHEN the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, THEN shall He sit upon the throne of His glory.” The throne of His glory is thus distinct from the Father’s throne in heaven, and is to be occupied by Him at His second appearing. He distinguishes the two thrones in the promise given to John in Patmos, when He says, “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me IN MY THRONE, even as also overcame, and am set down with my Father IN HIS THRONE.” Rev. iii. 21. And, again, this throne and the sovereignty to be exercised upon it by Christ and His Saints over the nations of the earth, is referred to in another promise in the Revelation. “That which ye have already, hold fast till I come. And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers; EVEN AS I RECEIVED OF MY FATHER. And I will give him the morning star.” Rev. ii. 25-28. Note that this is a promise to the Messiah in the second Psalm; hence the words of Jesus, “Even as I have received of my Father.”

“Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God;” for one of its fundamental elements is, that “it shall stand for ever, and shall not be left to other people.” Those who shall be privileged to inherit this Kingdom shall be made meet for it by being made partakers of the Divine nature, incorruptible and immortal. The Apostle Paul thus strikingly connects this transformation with the return of the Lord: “Our conversation (citizenship) is in heaven, from whence we also look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.” Phil. iii. 20, 21. And John agrees with Paul, “We know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is.” 1 John iii. 2. The moral power of this hope, as a purifying influence is a mighty incentive to the cultivation of that character so essential to the position of partakers with the Christ of His Kingdom and glory. John adds to the words above quoted, “And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He is pure.” And the Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, says, “Wherefore, we receiving” (not having received, as it is too commonly read, but) “we receiving a Kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. For our God is a consuming fire.” Heb. xii. 28. The past also supplies a powerful motive to holiness of life. “We love Him because He first loved us.” Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins. “Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.” The love of Christ constraineth us, “because we thus judge, that, if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again.”

This transformation, both moral and physical, being completed, the saints shall be honoured with a share in the administration of the Kingdom of God, with the Christ their Lord and Head. As kings and priests, they “shall reign on the earth,” over restored Israel and other nations. And the question presents itself, Is there anything in such a kingdom to justify the term “Carnal,” which some have applied to it? Is it not better entitled to be called a spiritual kingdom than the Christian Church, even in its best days? And infinitely more so than the church of modern times?

And if Jesus and His Apostles preached the glad tidings of this future kingdom of God, how can modern gospel-preachers, who do not believe in such a kingdom, escape the condemnation of being “blind teachers of the blind?” And how should we, who profess to see, prize the precious privilege of “knowing the joyful sound,” and seek to rivet the attention of our fellow-men upon this glorious kingdom?

Edinburgh. J. CAMERON.

QUESTIONS AND DIFFICULTIES.

BY ENOS JACOBS.

1. - Do you say that the serpent presents no signs of being a cursed cripple?

Ans. -Yes; we have said something to that effect, and have given scientific testimony to prove it. It now remains for those who believe that the serpent is a cursed cripple to point out where it is defective, and to show in what its perfection consisted before it was cursed and crippled.

2. - The frogs; lice; flies; death of cattle; boils; hail and fire; locusts; darkness; and the death of the first-borns: if we take this all literally, what a mess of stupid contradictions we have when we come to examine nature’s laws; especially hail and fire, which we never see in company.

Ans. - To what extent Mr. Jacobs is acquainted with nature’s laws we know not; but those who are more observant than he seems to be do not find “stupid contradiction” in hail and fire being commingled. This fire was probably what is called “globular lightning, which appears like a luminous ball or globe of fire; it moves through the air at a comparatively slow rate, while forked and sheet lightning exist but for a moment. Lightning of this kind sometimes obtains the name of fire-balls: it rolls along the surface with a hissing noise and often terminates in a disruptive discharge.” Hail and fire then have often been seen in company. “In 1223, we read of a terrible tempest, during which it thundered for fifteen days successively. - When Edward III invaded France, in 1339, a violent storm of hail beset his troops, near Chartres. The hailstones were so large as seriously to injure both men and horses, and his army suffered so severely that he was forced to conclude peace.”

It is not our business to write a history of storms with hail and fire. This testimony is sufficient to evince that such occurrences are possible, and have taken place, though Mr. Jacobs may not have either seen or read of them. As regards the frogs, lice, etc., it would be quite as reasonable for us to ask Mr. Jacobs to show on what grounds he denies these things, as it is for him to demand of us proof of their

existence in the manner narrated. Besides, are these things greater difficulties than many others of which we know enough to be compelled to admit we know nothing? Who can explain the colours and forms of vegetable life? Who can tell why a leopard is covered with spots? Why are no two blades of grass alike! How is it that frogs can croak under water? We might fill pages with such questions, many of which a child could ask, but none of which the wisest philosopher could answer. When ignorant men talk about what is contrary to nature's laws, they forget how little they know of what they are talking about. The admission of a Supreme Being makes all things possible; the denial of a Great First Cause leaves the mind a prey to incertitude and confusion.

3. - The crossing of the Red Sea – who can reconcile that with any known laws.

Ans. - Well, suppose this circumstance could not be reconciled with any known laws, does Mr. Jacobs know that there are no other laws besides those he calls known laws? If there are - which wiser men would not question - then by their operation the thing may be possible. It has been affirmed that, had the tides been well understood, at a certain part of the Red Sea, the Israelites might have crossed without a miracle. Over the falls of Niagara there are generally twenty feet of water; but once when a strong wind and the broken ice held back the waters at the mouth of Lake Erie, the falls were nearly dry for some hours, and many acres of rocks above the falls were bare.

4. - Can you explain Joshua's account of the sun standing still?

Ans. - No: we cannot; but it would be very unphilosophical if, for that reason, we were to deny that there was any truth in the account. The story need not be taken literally; in fact it cannot, for modern science has demonstrated that the earth moves and not the sun.

5. - There is the ass speaking to Balaam - who can believe that an animal which can utter only two sounds could articulate with human speech?

Ans. - The difficulty in this case arises from Mr. Jacobs' inability or unwillingness to see anything but the ass. A ventriloquist can bring speech out of stones; and although the ass is not formed for speaking, the circumstances of the case show that there was wisdom in God's rebuking the madness of the prophet through the mouth of his ass.

6. - But to the New Testament. John saw the form of a dove descend on Jesus, and heard a voice.

Ans. - Those who are well acquainted with the writings of John, would not conclude that he was either a simpleton, a fanatic, or a falsifier. There is no evidence on which John's statement can be rejected. To say that such a thing is impossible is only to proclaim one's own ignorance and unbelief. Jesus was about to enter on His public career and some sort of attestation was necessary. The attestation reported seems every way suitable to the occasion. If one man cannot believe the testimony of another he has no right to believe the evidence of his own senses; for the grounds on which the two rest are identical. If Mr. Jacobs cannot receive the record of what John saw and heard - though perhaps unable to comprehend it - he would be just where he is now, even had he seen the form and heard the voice himself.

7. - Ananias and Sapphira fell down dead. - Many of the dead came out of their graves - Did they go back without dying, and if not, where are they now?

Ans. - The circumstances under which Ananias and Sapphira lost their lives are plainly set forth. - They had lied deliberately to God, and God gave Peter authority to destroy them for the offence. The narrative has all the appearance of truth, and we know of no Jewish or heathen writer living at the time, who has attempted to prove it false. The same may be said of these who were raised. It seems probable that they died as Lazarus did, after his resurrection.

8. - Last but not least, - Is there any law by which a man is born into the world without the association of male and female?

Ans. - It is manifest that the first man was not born by this process; therefore there is a law or power, by which a man may be born, not according to the will of the flesh, although we do not now witness the operation of that law or power.

We trust that by humility and meditation, Mr. Jacobs will become wise; to this end it is not necessary either to stop enquiry or to be too credulous.

EDITOR.

GREAT CONSEQUENCES FROM LITTLE CAUSES.

Dr. Tyndall lays down as "science" the gratuitous paradox that winds and clouds of to-morrow may be, like the planetary motions, predetermined by only brute cosmic forces, which, if as true as it is

demonstrably false, would not even then give the fixity he wants, as the planetary system itself is invaded at any moment by unknowable comets and meteors, and solar radiation hourly altered by storms of the photosphere. He requires, at the outset of his attack, all the present centuries discoveries to be ignored. But let us grant him a solar system as simple as mediaeval ignorance ever fancied, this would not help him. Yonder is a gardener, who may dig twenty more spades full before dinner, or perhaps only nineteen. Is Dr. Tyndall prepared to prove that whether they shall be twenty or nineteen is already as determined, by laws of brute matter, as the next transit of Venus? If not, he should have warned his readers that the whole Prayer argument was a mere jeu d'esprit, hanging on the assumption of this extreme necessarianism. Relax one stitch thereof and the whole fabric falls, thus: - If there be any uncertainty about that twentieth spade-full, on this may depend whether a slug is turned up or not; on the slug may depend a young swallow's dinner who is feeble, and on this may depend whether he shall follow his colony and reach Africa; but on this hedgeling's arrival or non-arrival may depend whether a certain insect shall serve him for supper, or be left to lay a million eggs, which, in that case, will next, month be each a locust laying a million more; and on this billion of locusts and their progeny may depend whether at Christmas all Ashantee and three Senegambias of forest shall be green as Eden or a leafless wilderness, and its mean temperature 100° or only 70°; and on whether such an area be the hottest or coolest portion of the planet's inter-tropical lands may well depend, by Dr. Tyndall's own showing, the winds and drought or wet of a season, over half Europe or the whole. It behoved him, then, to be quite sure about that gardener's last spade-full, and all such causes, which yet he wholly leaves out of account! The weather of large districts may as plainly be still more quickly affected by events that acts of man or beast unconsciously bring about - as forest fires; avalanches that a goat may set rolling; dykes burst, and Zuyder Zees refilled for ages by the burrowing of a rat; shoals of herrings or of whales that by turning right or left may make a month's difference in the break-up and drifting to us of half a year's Polar ice. Here we confine ourselves to visible nature and known forces. Let the insane assumption be granted that there is no invisible nature nor aught unknown, and even so, He that owns and actuates the cattle on a thousand hills might thus plainly, by only one of their hoofs, make the winds his ministers, and flames of fire his messengers. -- Public Opinion.

THE WALLS AND GATES OF JERUSALEM.

THE walls of Jerusalem are chiefly modern and Saracenic, but are built evidently on the site of more ancient walls, raised in the time of the crusaders, and those, not improbably, formed of the material of others still more ancient. They consist wholly of hewn stones, in general not of remarkable size, and laid in mortar.

