

The Christadelphian Lamp

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

VOL. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1875.

No. 4.

CONTENTS

Page 2.	A Treatise on The Two Sons of God	Editor
Page 5.	The Archbishop of Canterbury on The Soul	Editor
Page 6.	Papal Oaths	Extract
Page 7.	Egypt Revisited Bayard Taylor on Egyptian Antiquities	Antipas
Page 12.	Benevolence	Editor
Page 13.	The Father and The Son	
Page 16.	Co-operation Without Compromise	Bro. W. Laing
Page 17.	Three Sermons a Week for 25 shillings	Liverpool Mercury
Page 19.	Gradual Apostacy	
Page 19.	The Wicked God's Sword	
Page 20.	Meekness	Eclectic
Page 21.	Criticism on Isaiah LIII, 9	Eclectic
Page 21.	The Stone-Cutters Six Wishes	The Rock
Page 22.	The Jews	extract from
Page 22.	Self Examination	Lawrence Lectures
Page 23.	He Is Coming	Eclectic
Page 24.	Discipline of Trial	The Rock
Page 24.	On The Passover of The Passion Week	Froude
Page 27.	Earth to Earth. Dust to Dust	Eclectic
Page 28.	The Land of Moab	Rev. George Croly
Page 29.	The Children's Columns – An Arab Encampment	Gleaner
Page 30.	At The Breaking of Bread	
Page 31.	The Vatican	Bro. Glover
Page 32.	The Doctrine of Anti-Christ	E.A.
Page 33.	Intelligence	W.E.
Page 36.	Foreign Intelligence	
Page 37.	Incomes of Bishops	
Page 38.	Education	

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. - John 3:16 and 18.

Jesus saw that the accomplishment of His Father's purpose - obedience to His Father's will - and the salvation of sinners necessitated His death, therefore, out of supreme deference to His Father's will, and deep love for the sons of men, He freely gave up His life a ransom for all, even despising the shame of so ignominious a death as the death of the cross. We must also remember that this humiliation and obedience constituted the basis of His present and future exaltation. Because He stooped so low, the Father has raised Him so high, even exalting Him to his own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, far above all principality and power. Because He was obedient in all things, even unto death, the Father raised Him from the dead, and will give Him the heathen for His inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession, in the age to come.

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

(Continued from January page 5)

XII-THE SON OF PERDITION.

[Written Two Years Ago.]

THE SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

THE Son of perdition is the title chosen by the Eternal