An Arabic inscription over the Yaffa Gate gives the rebuilding to Sultan Sulieman, in the year of the Hegira, 948 (A.D. 1542). The walls are still stately, and, at a distance, picturesque; they have towers and battlements, the latter crowning a breastwork with loop-holes. A broad walk passes along the top of the wall, protected by the breast-work, and reached by flights of steps from within. Their height varies, according to the inequalities of the ground outside, from 20 to 50 feet.

Jerusalem has four open gates, and four walled up; which seem, in general, to retain the places of still older ones, and, in some instances, to be older than the walls. Of the four open gates, facing the four points of the compass that to the North is called by the natives Bab-el-Amud, or "Gate of the Pillar." The "Damascus Gate" is a name given by the Europeans, from its leading to Damascus and Nabulus, by the great northern road. It is more ornamented than the others, and forms a striking object to the traveller.

"The Hoy Land, illustrated by David Roberts, R.A., with historical descriptions by George Croly, LL.D., vol I." GLEANER.

EXHORTATION on PHILIPPIANS II.

IN perusing the first verse, I am struck with the method of instruction pursued by the Apostle. I like the way Paul gives his advice, the way he treats his subject, and seeks to stir up those whom he addresses to a sense of duty. He seldom resorts to open rebuke, but approaches his brethren indirectly, rendering his admonition more forcible; because, presented in this mode, it runs little or no risk of giving offence - it

escapes the sharp edges of human feelings. His appeals thus combine the two-fold advantage of being less liable to wound the sensitive, while they are more effective in reaching the conscience. They did not fail to produce the convictions he intended them to produce. See how he proceeds in the chapter we have just read. He places several matters before the Philippian saints hypothetically - "If such and such a thing be, then I shall require of you in accordance thus and so." He did not adopt this form of speech because he imagined they had any doubt about what he advanced, but by a shrewdness of tactics (if I may use the term) he endeavoured to impress their minds more deeply with the form of his reasoning.

"If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies." There are four things enumerated by the Apostle. Now, who among the believers at Philippi doubted the existence of these four things?

"If there be any consolation in Christ." The brethren knew there was consolation in Christ in a manner we cannot realise; that was the only consolation they had in the midst of the persecutions they were called to endure. Their faith and hope were sharpened by the sword, tested by the rack, and the fagot.

What did they fall back upon as their great, sustaining power? Immediately upon the enthusiasm which a knowledge and love of the truth inspired, they thought of Him who bled and died for the same cause, they would resolve the matter in their minds something like this - "If these great riches in the distance be real, then we can understand all these persecutions and sufferings; there is a meaning in them." Those who were in the habit of thinking more than others would find their meditations running in this direction - they would say "Take courage, brethren, these afflictions are of short duration; they are light and trifling; there is a certain weight of glory awaiting us. That is our consolation; consolation in Christ - in Him who passed through the same tribulation, and who has since ascended to heaven. Abundance of testimony, furnished by credible witnesses, attest these facts; it is only a question of waiting for the Lord's return.

"If there be any comfort of love." There is much comfort in love, as we all know from experience, whatever may be the object of it; none are so cold and selfish as to be entire strangers to it, though some are more susceptible of it than others. The love now adverted to was attracted towards Christ. And why? Because each could declare He died for me; each one who had believed the Gospel could apply this to himself. He died not only for my neighbour, or my friend, but for me. That was the comfort of love.

"If there be any fellowship of the Spirit." What does fellowship mean? It means union, oneness, unity. The Spirit is here referred to. What is the signification arising out of this? It is that, through our relation to Christ, our connection with Him, we are lifted up into fellowship with Him who is the God of the universe. Ponder the high vocation wherewith we are called. What could tend to exalt man more, or to inspire him with nobler ideas? What more calculated to strengthen him for the conflict of life? The Philippians could say - "God cannot deny Himself, the Creator of all things, the Eternal, the Supreme. His Word, like a rock, is immovable, and changes not."

"If any bowels and mercies." This implies tenderness, sympathy, goodwill, brotherly kindness, and to cover all, the mantle of charity. Are these graces manifest? Paul was not speaking with any uncertainty so far as he himself was concerned. At the time he wrote this he was a prisoner at Rome; he had a chain on one hand, with which he was kept bound to a Roman soldier, for thus were Roman prisoners held in custody. It was in that condition, and from that city, he addressed this epistle. Had he shewed no "bowels of mercies?" Let memory dwell upon his shipwrecks, his stripes, his imminent assassination, his being stoned and taken up for dead; and then this chain with which he is bound. What a proof of his spirit of self-sacrifice do these things offer! Now, these sufferings were indisputable; and, alluding to the "conflict" which he had, he exhorts the saints at Philippi, in these touching words, "Fulfil ye my joy, that ye be like minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." "Of one mind" - how strong the advice appears when we consider the close sympathy, the oneness of purpose and feeling, existing between the Apostle and Christ. Paul says, He died for me. I bear in my body, the dying of the Lord Jesus. I know that bonds and afflictions await me everywhere, but I am ready for the worst extremity, prepared to follow in His steps who suffered so much for me. Oh! how far removed were this disciple and the Master from anything producing a jar, anything approaching discord, however slight. How perfect their unity. How warm and mutual their sympathies, and how self-sacrificing they were. The entreaty of the apostle is, "fulfil ye my joy." Brethren, let us try to cherish and display this disposition for a week. I venture to affirm that, in a remarkable degree, we shall discover that it will save us from many disagreeable things. Petty annoyances, malice, wrath; pride will wear a very ugly aspect indeed. Our duty is to be "like-minded, having the same love."

"Let nothing be done through strife and vain glory." There is nothing about which there has been more strife than about religion; not only strife of words, but clashing of swords. To destroy heretics," holy

men," (so called) have not scrupled to resort to poison and the dagger; - in fact, no atrocities have been too shocking for religious partisans to practice; no means of torture too cruel for their mistaken zeal. Happily, people have learned somewhat better; neither is there the same opportunity for persecution, We may descend to a lower scale, and examine next this matter of "vain glory." When we come to the home circle, to our own vicinity, whether among common people or people of a different class, we find much that tends to embitter and mar all that is sweet and good. Our neighbour, our brother, or sister, possesses something which another has not, and cannot lawfully obtain; this is a cause of envy; there is a little rancour, a little uneasiness about it. To what does all this amount? Surely to this, that such persons would never be satisfied except on the ruin of society itself; their emotions betray the very essence of selfishness, and the more they had, the more they would want. Now, according to the teaching of the apostle, just the opposite should prevail among us. The prosperity of others should be a source of delight to ourselves. "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." What happiness this generous disposition would create, - to be glad that other people were enriched, and to rejoice in their welfare. "In lowliness of mind, let each esteem others better than themselves." This admonition is quite out of harmony with what we too often see manifested. Some walk as though they deemed themselves superior to others. Women are peculiarly open to the charge of vanity; many evince an amount of affectation which does not at all comport with the Christian character, but is totally opposed to the simplicity, sincerity, and humility enjoined by the precepts of the New Testament.

"Let each esteem others better than himself." How blessed would be the result, were this counsel heeded. It is easy to perceive what great mutual benefits would accrue from the exhibition of such a spirit. Paul illustrates his exhortation by reference to the example of the Lord. Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ." He was the Son of God; in certain respects equal with God; and far above all men. How does the apostle enforce this lesson? We should note his words, for our practical use. He says, though Jesus "was" in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, (yet He) made himself of no reputation." It would read more intelligibly, if the last clause were rendered "did not meditate any usurpation." A workman knows what it is for another to try to take his place. Look at the greatness of Christ. God tells us to look on Him, as on Himself; and yet, the Saviour did not stalk about Jerusalem boasting I am the Christ; the Sanhedrim is a mere figment. No, - He seldom uttered an expression to call attention to Himself, but ever sought to magnify His Father.

We can readily apply these things to ourselves. In our great Exemplar there was no feeling of jealousy, no kind of usurpation; that is not the mind of Christ. He did not parade His own powers and merits; on the contrary, he "made Himself of no reputation;" though a Master, he behaved as a servant - not an idle servant, but as one who had a mind to work, a zeal to execute His mission. His highest enjoyment seems to have consisted in going about doing good, and alleviating human misery.

"He was made in the likeness of men; and, being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name, which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." It is very pleasant to look forward to the time when He shall be seated on the throne of His Father David, and to picture ourselves placed on His right, and on his left, earthly potentates bending down before us; but there is something to be done before then. We must be better than they, for Christ said, "except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." We must not forget the preparatory stage; this would be acting as did the Jews of old, who expected their Messiah to come and reign in great glory, but overlooked His previous humiliation, suffering, and death. The appointment of the Deity, is present discipline and humiliation that we may be meet for future exaltation. It is true, that the prospects of the promised inheritance, and of assimilation to the divine nature, is calculated to make us think highly of ourselves; still, we must also "think soberly." Let the grace of humility temper all our aspirations, even in view of the glory that awaits us.

EDITOR.

THE JEWS AND THE PRESS.

THE Jewish press is comparatively a new institution in this country. Fifty years ago the British Jews were altogether unrepresented in literature, and their grievances came before the general public only on those occasions when the editor of a Christian paper happened to be well disposed towards them. The Jews were the best abused people in England, and any individual who thought himself capable of wielding

a pen, launched forth tirades of abuse against the scattered nation. The press, which is looked upon as the advocate of "right" against the incursions of "might," always demonstrated an eagerness to blacken the character of the descendants of Israel; the Jews were down, and the "fourth estate," un-Briton-like, kicked them. Gradually, however, the true nature of Israelites became revealed to their defamers; it was seen that they possessed feelings, tastes, and ambitions in common with the rest of humanity. In our opinion, the establishment of Jewish journalism had much to do with the growth of brotherhood now existing between Jews and Christians, as from the papers published in the Israelitish community; the public may form a tolerable conception of the characteristics of the Jewish people. – Quoted by the Jewish Chronicle from the Sun, 1874.

THE MAN OF BUSINESS.

THE man of business is one of the most potential individuals of the age. Nearly all the world admire him, and there are very few who are not only willing but eager to pay him homage. It matters not that in private life he is eminently stupid, nor is it a concern of moment that he knows nothing of literature, science, art, and the other things which are supposed to ennoble humanity. In spite of the fact that he may be unable to utter ten words consecutively in accordance with the recognised rules of grammar and with correct emphasis, and notwithstanding that he may ever carefully abstain from the enunciation of a novel idea or a glowing sentiment, people's faith in him remains undisturbed, and they continue of the opinion that he is a man of great ability and conspicuous merit. When these good souls remind you that he is clever at business they seem to imagine that they have said more in his favour than should suffice to establish him high in your estimation. It may be presumed that the confiding persons do not, in a general way, go to the trouble of ascertaining what particular form his business ability takes. If they did so, they might, in spite of their irrational longing to worship wealth and success in life in whatever forms they may be found, come to the conclusion that their idol was not deserving of that profound worship which they had been in the habit of according him. As a matter of fact, the man who is conspicuous above his fellows an adept at making money - which is, of course, the sole end and aim of business - is not invariably a lovable creature and is not likely to raise the character of the age in which he lives. His triumph in itself, save in exceptional cases, argues that he has acted selfishly, that he has been "hard," as was Shylock, that he has not always been true to those principles of honesty which are commonly accepted, and that he has devoted his whole attention to that which has a tendency to narrow men's minds and degrade their understandings. And it is a melancholy fact that the deductions which might be drawn from the success of the typical business man are often justified by the character of the individual himself.

The smart business man acts upon the principles of believing that every man is a rogue until he has been proved honest, and until it has been demonstrated that he has sufficient balance at his bankers to meet all the demands which are ever likely to be made upon him. This being the smart business man's faith it is but natural that he should place confidence in no one, and that he should not allow himself to be misled by any dodge of a delinquent creditor. It is nothing to him that, by actions, which he takes in the prosecution of his business, whole families may be cast adrift upon the world. He may, perhaps, be gracious enough to admit that it is hard that because he will recover his pound of flesh at his convenience others may be ruined, but he is firmly persuaded that it is better this should be so than that he should be un-business like. He has a perfect horror of everything which "is not business," and he seems to be of opinion that if he willingly did anything that was otherwise something of a dreadful and unprecedented character would happen. He would rather offend a friend, cut to the heart a weak applicant for his bounty, and outrage such humane instincts as he may himself possess than be un-business like.

Go to him with a request that he will grant you a small favour - a favour which it is quite in his power to grant without doing himself serious hurt - and the chances are ten to one that he will tell you it would "not be business" if he did what you request. Venture to hint that the fact that it may not exactly be business is no reason why he should not act as you wish, and he will hold up his hands in astonished dismay, show that you are a being with whom he can have no dealings, and end by indicating that the sooner you leave his place the better. Any act of selfishness, any act of trickery, any act of dissimulation, provided it be business-like, he will not only gladly excuse but applaud. His "friends," or, rather, those people who flatter themselves they are his friends, find him as do the rest of the world. With a calm face will he drive a hard bargain with them, with dexterity will he diddle them, and the only explanation he will deign for his singular conduct is that business is one thing and friendship another, which surely, as he demonstrates, is true enough. His servants' wages are ground down to the last penny, and the greatest

possible amount of work is got for the paltry pittances that are paid. He regards his employees as he regards humanity generally, simply as machines which those who have the brains to employ them may work with profit, and, consequently, he feels no more compunction in replacing an old and worn-out clerk by a young one than does a manufacturer when he discards a piece of antiquated mechanism for another of modern date.

The smart man of business does not deem it wrong to start bubble joint-stock companies, and to retire, with full pockets, from all concern in the same, just when they are on the point of bursting; nor is his conscience wounded by the reflection which must surely sometimes come upon him that his efforts have brought ruin to many a household and turned many a peaceful life into one of tribulation. No, he remembers that business is business, that morality is morality, and that the two are utterly incompatible with each other!

There are churches in the land which have been erected by smart business men and which stand as monuments of what these worthies have done. Probably, the majority of the worshippers who pass through the portals of the sacred edifices are inclined to murmur a blessing upon those men who have caused the buildings to be erected. Those who have had all their spirit crushed out of them by the smart business men, those who have been led to wildly curse the day on which they were born, owing to the smart business men's machinations, and those who, under the influence of the smart business men, have lost the simple freshness of their nature, and have become cold-blooded spiders, whose efforts never soar above the weaving of webs for the capture of unwary flies, are forgotten in the moment of popular beatification. Such is life, and such is the way in which smart business men receive their reward! --
Liberal Review.

JEWISH ITEMS.

The only event of significance that has happened recently, in Berlin, is the election of Dr. Strassmann, a Jewish physician, as President of the representative or Municipal Council of the city. It is the first time that this highly important post has been given to a Jew.

Herr Cassares, of Amsterdam, has received the appointment of chronometer maker to the Dutch Navy.

The Hon. Samuel A. Lewis, has been elected President of the Board of Aldermen of New York, the second civic honour in the metropolis of the United States.

Mr. Jacob Menasee Cattani, a banker, residing at Cairo, universally esteemed in Egypt for his commercial integrity and philanthropy, has been elevated by the Khedive to the rank of Bey.

The Town Council of Bordeaux has presented the Jewish community of that city with a piece of ground, 1000 square metres in length, for the erection of a new synagogue, in lieu of the one burnt down in 1873.

The Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs has delegated Signor G. Malvano, to represent Italy, at the forthcoming International Geographical Congress, to be held at Paris. Signor Malvano took part in a similar congress which was formerly held at Rome.

The University of Berlin, has, for the first time, elected a Jewish Professor as Dean of the Faculty of Medicine. One Jew has been made a Baron - the only Jew elevated to that dignity in the Prussian realm, - Baron Gerson von Bleichroder. Truly, it must be admitted, that the prejudices against our people are happily disappearing in Prussia.

Sir David L. Salomons has patented a mode of signalling on railways.

The Government of Aargau, has recently prohibited the Jews from killing animals according to the Mosaic law. This decree is the harsher, as the Canton of Aargau contains the two largest Jewish communities in Switzerland, viz., Eudingen and Lengenan, the majority of which are very orthodox. The Cantonal Government, argue, that, as the majority of the inhabitants of Aargau consume animals killed by blows, the minority, shall not eat animals which are killed by the knife. The Ultramontanes are jubilant. Another Cantonal Government, has since forbidden the slaughtering of animals according to Jewish law. The inconvenience to which the Jews are subjected, owing to this restriction, is very great, as they are either compelled to obtain their meat from a great distance, or do without altogether. The origin of the restriction, lies in the fact that a new system of killing animals has been introduced into Switzerland; to which system, everyone will have to conform, from the commencement of the present year.

Rabbi Abraham of Rustchuk, already decorated by the Sultan with a medal of honour, has received from his Imperial Majesty the title of Chacham-Basi, and a rich costume suitable to the dignity.

At a brilliant reception held a few weeks ago in Paris, by Prince Hohenlohe, the German Ambassador to France, Marshal Mac Mahon, President of the Republic, was represented by Colonel Lambert, a Jew. Sad news from Yemen is reported. The Jews there, are subject to cruel oppression. They are forbidden from dressing like the other inhabitants of the country. They may only wear black clothes; they must walk barefooted; they must wear a hideous head-dress, and are not allowed to cut their hair or beards. They are not even permitted to ride, when proceeding on a long journey. For the least thing, a Jew is beaten and thrown to the ground, and very often seriously injured.

In J. A. Mac Cahan's work, entitled "Campaigning on the Oxus, or the Fall of Khiva," the author gives particulars of a marriage contract among the Kirghis. It is the precise counterpart of the marriage contract of the Jews, published in our last number (for December). Is this a coincidence or are the "lost (?) tribes" to be found among the Kirghis?

Mr. De Long, ex United States Consul in Japan, has declared as his belief that the inhabitants of the Island Jeddo are of Jewish origin. He founds his theory on the appearance, morals, and customs of the islanders. He believes that Jeddo, must be the "Ophir," to which King Solomon sent ships, to fetch gold and silver, and other precious metals. He further premises, that, after the death of Solomon, the voyages to and from the island were suddenly put an end to, and the Israelites then at Jeddo, remained there, and founded a colony.

Among those persons to whom it is proposed to intrust the election of members of the New French Senates are the Grand Rabbis of Paris and France.

The Daily Telegraph, in an article on the sanitary condition of Rome, says: "It is certain that the most densely peopled portions of Rome, are the least accessible to malarious influences; and the Ghetto, a Hebrew quarter which has always borne an evil reputation for its unsavoury odours and teeming population, has the character of being the healthiest district, in a city of which the fashionable streets leading into the Piazza del Popolo rarely escape the visitation of fever during the torrid summers."

The Committee of the Anglo-Jewish Association has received most disastrous news from Morocco; it appears that several murders had been committed on Jews (for the sake of their money and merchandise), and that in every instance the authorities have failed to discover the criminals, and that no redress can be obtained by the friends of the murdered persons.

Marazion, in Cornwall, is said to have been anciently inhabited by the Jews, who held markets there for the sale of tin, and named it Mara-Zion, the "Bitter Zion," from its being their allowed place of rest. It is also sometimes called Market Jew.

- Culled from the Jewish Chronicle for January, 1875.

THE "MOUTH SPEAKING GREAT THINGS" (Dan. vii. 8-20.) - In the course of a Confirmation address delivered at Samlesbury, near Preston, last week, Dr. Vaughan (Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford) thus expressed himself: "The Catholic Church cannot err; it cannot teach anything false, either as to doctrine, piety, or moral life, and for this simple reason, that the Holy Ghost is with the Pope and with the priests. The Holy Ghost is with the Pope when he speaks as the head of the Church, and thus preserves him from teaching error. The Pope is in fact for this purpose the mouth-piece of the Holy Ghost." The frightful impiety of such language would almost transcend belief, had not the Holy Spirit warned us of the coming of one who would open his mouth in blasphemy against God. - (Rev. xiii. 6.)

THE FORGIVENESS OF INJURIES.

THE duty of the forgiveness of injuries is a prominent feature in the teaching of Christ. From Mat. vi. 15, we learn that it is essential to our own forgiveness. The words of the Lord are: "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." In the parable recorded, Matt. xviii. 23-35, Jesus instructs us that this duty should be exercised from a remembrance of the forgiveness which we ourselves have received. His answer to Peter's enquiry, "How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?" shows that pardon should be unlimited as far as the number of offences is concerned. "I say not unto thee until seven times, but until seventy times seven." But Christ not only taught this duty by precept, but also by example - unmoved by ingratitude, contumely, and the approach of a cruel ignominious death. Though His life had been crowded with acts of kindness, though He had found His

highest joy and constant service in mitigating human woe, and thousands could have borne testimony to His tender compassion and healing power, He fell a victim to the malice of His enemies. Human dogs compassed Him about, they clamoured for His blood, "pierced His hands and His feet" - those hands which had so often ministered to the wants of others - those feet that had walked so many weary miles to preach the gladdest of all tidings, the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; yet even in His dying moments He cried, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

Again, what a wondrous manifestation of this spirit do we see in the commission he gave to His Apostles. Having told them to go into all the world to preach the Gospel, He added, "beginning at Jerusalem," which was equivalent to saying, let my murderers have the first offer of mercy.

Peter, in addressing the "men of Israel" on the day of Pentecost, charged their guilt home upon them, for he said, "Him (referring to Christ) ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts ii. 23. Yet, for this most heinous crime, the same Apostle had been commissioned by his Master to offer them a free and full pardon, in the name of Him whom they had so cruelly treated.

Although judgment ultimately overtook them as a nation, it was not because they had killed "the Holy One and the Just," but because they refused to have life through His name; not because their sins were great and numberless, but because they were relentless and persistent in their iniquities.

The injunction to forgive presupposes the possibility of one brother trespassing against another. There always have been such cases, "for it must needs be that offences come." It will be readily admitted, that injuries are more keenly felt, and more difficult to bear, if inflicted by a brother, than if they proceed from an alien. This is touchingly illustrated by those significant words in the 55th Psalm, which had their striking fulfilment in the experience of Christ, when sold by Judas for thirty pieces of silver, "For it was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it . . . but it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company," - (verses 12-14). But however hard it may be to endure, the duty remains the same, namely, to forgive.

When the act which has caused the wound is in itself morally wrong, (which it generally is, though not always) then forgiveness of the injury is perfectly compatible with indignation against the act itself, on account of its moral turpitude. Thus it is requisite to make a distinction between the act itself, and the perpetrator of it; for the former may be justly the object of indignation, while the latter is the object of forgiveness. This is clear, from the fact that, after we have forgiven the offender, our opinion of the offence remains the same.

Bishop Butler, in writing on this point, says, "forgiveness of injuries, does not preclude resentment, but only the excess of it."

This statement probably appears very objectionable to you, and were I to submit it as the expression of my own opinion I presume it would not fail presently to be the theme of criticism. I should judge that resentment and forgiveness of injuries are about as opposite to each other as heat and cold, and that it is not possible for both to be consistent in the same person. Dr. Angus, who has reproduced Butler's works, has put a foot-note to this effect, "resentment in man answers to wrath in God, and means that moral sentiment with which a holy being cannot help but regard iniquity."

If this is all that the Bishop intended by the word "resentment" it is quite true that forgiveness of injuries does not preclude it, though it is not true that it precludes the excess of it: since there is no danger of excess in the case. We cannot be too indignant against an action on account of its moral baseness; the only danger in the case, is permitting our indignation to lead us to a reprehensible course of conduct. Instead of this passion (if passion it may be called) being wrong, it is stronger in the Deity than in any of His creatures, because His apprehension of the enormity of sin is perfect. But while forgiveness of injuries is compatible with indignation against the act, it is opposed to cherishing ill feeling towards an individual on account of what he has done, and allowing that ill feeling to be manifested in retaliation, should opportunity occur.

By recognising the distinction between the act and the perpetrator, it becomes evident how the precept "Be ye angry, and sin not," may be obeyed, because the object of the anger is the sinfulness of the act. However angry we may be on that account, it does not at all necessitate our fostering malevolence towards the transgressor. That the two are reconcilable is clear, from what is affirmed of the Deity, "that He is angry with the wicked every day"; yet He is a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He. It must not be inferred from what has been advanced that there is no medium between refusing to forgive and cherishing ill feeling. Refusal to forgive may be a proof of ill feeling, but not necessarily so. This leads me to correct a misconception which seems to prevail on this subject, namely, that it is our duty to forgive unconditionally. This is an error, as may be seen by reference to Luke xvii. 4. "If thy brother trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent;

thou shall forgive him.” The word if, shews that conditions are imposed as a pre-requisite to the obtaining of forgiveness. Moreover, we are told to forgive even as our Father in heaven hath forgiven us. Does God forgive unconditionally? If He does, then it might be argued that we ought to do likewise. Imagine a case where forgiveness is withheld because there has been no acknowledgment of guilt, no expression of penitence: this would by no means be a proof that resentment was entertained against the perpetrator of the injury. At the same time, it would not imply that there was a disinclination to forgive, but simply that pardon was not granted for the reason specified, a reason held (and rightly too) to be justifiable.

So far from there being no medium between refusing to forgive and cherishing ill feeling towards the individual, there is a possibility of being very anxious to forgive, and yet not being able to carry out the benevolent desire. Take, for instance, a father and son. The son has been guilty of some gross misdemeanour against his father. The parent might truly say, were I to forgive my son apart from any recognition of wrong doing on his part, I should only be encouraging him in his evil way; neither should I have any security that he would not repeat the same offence at some future time. This is what I cannot do. We can all understand, nevertheless, that he would be only too willing to forgive. And this explains how easy a matter it is to forgive, if our disposition towards the delinquent is what it ought to be. We should require no external pressure to be brought to bear upon us; we should have sufficient pressure in our own breast to lead us aright. Although we are not expected to forgive unconditionally, the teaching of Christ on this subject does not end here. There are two courses of conduct forbidden; one is, proclaiming the matter abroad; the other, letting it rest in abeyance until the party comes to us and acknowledges the wrong. It may be his duty to come, or it may not, for, possibly, he might be unconscious of having given offence. That both these modes of procedure are prohibited, is clear, from the following precept, “If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone.” 11 Matt. xviii. 15. It may have been only a misunderstanding, or it may have been thoughtlessness (not that thoughtlessness is altogether excusable); it might turn out after all, to be only imaginary; or, if real, perhaps not intentional. How wise the counsel, to go and ascertain. What a vast amount of mischief might often be spared, by attention to this precept.

Christ, in giving this injunction, does not profess to legislate for the world at large, but only for the members of His own household. The uniform observance of it, by them, is intended to draw a line of demarcation between His disciples and the votaries of the world, who are too selfish to act in accordance with the Saviour’s command, perceiving not that obedience would promote their own happiness. The precept is as merciful as it is wise, it is based not only on God’s sovereignty, but also on His love; enjoined not only out of “jealousy” for Jehovah’s honour, but from solicitude for our welfare.

The gracious character of the admonition, may be best apprehended by considering what would be the consequence of acting in a contrary direction. Suppose, then, a community to establish the law of retaliation as just and salutary. Those constituting this community would unavoidably be dependant one upon another; in the nature of things it could not be otherwise. They agree to regulate their conduct according to this law. What would be the effect? Just this; malice would beget malice, resentment engender resentment, revenge incite revenge; this vice would propagate itself, not only in a general way by example, but by a peculiar inducement and method of its own; reason would be blinded by passion. How painful and disastrous the result of indulging a thirst for vengeance; it would be like adding fuel to the fire, causing still greater conflagration; as the wise man says, “the beginning of strife is as the letting out of water,” but who could tell what the end would be? The duty of forgiveness has its foundation in justice, and, therefore, though only saints are under its binding power, owing to their allegiance to the Lord, yet, none are altogether free from moral obligation in the matter. The law is not only written in the sacred Oracles, but God has, to a great extent, inscribed it on the hearts of his creatures; for, apart from the scriptures, men have an intuitive conviction of the rectitude of the thing itself. They cannot help but know and feel that it is wrong to withhold from another that to which they would consider themselves entitled under similar circumstances. It is true, that evil surroundings and vicious training can all but obliterate this inward consciousness, but this is no proof that it was not originally implanted. With respect to punishment for disregarding the Divine word, we find, that God for the most part chastises, by leaving men’s evil doings to bring about their own recompense; and thus it has ever been, that the history of nations is a history of blood.

But while we may rejoice that submission to Christ’s commands is so conducive to our happiness still we must be prompted to obedience by higher considerations than those of self-interest, namely, by recognising that obligation which arises out of our allegiance to Christ. This leads me to notice, in conclusion, that the exercise of a forgiving spirit is essential to the very existence of the Christian character.

“The Chinese are remarkable for their skill in all that concerns the art of design. In China, when a man has found out any improvement in his art, he makes it known to the governor of the province, and claims a reward for his skill. The governor immediately orders the article to be placed at the door of his palace, and exhibited there for a year. If in that time no one points out any imperfection in it, the artist is rewarded and taken into the governor’s service. But if any real defect can be pointed out in the work, it is returned without any reward. One day, a young man brought to the Palace a piece of silk-cloth, on which, was represented an ear of corn, and a sparrow perched upon it. No one, on seeing it, could deny that the representation was very life-like. At last, a man came by and began to criticise the performance, declaring that it was by no means faultless. He was immediately admitted into the governor’s presence, and at the same time, the artist was sent for. The fault-finder was then asked what his objections were. He said, “everybody knows very well that a sparrow cannot alight upon an ear of corn without making it bend. Now, the artist has represented it as quite straight, and yet he has shown a sparrow perched upon it.” The remark was just, and the artist received no reward.” You see, the want of the bending in the stalk completely spoiled the naturalness of the picture, and, it may be said, that the absence of a forgiving spirit not only mars the beauty and harmony of the Christian character, hut destroys its very existence. Though an unregenerate person lacking this spirit, might have many good qualities, yet it is utterly inconceivable that there could be a Christian character in its absence. Christian means Christ-like, and an unforgiving spirit is infinitely removed from likeness to Christ. The gentle forbearing spirit, which is ever ready to forgive, may not unaptly be styled the bending element in character; and, how often does it happen, in the case of offences, that if there were but a little yielding on both sides, a reconciliation might speedily be effected.

The artist lost his anticipated reward, and assuredly we shall lose ours too, if the important element in question, be wanting in our character. The governor did not take the young man into his service, neither will Christ accept our services in ruling the mortal nations of the earth, if we have failed to manifest the Christ-like spirit of forgiveness.

Lastly, let me refer you to the inimitable parable of the Prodigal Son, as beautifully and forcibly illustrative of the forgiveness we have received from our Heavenly Father.

JOHN GLOVER.

PSALM III.

Many there be who say
 “There is no help for him in God.”
 Why walk the narrow way?
 Why trust Him in His word?
 But Thou wilt be our shield,
 O Lord! our glory, too!
 In might wilt make us wield
 Thy sword of temper true,
 To put our foes to flight
 When they increase around,
 And make our darkness light
 When troubles sore abound.
 Therefore to Thee we cry
 To lift us when we fall,
 To wake us when we die,
 To be our strength, our all.
 Arise, O Lord, and save
 Our souls from deathly fear;
 Destruction and the grave
 Before Thee disappear.
 Salvation is from Thee,
 O Lord, from Thee alone;
 O let Thy blessing be,
 On all Thy grace doth own,

D. B.

ASSYRIA AND MESOPOTAMIA.

(Continued from March page 8)

“Out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city.” - -Gen. x. 11-12.

Of the sons of Shem, scripture has recorded nothing, except of Asshur; but of him the record is of the highest importance, as it fixes the epoch of the kingdom of Assyria. It may be inferred from the verses in Genesis, that Asshur had originally dwelt in the plains of Shinar, and that at some period of Nimrod's reign, he led a company or tribe from Babel; that he travelled up the Tigris, and settled in the land to which he gave his name, Assyria being the Greek derivative from the Hebrew Asshur: farther, it may be deduced that he followed the system of government adopted by Nimrod, dispersing his people over the country as they increased, and employing them in establishing adjacent cities. Others explain the text differently, adopting the marginal reading, “he went out into Assyria,” which they understand to speak of Nimrod, who left his own country to attack Assyria. The verse in Micah, however, strongly corroborates our view of the question, - “And they shall waste the land of Assyria with the sword, and the land of Nimrod in the entrances thereof (Micah v. 6.); a passage which certainly implies distinct founders for the separate kingdoms of Nineveh and Babylon, which were both united in the Assyrian monarchy about the time of this prophecy.

How long Asshur lived, or how far he established his power, are not to be learned from the sacred narrative: nor has Assyria, like Babylonia, any great natural frontiers to determine its extent. The site of Rehoboth is so uncertain, that it has been shifted everywhere but we learn from Chesney, that “on the right bank the Euphrates, at the north-western extremity of the plain of Shinar, and three-and-a-half miles south-west of the town of Magadin, are extensive ruins, around a castle, still bearing the name of Rehoboth.”

After the foundation of the kingdoms of Nimrod and Asshur, we meet with no direct mention in the sacred writings, of Nineveh or its king, for a period of fifteen hundred years. *(1) This is no proof that the city or empire remained unimportant, since the Bible does not profess to contain a systematic history of the world. In the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, one “Amraphel, king of Shinar is mentioned, of whom the Jewish archaeologist, Josephus, says, he was a commander in the Assyrian army. (Ant. Lib. I. c. ix.). Likewise, Arioch, king of Ellasar, El-Asar; may not this be “the Assyrians”? At all events, it is probable that they were Assyrian satraps or viceroys, according to the subsequent Assyrian boast, “are not my princes altogether kings?” (Isaiah x. 8). At the closing period of the age of Moses, we again meet with traces of Assyria, as an independent and formidable state. Balaam, the seer, addressing the Kenites, a tribe of Highlanders on the East of the Jordan, “took up his parable,” “strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock. Nevertheless, the Kenites shall be wasted until Asshur shall carry thee away captive.” (Numbers xxiv. 21-22). We also find, that, shortly after the death of Joshua, the Israelites submitted to the arms of Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, which was then a separate government from Assyria, “Therefore, the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He sold them into the hand of Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia: and the children of Israel served Chushan-rishathaim for eight years.” (Judges iii. 7-10).

Although the Assyrian kings or their country are not expressly mentioned until the reign of Jeroboam, (825 B.C.) we are not left without indications of the state of the kingdom during the latter part of this period. It is a striking proof of the weakness or sloth of the kings of Nineveh, that they made no attempt to resist the rise of the Jewish power, under David and his son Solomon, whose sovereignty extended to the very banks of the Euphrates. (Gen. xv. 18; Exod. xxiii. 31; 1 Kings iv. 21-24; 1 Chron. xviii. 3; Psalm lxxii. 8).

Footnote: - (1)* Many learned men, including Dr. Faber, (who informed me that he had made the subject his particular study), think that, there are strong reasons for adopting the Samaritan text in preference to the Hebrew, the great point gained, being the increase of time from the Deluge to Abraham. The adoption of the Samaritan text, however, does not appear to me to affect the question of the nearly coeval foundation of the kingdoms of Nimrod and Asshur, as gathered from the Bible, but - - - - [some text missing in original copy.]

The first returning mention of Assyria, or Nineveh, in the Bible, is in the book of Jonah. The name of the monarch then reigning is not given, but it is supposed that he was the father of that “Phul,” whose

invasion of Israel is subsequently recorded, and the commencement of whose reign is dated B.C. 821. In the history of Jonah's visit, Nineveh is twice described as "that great city," and again as an "exceeding great city, of three days' journey."

The measurement assigned to Nineveh by the sacred writers applies, without doubt, to its circuit, and gives a circumference of about sixty miles.

The twelfth verse of the fourth chapter of Jonah furnishes us with the means of estimating approximately the population of the ancient city, when visited by the prophet. It is there stated to have contained 120,000 persons, who "could not discern between their right hand and their left," - a figurative expression usually understood of young children. As these are, in any place, commonly reckoned to form one-fifth of the population, Nineveh must have contained 600,000 inhabitants. The relative proportions of Nineveh, Babylon, and London, are thus computed. The area of Babylon 225 square miles, that of Nineveh 216 square miles, while that of London and its environs, is but 114 square miles; so that with an area of little more than half that of Nineveh, the population of the latter is nearly four times greater. This may at first sight appear a disappointing calculation, but we are not to look to our crowded - - - [text missing in original copy] those arrangements which 3000 years ago prevailed in Asia.

Babylon, we know, contained within its walls not only gardens and large open spaces for pleasure, but a sufficient quantity of land for tillage, to support the inhabitants in the event of a siege. It may be, that the majority of the houses of Nineveh, like those of many eastern cities of the present day, consisted but of one story, so that the number of people spread over a much wider area than in our western towns, where houses are carried to a considerable height, and are often made to accommodate several families; but to enable masses to provide themselves with the necessaries of life, there must be ten thousand centres instead of one, and immense independence of individual action. This can only be the offspring of freedom through long ages; and no one of these conditions ever existed in Assyria.

None of the historical books of the Old Testament give any details respecting Nineveh. The prophets, however, make frequent incidental allusions to its magnificence, to the "fenced place," "the stronghold," "the valiant men and chariots," the "silver and gold," the "pleasant furniture," "carved lintels and cedar work." Zephaniah, who wrote about twenty-four years before the fall of Nineveh, says of it - "This is the rejoicing city, that dwelt carelessly; That said in her heart, I am, and there is none beside me." (Zephaniah ii. 15.)

"Nineveh and its Palaces," by JOSEPH BONOMI, F.R.S.L., pp. 48-52 - Gleaner. (To be continued).

THE SOUL OF MAN AND BEAST.

The acts of the soul in men are thought, will, memory, design, reason, understanding: but all these actions are discernible in brutes: therefore, the agent or soul is of the same nature in men and brutes. But since the souls of men and brutes are of like nature, and it is granted that the soul of the brute dies with the body, therefore also does the human soul die with the body.

THE CHILDREN'S COLUMNS.

THE PICTURE OF THE LAST SUPPER.

I think that all my young friends must have seen a picture of the "Last Supper of the Lord Jesus with His disciples." It is one which most artists have loved to draw or paint; but one thing seems very strange, all these pictures have a little resemblance to each other. There is the long table, covered with a clean white cloth, - some artists have been so careful as to draw the marks in which the cloth was folded, while others have a table-cloth tied up in knots at each corner.

There is Jesus, seated just opposite to us in the centre, with as lovely a face as human skill could paint, a little sad with the thought of the parting that must soon take place, the baseness of one of His disciples, and the pain that He must presently suffer. Six of His disciples sit on one side, and six on the other. Most artists have put John next to Jesus, leaning on His breast, as we find from John xiii. 23 to 25,

the beloved disciple is said to have been. Jesus has taken bread in His hands, and is looking up to God, to give thanks for the food they are about to eat. Through the open archway behind, we may see the purple hills in the distance, and some lovely palm trees. If it were not for those trees, and the loose robes of the men we might fancy it was a picture of a supper in our own land. Now, an Eastern told us that he always felt inclined to laugh when he saw such pictures - it looked so strange to see Easterns sitting to a long table, with proper dishes down the centre, and each having an English-looking plate before him. He said the men who painted such pictures did not know much about Palestine, and how they eat their food there. He also told us an amusing story of a friend of ours, who went to visit him in his home in Palestine. He said when they went into the room that serves for sitting and dining-room, our friend looked surprised to see it furnished with nothing but cushions. However, as the family came in they seated themselves, something like our tailors, with their legs crossed under them; so he did the same. The servant brought a small stand, or tiny table, just large enough for one dish. The first dish was brought in. It was a tall pyramid of rice. He was just going to ask for a plate and spoon, when he saw the rice quickly disappearing. Each of the party had seized a handful, rolled it up in a small ball, thrown it in his mouth, then another, and another, in that quick active manner that only Easterns can, till before he had time to recover from his surprise the rice was all gone. The next dish was a fowl. Our friend was very hungry, and he began to think that he must save his English manners till he got back to England, or he should have to go without his dinner. So, as soon as the dish was put on the stand, he seized the wing of a fowl, another of the party very good-naturedly grasped another, others too seized the legs, and so they pulled the bird to pieces and ate it. Then there was soup, but only one dish, into which they all dipped, some their hands, others pieces of bread rolled up to form a spoon. After the meal was over the servant brought a bason of water and a towel to wash their hands. This is always done, and you will see it is quite necessary. Some few have spoons of wood, gold, or silver, but they do not often use them.

This Eastern told us that it was most unlikely that Christ would have been sitting at a long table, covered with a white cloth, and plentifully supplied with plates and dishes, as the people in the East scarcely ever change their ways. What they did hundreds, nay, thousands of years ago, they do now in the same way. They use no fashion books for cutting out their clothes. The picture of a fashionable lady in the East at the present time would do very well for a picture of Either the Queen, and the dress of a shepherd boy on the plains of Bethlehem now, would do for that of the young shepherd David,

Jesus, you know, said "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Matt. xxvi. 28. "And when He had dipped the sop He gave it to Judas." John xiii. 26. From this custom of washing after a meal, Jesus taught His disciples a beautiful lesson - that of servicing one another. He took a towel and girded Himself, just as a servant would, after that He poured water in a basin and began to wash His disciples' feet. His disciples did not wish their Lord and Master to do the work of a servant for them, but He wished to teach them two good lessons; - one was, "If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet." The other lesson they could not understand, but He said to them, "Thou knowest not now, but thou shall know hereafter." If you keep on reading God's word I trust that some day you too will understand what He meant by this act. But the first lesson you can both remember and practise, - Be humble, and serve each other.

CHURCH DEFENCE CONFERENCE AT BIRMINGHAM.

The Times severely criticises - and we are not surprised - the speakers and proceedings at this important meeting. With the exception of the Marquis of Hertford, not one of the distinguished orators had a word to say about Ritualism and Romanism which, unless they be cast out, will inevitably bring down the walls of our Church. Lord Hertford spoke so well that we gladly give a portion of his remarks, as reported in the Times: - "The Marquis of Hertford said the Archbishops' Bill - for which he gave his vote in the House of Lords with much satisfaction - might not effect all they desired at once, but he believed that in the end it would do much to prevent the Ritualistic excesses which were so properly denounced in the House of Lords, and he hoped that both clergy and laity would henceforth see that it was their paramount duty to obey the law."

DREAMS OF PEACE DISTURBED.

THE following article from the Peace Society's Papers shews that our pious dreamers are waking up and looking about them with alarm. Russia is getting too near to British possessions in India, even for peace-at-any-price people, to feel quite comfortable about it. If Russia would only make conquests without the sword, what a blessing it would be to Asia! "If!" It is, we firmly believe, the mission of Russia, to conquer by any means. Be this as it may, that she is acquiring territory at an extraordinary rate, no one will deny. Surely, it must very soon come to a contest between her and Britain. Then may the saints lift up their heads, for it is assigned to the Lion of the tribe of Judah to settle the quarrel between the Prince of Ros, Mose, and Thuval, and the Lions of Tarshish. He will depose both, and "take unto Himself His great power and reign." Shall we reign with Him?

"RUSSIA AND HER PROSPECTS. – In many ways the progress of Russia has produced an amount of popular happiness and peaceful improvement amongst her numerous millions, superior to that attained by the great bulk of the inhabitants of Western Europe, and even of some districts of Great Britain. But a broadening shadow is gradually spreading over this fair prospect – the cloud of excessive militarism. The Russian army, even on a peace footing, is swelled to more than a million and a half of soldiers. Conscription seems likely to become the same universal plague throughout the empire which it has become in war-desolated, army-ruined France. And if Russia does not take heed, her armaments will be her ruin, instead of her safety, and may probably break up her empire and break down her throne. For this growing militarism has already driven thousands of her most industrious and most useful subjects, the Mennonites of the Volga, into voluntary exile in America. A hundred thousand more are only reluctantly retained in Russia by the promises of the Government that the conscription shall not be enforced in their case - promises which they hesitate to trust or act upon. The Crimea, which has hitherto been as the garden of the empire, is being depopulated of its Tartar inhabitants, who are fleeing in multitudes into the dominions of the Turkish Sultan, to escape their increasing military burdens at home. In Central Asia the same excessive militarism is raising grave perils of collision between Russia and Great Britain, on the confines of India. It is not the gradual peaceful progress of Russia over the Asian plains, by means of commerce and immigration, which produces danger. Such progress is an almost unmixed benefit to the East. It tends to substitute civilization for barbarism, and to sap the foundations of a cruel and rotten Mahomedanism. Well would it be for Asia, and for India, if the Russian sway could be peacefully extended throughout all Central Asia, right away to the boundary of British India and of China. It would be well for all parties concerned. But the danger accumulating in that quarter is being wrought by ambitious military agents, and, if not checked by the St. Petersburg Government, may result in disastrous eventualities. And at St. Petersburg itself there is danger from this ever-swelling militarism. Already there are more than whispers that the Czar is sometimes outvoted in his own council by powerful military chiefs. The history even of Russia itself ought to convey a suggestive warning in this direction. Was it not a clique of military officers who assassinated the Emperor Paul? And, on the death of Alexander I did not the soldiery manifest a dangerous movement, which was with difficulty suppressed? Praetorian guards are apt to become praetorian executioners, even of the sovereigns they are marshalled to support. So, in proportion as the military element becomes intensified at St. Petersburg and throughout the empire, there will be increased peril to the Emperor himself and a greater danger of revolt. Hence it is fervently to be hoped that, through some influential channel or other, the voice of wise caution may reach the Russian Government, and may receive such effectual consideration as may tend to check the present perilous and heavily burdensome preponderance of militarism, which is threatening to ruin the happiness of the Russian people, to paralyze their industry, to cripple their resources, to disorganize their empire, and even to undermine the stability of the imperial throne. - *Peace Society's Papers.*

M. GASPARIN'S EXPOSE OF THE CONFESSIONAL. - According to the Times' Paris correspondent, the colporteurs are no longer allowed to sell this (to the Papists) most damaging work. We wonder if we are to have a repetition of poor Murphy's case in the French capital!

THE Rev. R. O'Keefe has just published a very remarkable work on Ultramontanism versus Civil and Religious Liberty, regarded from a loyal Roman Catholic point of view. We at once commend this book to the careful study of our readers, and we may probably take an early opportunity of bringing its contents more immediately under their notice.

GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

SIR, - At a period when sceptics take advantage of every seeming error which appears in the Bible to aid them in deteriorating the value of the written Word of God, it requires more than usual diligence on the part of Christians to defend the truthfulness of the sacred writers. Occasional misprints do appear, and it is hoped that all trivial errors will be corrected when the present revision of the New Testament is completed. One seeming error in the genealogy of Christ is easily accounted for, although it is one which has puzzled many Biblical scholars. It is recorded in the 17th verse of the first chapter of Matthew's Gospel, "So all the generations from Abraham to David, until the carrying away into Babylon, are fourteen generations, and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations," thus making forty-two generations in all.

The following is a faithful transcript of the generations enumerated in the modern or common version of the New Testament: -

Abraham	Solomon	Salathiel
Isaac	Roboam	Zorobabel
Jacob	Abia	Abiud
Judas	Asa	Eliakim
Phares	Josaphat	Azor
Esrom	Joram	Sadoc
Aram	Ozias	Achim
Aminadab	Joatham	Eliud
Naason	Achaz	Eleazar
Salmon	Ezekias	Matthan
Booz	Manasses	Jacob
Obed	Amon	Joseph
Jesse	Josias	JESUS -13
David - 14	Jechonias -14	

From whence it would appear that there are only forty-one generations. On, however, comparing the 11th verse of the first chapter of Matthew in the modern version with that of an old version (Beza's edition), the reader will find the missing generation accounted for: -

NEW VERSION. - "And Josias begat Jechonias."

OLD VERSION. - "And Josias begat Jakim; and Jakim begat Jechonias."

Jakim therefore fails to be added to the genealogy in the modern version, which will complete the forty-two generations mentioned in verse 17; it does appear somewhat strange that such an omission should have occurred on so important a subject, and that centuries should be allowed to pass without the error being noted.

A CHRISTIAN.

We read lately of a man who declared he should go on "heedless of criticism," and we thought of Solomon's sayings: "He that hateth reproof is brutish; "He that hateth reproof shall die."

- EDITOR.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Christadelphian Lamp,
NEW PITSLIGO, Mar. 8, 1875.

Dear Brother, - In carrying out my intention to write to you I may in the first place say that I consider the plan you have adopted in conducting the Lamp is the only consistent, satisfactory plan. To suppress everything not exactly to your mind would be to assume that you are wiser than any other person, and betray a weakness somewhere.

I fail to see why a magazine devoted to the propagation and defence of the Truth should be conducted on principles different from those usually acted on by the brethren in lecturing or in conversation, viz.: the institution of a comparison between truth and error; we are pleased when we get people to compare their ideas with ours, and confident that truth will never suffer in a comparison with error.

A retrospect of the past few years testifies to the truth of this; it is in the healthy atmosphere of free discussion that the truth has achieved such triumphs against such tremendous odds, and if it can no longer flourish in this atmosphere, whither shall it be transplanted?

The fact that difference exists among the brethren proves that there are ideas present foreign to the word, else all would be harmony; how desirable it is then that we should have the wisdom and courage to sift out and renounce every such idea, and at the same time guard against the folly of considering ourselves bound to take a side in every dispute which may originate among the brethren, or under the necessity of jumping to a conclusion on every question - taught or untaught - which may be agitated. There are many questions connected with the purpose of God of which I desire a solution, but not having the necessary materials, or having them, being at present unable to use them, I am content to leave them open, and make no pretensions to an understanding of what I do not comprehend.

In regard to the division arising out of the recent controversy, my position is simply this, that I do not recognise it, for the reason that I fail to see any necessity for it; true, a theory has been adopted and advocated on the one hand, and placed in opposition to a conflicting theory on the other; laboured arguments being adduced in support of both, but, stripped of all assumptions and assertions, the controversy looks a diminutive affair. I adopt neither theory, believing that both contain an element of evil, in seeking to supplement the word by the use of unscriptural terms, hence we have recently formed an undesirable acquaintance with many such, of which "Free life" and "Constitutional sinner" are specimens. The theory represented by the former may be very pretty, but it will occur to those not enamoured of it, whence arises the necessity of hazarding a conjecture as to what would have been the result had Jesus done otherwise than He did in laying down His life, when the prophetic word declared that, He was to "pour out his soul unto death?" Or, why affirm that Jesus was a sinner, no matter by what term you seek to qualify the expression, when the scriptures declare that "In Him is no sin"? Why persist in saying that He died for Himself, when the scriptures are silent on the subject?

It would appear to me that, personalities excepted, the chief cause of this misunderstanding and division consists in the contemplation of the Christ apart from His mission, a view of the subject on which I understand the scriptures to shed no light whatever. In them He is not presented in this abstract way but in relation to the work appointed Him.

Were we at liberty to speculate on what Christ might have been or done apart from His mission, and to exalt our conceptions derived therefrom to a level with the word of God, then we must bid adieu to all unity, and consent to rank ourselves among the sects, who all act on the principle of supplementing the word wherever they deem it too brief or too vague.

Wisdom and reverence dictate a course contrary to this; where God has been pleased to be silent let us be dumb, fearing to add one idea of our own, however correct it may appear to us. As ample time has been afforded to allow of a full statement of both theories, during which a considerable amount of energy and talent has been expended in shewing how far apart from each other the conflicting parties may go, let me humbly suggest that something like the same effort be put forth to ascertain how near each other they may come, lest He whom they call Lord appear and find bitterness and hostility where good-will and peace should prevail. - Yours in hope of life, CHARLES REID.

[In our next issue we shall have a few remarks to offer on this letter. - EDITOR.]

SYDNEY, December 21st, 1874.

Dear Brother Turney, - It is under peculiar circumstances that I send you these few lines; I may tell you that before your so-called heresy came amongst us, there was a personal difference which caused a division; each refusing to break bread with each other, though both were teaching the same things. When

the Christadelphian for July, 1873, came to hand, all, without exception, in our branch of the Church declared against you, but Bro. P. Graham, the principal of the other branch, boldly censured us for accepting one side of the question before hearing the other. He sent to you for some copies of your answers to the 32 Questions, and the Lecture; he kindly lent all he had received to us. Bro. O. Toole, Bro. Marsh, and myself saw the truth, and urged all the brethren to give the truth a fair trial; but the teaching began to get very pointed. Bro. Marsh went to Ashfield, to Bro. P. Graham's, and they immersed each other; I called a meeting to consider the subject, but only to receive in a less degree all that has befallen you. Bro. and Sister Lees were the last to read, and I entertained very little hope, when he returned the answer to the 3rd Questions, but I handed him the lecture the next time I saw him. Oh, how changed, although he only told me he had sent to you for all the publications; I thanked God, and believed I saw in him the champion of the truth. That was the last time I saw him alive; a few weeks after, apoplexy seized him, and in 25 hours he was taken away. An hour before he was taken, he was in perfect health, and one of the last conversations Bro. and Sister Lees had with him was in reference to immersion. Bro. Lees saw the necessity of it, but Sister Lees hardly did. Neither Bro. O. Toole, Sister Lees, nor myself are meeting at present with either section of the Church, nor do I see any hope in that direction. I am sorry to add, that Bro. Lees has left our Sister in a very embarrassed position, but, with God's help and the blessings of health and strength, she hopes to be able to meet all demands. That you may continue to shew the way of the truth more and more perfectly is the prayer of yours in Israel's hope, WILLIAM BROWN.

[We sincerely sympathise with Sister Lees in her late bereavement, and trust she will be able to tide over all her difficulties. - EDITOR.]

THE PERVERTED PARABLE. THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

LUKE xvi. 19-31.

IN spite of the many plain statements of Scripture regarding the utter unconsciousness of the dead - such as, "The dead know not anything" - (Eccl. ix. 5); "The dead praise not the Lord, neither they that go down into silence" - (Ps. cxv. 17); "When man's breath goeth forth, he returns to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" - (Ps. cxlvi. 4) - this parable is constantly brought forward as demonstrative evidence to the contrary.

Surely this, to say the least, is making a different use of the parable from what our Lord intended. Besides, it is a fair rule to apply to the teaching of Scripture, that those parts which are parabolic, metaphorical, or obscure must be understood by the light of those parts which are plain, direct, and explicit. We must not understand parables literally, if, by so doing, we require to make plain, direct, or explicit statements figurative. Dr. Kitto wisely remarks: 'The rule seems to be, that in parabolical discourses, provided the doctrines inculcated are strictly true, the terms in which they are inculcated may be adapted to the prevailing ideas of those to whom they are addressed. If any question arises about the particular circumstances, in such a discourse, the clue for our guidance to the correct interpretation must be sought in those parts of Scripture which speak to us plainly, and not in parables.' Thus, in the parable before us, two dead men are represented as conversing with each other - suffering, desiring, and reasoning; while, in the Scriptures already quoted, we are distinctly told that "the dead know not anything," that in the same day that man "returns to the earth, his thoughts perish." These direct statements regarding the condition of the dead are not to be understood by the representation given in the parable, but as containing in themselves an expression of absolute truth; while the representation in the parable must be understood in a sense harmonious with these direct statements regarding the condition of the dead. This, we submit, is fair dealing.

No one supposes that the story told by Jotham (Judges ix. 8-15) of the trees electing and anointing a king to reign over them, is a description of facts; and we read of the blood of Abel crying unto God from the ground - (Gen. iv. 10) - and that "the blood of sprinkling speaketh better things than the blood of Abel" - (Heb. xii. 24) - we never imagine that a real voice was heard. And if shed blood be represented as speaking, as well as other inanimate objects - such as mountains breaking forth into singing, and trees of the field clapping their hands - (Is. Iv. 12) - is it at all wonderful that dead men, who know not anything, should be (for a purpose) represented acting as if they were alive? Surely not.

This is not the only instance in which the dead are represented as speaking. In Is. xiv. 10, the inhabitants of Sheol are represented as rising up to meet the King of Babylon, and exclaiming with astonishment: 'Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee;' yet no one would affirm that those thus covered with worms in the grave were at the same time in a state of conscious being; and it requires no great endowment of ideality to perceive the beauty and force of the figure. Let the parable in question be viewed in a similar way, and its teaching shall be found in no degree contradicting the direct testimony of Scripture regarding the unconscious state of the dead. To understand the parable to be a real description of the condition of the righteous, and the wicked dead, before resurrection and judgment, is to ignore not only the plain and direct teaching of the Bible regarding the condition of the dead, but also its positive testimony that we 'must appear at the judgment seat of Christ, to receive the things in body, according to what we have done, whether it be good or bad' - (2 Cor. v. 10).

The Lord Himself taught plainly that it is at the resurrection of the just, that recompense shall be given to those who are worthy - (Luke xiv. 14); and this truth is strikingly illustrated in His memorable words: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity" - (Matt. vii. 23, 23).

The day here referred to, is evidently day of judgment, and the parties introduced are represented as being surprised at the fate awarded to them. But why should they be surprised at their rejection if they had been suffering in Hades ever since the day of their death, till they came forth to judgment at "the resurrection of damnation"? - (John v. 28, 29). The idea that the wicked dead are punished by the Judge before resurrection and judgment, is thus utterly at variance with the teaching of the Lord, as it is opposed to the principles of reason and justice.

Whatever, therefore, be the import of the parable, we cannot believe our Lord used it to teach a doctrine so utterly opposed to his own testimony on other occasions, and at variance with the uniform testimony of Holy Scripture.

Here the matter might be left to rest; but in confirmation of what has been advanced, we submit a few animadversions on the common method of understanding the parable as setting forth a conscious state of disembodied existence between death and resurrection. The representation in the parable gives no countenance whatever to a disembodied state of conscious existence. By what process of reasoning could we infer the consciousness of a disembodied spirit from the declaration that, in Hades the rich man lifted up his eyes and felt his tongue tormented in a flame, requesting that Lazarus might dip his finger in water to cool his burning tongue? Besides, the scene of the representation is in Hades - the grave, or state of the dead, where there is neither knowledge, wisdom, nor remembrance, and where the blessed Redeemer Himself lay for three days - (Acts ii. 2.5-30).

The rich man died, and was buried, and in the grave he lifted up his eyes being in torments. Does it not meet all the requirements of the case to understand our Lord as making use of a parable to convey reproof or instruction to his prejudiced auditors, the Pharisees?

According to Whitby, this same parable was contained in the 'Gemara Babylonicum,' and was probably familiar to the Jews at the time our Lord repeated it in their hearing. His object seems to have been to reprove the Pharisees for their covetousness (see verses 14, et seq.)

While this parable by no fair means can be held to militate against the positive declarations of the Scriptures regarding the condition of the dead, it contains strong presumptive evidence against the theory that men exist consciously, as spirits, between death and resurrection. Observe, that the rich man is represented as pleading that Lazarus should be 'sent from the dead,' to warn his brethren. From the answer given, it is assumed that, in order to do this, Lazarus would require to 'rise from the dead' (verses 27-36). This certainly does not favour the notion that, at death, or what is vulgarly called death, the soul, or man proper, only bursts the cerements of his chrysalis covering, and soars forth unfettered to the exercise of nobler and transcendent powers, capable of performing far more arduous duties than that of carrying a message of warning to men in the flesh. Having never ceased to live, such a person had no need to rise from the dead to perform that service. The spirit mediums manage such affairs otherwise, though, unfortunately for them, and the philosophy which sustains them, the words of the living God proclaim them 'deceiving and being deceived.' From such seductive and ruinous devices, let the reader turn to and rely on the sure Word of God, which tells us of a coming judgment and a coming Judge, who will render to each one according to his work. For "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." Above all, make sure that you are "in Christ Jesus." To such "there is no condemnation" - (Rom. viii. 1). - W. LAING.

MOUNT HOR.

Upon this mount rests the tomb of Aaron; at its base, deeply seated in its ravines, and bounded by its precipitous sides and lofty peaks, lies the excavated city of Petra, the Idumea of the Greeks, the Edom of the prophet Jeremiah - the city of impregnable position, which gloried in its strength but which strikes the traveller who is fortunate enough to visit it, as an awful realization of the prophetic denunciation: "Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hills; though thou shouldst make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord" - (Jeremiah xlix. 16).

Petra is the wonder of the desert.

The Holy Land, illustrated by DAVID ROBERTS, R.A., with Historical Description by GEORGE CROLY, LL.D., vol. 1. - GLEANER.

EXTRACT ON SELF-DECEPTION.

A general and fertile source of self-deception is our readiness to excuse, or at least extenuate, the vices of our particular station or profession, or situation, or circumstances, while we congratulate ourselves on the absence of other vices which we are under no temptation to commit. It is a delusion much of the same nature, to feel and exaggerate the amount of the difficulties and temptations to which we are actually liable, and thence to excuse our slow and small progress in the Christian road; "but if we are in such or such other situations, how resolutely would we advance in the path of duty; our natural temper renders it particularly difficult for us, circumstanced as we are, to stand our ground; but were we in almost any other situation, we should not exhibit such melancholy marks of weakness." Thus we hide from ourselves the wholesome humiliation of real defeats, in the fallacious complacency of imaginary victories. The man of action excuses to himself that worldly-mindedness which he cannot deny. But he is not slothful in business: he does not hide his talent in a napkin. Avarice, again is a passion of sober and domestic habits: its votary may felicitate himself on his freedom from the licentiousness of a dissipated age. And does not many a one derive a secret self-complacency from having quitted the haunts of gaiety, the public places and amusements of fashionable life; - while censoriousness, while spiritual pride, while anger, while indolence, too fatally betray the important truth, that every situation has its own appropriate temptations and dangers, and that it is by our conquest over these, over "the sin that most easily besets us," that our religious proficiency may best be measured.

A still more deep and subtle fraud, often, it is to be feared, maintains a lasting influence. We are seduced into vice. We are filled with remorse. We renew our applications for pardoning mercy. The balm of Scripture promises is poured into our wounds. We gradually obtain comfort. All this, is as it should be, if the result be a growing power to resist the force of temptation and quell the risings of appetite; if opposite habits by degrees are formed, and if in the language of Scripture, the fruits of the spirit appear instead of the lusts of the flesh. But are there not many who carry on an habitual practice of sinning and repenting, who confound their constant subjections to some besetting sin, which is victorious as often as it renews its attacks, with the occasional falls which may, perhaps, occur in the walk of even the real Christian, filling his heart with sorrow, and his eyes tears, while they urge him to more diligent watchfulness and more steady self-denial?

We render others the innocent instruments of deceiving ourselves, when we accept their flattering testimony against own knowledge, and suffer ourselves to derive complacency from that approbation and applause of our principles and conduct, which we know to be founded on misunderstood facts and mistaken suppositions, or which we are conscious would be changed into disapprobation and censure, if our judges were aware of the actual affections of our hearts and the real springs of our actions. How gross is the delusion! Yet who is there that has not recognised it in himself? How open must we be to the friends of self-deception, when we thus become the willing dupes of a known imposture, and suffer our feelings to be gratified by commendations, which at the very moment we are receiving them, we see and feel to be unjustly bestowed? . . . Then there are those deceits which our hearts impose on us, as in making us promises which are not kept, and contracting engagements which are never performed. . . . They render us the slaves of procrastination. They lead us to over-estimate our moral powers. They flatter us with a persuasion, that we can at any time break our chains. . . . Meanwhile year after year passes away. Evil habits are strengthened. Our moral sensibility is impaired. The awful warnings of religion are heard with

less and less emotion . . . Of these and all other modes of human deceitfulness, self-love is the fertile parent, and pride the nurse which fosters and cherishes them . . . Let me close by remarking, how justly does the wise man's counsel lead us to watch against our own deceitfulness with jealousy. How truly does he warn us, "He that trusteth his own heart is a fool." - SCRUTATOR.

The Christian Observer, Nov., 1802, p.p. 693, 695. ECLECTIC.

A Hindu proverb says: "A wise man will take advice; but a fool never."

IT was in the disastrous days of both (the Jewish) kingdoms that prophecy and miracle shone with conspicuous lustre. Yet, a striking distinction marks their use. Miracle is almost solely directed to the kingdom of Israel, prophecy almost solely to the kingdom of Judah. The deeper guilt and more intractable rebellion of the ten tribes are assailed by the terror and wonders of the senses; the less stubborn infidelity and less furious vice of Judah are addressed "by the hopes and fears of the heart. Of all the prophets, but two, Hosea and Amos, were sent directly to Israel; and their language, sharp, wild, and terrible, is like the sound of a trumpet for the assault. - CROLY.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - Dear Bro. Turney, - It is my duty to report to you that our operations for the Truth's sake have been carried on with unflagging energy and zeal, during the past month, and we are patiently waiting for the fruit of our labours, and hope that our efforts may receive the Father's blessing. We scatter the good seed of the Kingdom to the best of our ability, and wait for it to be fed and watered by our Almighty Father's hand. Our Lectures have been as follows: February 14th, "Conversion: From what? To what?" Bro. W. Ellis. February 21st, "Heaven: No man hath ascended to heaven," Jesus, - Bro. D. Handley. February 28th, "Hell! Why are the righteous and, the wicked there?" - Bro. W. Ellis. March 7th. "The kingdom of God: Popular ideas considered," - Bro. Henry Flint. It is pleasing to note that the brethren here are striving by their devotion to the interests of the Truth; in various ways, to make themselves approved of the Father, workmen that need not to be ashamed, and are thus endeavouring to make the best of the time while the Lord delays His coming. In addition to our usual Bible meeting, which is held every Tuesday evening at our Hall, some of the brethren also meet at Bro. Raver's, for the study of the prophetic Word. - Yours fraternally, CHARLES JENNINGS.

DEAL. - The believers in this place continue firm in the faith, and were lately cheered by a visit from Bro. Capt. D. Brown of London.

DEVONPORT. - Dear Bro. Turney, - It gives me great pleasure to inform you that "the truth" is making a little progress in this place. On the evening of the 26th of February, after a confession of faith "in the things of the kingdom and name" three friends put on the Christ, by being buried with Him by baptism, namely, Elizabeth Peline, wife of Bro. Peline, William E. Gruit, son of Bro. and Sis. Gruit, and Alfred Smart, Bro. in the flesh to Charles Smart, also one of our number. This is encouraging, we must continue to scatter "the seed," for this is the only means, at present, by which our Heavenly Father is pleased to select from among the masses some for His name. How changed the position and prospects of those who thus receive and obey "the truth," previously "afar off, now nigh by the blood of Christ." The ultimate object the Saviour had in view, in thus giving Himself for the Church, is described by Paul, "That He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish." - Yours in hope of the crown, W. DASHPER.

LEICESTER, - Dear Bro. Turney, - I have the pleasure to ask you to record in the forthcoming issue of the Lamp the immersion of Miriam Mc Gowen, 58. which took place on Wednesday, the 3rd inst. She was formerly connected with the Campbellites, having being baptized on joining that body some years ago, but has since come to see that the baptism to which she then submitted was scripturally invalid, inasmuch as she then knew nothing of "the things concerning the kingdom of God," her hopes being directed skyward; hence, though acknowledging Jesus of Nazareth as the Saviour of men, she was not acquainted with Him as the Christ or Messiah of Israel, and king over the whole earth. She now rejoices in having been brought to a knowledge of the truth as announced by prophets of old, and since confirmed by the prophet like unto Moses, and "further corroborated by inspired apostles, so that she now feels her feet firmly planted on a rock. Sister McGowen, though a native of Leicester, has been for some years settled in the United States; she came over to England, I believe, to be among her friends and hoping to do

as well, or possibly better than in America, but after remaining here some time, found it more difficult to get along than she anticipated, and so determined to return to America; her destination being Philadelphia or neighbourhood. We trust she may find some there, if but a few, who will extend to her the hand of fellowship, and mutually sustain each other in patiently waiting for the revelation of the Lord from heaven, to be the admiration of His saints. Since writing you last month, the lectures have been given by Bros. D. Handley, W. Ellis, and F. M. Lester; attendance and interest very encouraging, - several are in a position which may be defined as "not far from the kingdom of God," - this is gratifying, but it would be more so, to see them inside the Ark of Refuge, instead of just outside. - Yours in the faith, CHAS. WEALE.

MALDON. - Dear Bro. Turney, - Bro. Martin being on his way to Brightling-sea, a place about 30 miles north of Maldon, he called upon us, and we spent a very comfortable Sunday together. The time being short, no public effort was made. He was advertised, or rather Bro. Townsend had given notice to the inhabitants, about 5000, that three lectures would be delivered by Bro. Martin. The Hall, which holds five or six hundred, was filled to overflowing, and numbers went away. The first meeting was rather boisterous. A Swedenborgian minister challenged Bro. Martin to a public discussion, which was arranged and came off in due course. The second meeting was again crowded, and the attention very great. My Brother Charles and I went by rail on Wednesday afternoon, to the three lectures. My brother took the chair, and it was truly marvellous to see the people long before the opening, through the place for admission. The lecture was given to a very large and attentive audience, in such a way, I think, as could not fail to convince many of the hearer's. The discussion came off the next evening, and we have every reason to believe the truth will be benefitted thereby, although the ministers craftily tried all they could to prejudice the meeting by appealing to the feelings, especially to the bereaved asking such questions as "Where are our darlings that we have nursed and idolized?" "If this is true, they are done for," and many such like expressions. The charge was two-pence for admission to the discussion, the profits, if any, to go to the Life-boat institution. There remained after paying all expenses, the sum of - £1. Is. 2½d., which was sent with a note, hoping it might be useful in saving some poor soul from a watery grave. While we wait the issue we shall no doubt follow up the work thus started. It might be well to state that fully 1000 men and lads were from home; the autumn brings them back. Let us hope we may find a Peter, or some sons of Zebedee amongst them; at all events, Bro. Townsend is a good fisher of men. - Yours in the hope of Eternal Life, GEO. D. HANDLEY. [The lectures by Bro. Martin, referred to above, were the following: "Christ is coming a second time to the Earth to reign as King." "Where are the Dead." "Heaven to come to men, Men not to go to Heaven."]

NOTTINGHAM. - We have again the pleasure to record the addition of two more to our number, by obedience in the appointed way, namely: - Mary Elizabeth Bates, aged 24, wife of Bro. Bates, brought up to Wesleyan Methodism from childhood, and for some years a member of that denomination; and Albert McCombie, aged 23, skin dresser, formerly neutral. Within the last few weeks, an alteration has been made in the manner of conducting the Wednesday Evening-Bible Class, which thus far has worked exceedingly well, and has more than doubled the audience. It consists in the reading of essays by the Brethren on various Bible subjects, followed by free discussion, in which all are allowed to join. Essays on the following subjects have been already read and discussed, with the result of bringing out many interesting points, and although the criticism has been sometimes hostile to the essayist, perfect harmony and good feeling has been invariably maintained. The first essay was on "The Forgiveness of Injuries," by Bro. Glover, and will be found published in the present number of our periodical. The other subjects were "The Allegory of Sarah and Agar," Bro. Richmond; "Redemption," Bro. Liggett; "The Jewish Jubilee," Bro. Riggott; "Sacred Astronomy," Bro. W. Lewin; "Faith, Hope, and Charity," Bro. Farmer; and "The Nature of Man," Bro. Wyer. The following lectures have been delivered on consecutive Sunday evenings: - "The Overthrow of the Kingdoms of Men, and the Establishment of the Kingdom of God," Bro. Fred. Turney, of Stourbridge; "Sowing and Reaping, or Seed Time and Harvest," Bro. Hayes; "No Man hath ascended up to Heaven," Bro. Handley; "The popular Doctrine of Salvation shown to be a Delusion," Bro. Richmond.

RHYNIE (Scotland), 9th March. - Dear Bro. Turney: In the November number of the Lamp I mentioned my intention of sending you something of the nature of intelligence, but really I am at a loss for anything to communicate from this place; when at Crimond there were a few of us who endeavoured to uphold the truth as an "Ecclesia of Christadelphians," and moved along very quietly and agreeably on our spiritual warfare, until that important subject, "the Nature of Christ," was introduced; then there was no little stir, and also division, amongst us. Had I been a "bug-bear" in the estimation of any of the brethren, in that cause, I am now out of the way, for my removal to this place has isolated me altogether from the company of those known by the name of Christadelphians, so much so that I have not had the opportunity of

meeting on the first day of the week since I came here. This I feel to be a great denial, as it is very refreshing to meet for the purpose appointed by the Lord Jesus, and have sweet fellowship together; but yet I am not alone, neither do I find any difficulty in spending the time; my duties, which I am glad to say are light, occupy so much of my time; then I have my Bible; in which is contained the unsearchable riches of Christ. If we would seek for truth, as we do for hidden treasure, we shall have no cause to say the time is long, or the labour cheerless, for where the treasure is there will the heart be also. I have another great boon in the punctual arrival of the Lamp, which I hail with joy. To me it has indeed been a lamp, as by it I have been enabled to behold clearly things that formerly were obscure. I hope it may still continue to send forth those pure rays of light which alone are qualified to direct the pilgrim on the rugged, strait, and narrow way. Since I came here I have had several encounters with the different sects, and have loaned some books and a few tracts, but as to what the result may be I cannot say. Some have made the remark that I hold strange views; in most cases I find that when you say that man is mortal, you touch on a very tender chord of Protestantism, and are soon denounced as an "Infidel;" however, we are not to be discouraged at names when we remember the epithets applied to the Lord Jesus while He was on the earth; He is our example, if we would follow His footsteps. Let us then bear His image here, that we may bear it hereafter. - Yours truly, in the one hope, ALEX. TARVES.

The most beautiful of all that exists in the universe, is a countenance which beams with purity, intelligence, and benevolence; to be thus beautiful is within the power of all. - Bible Echo.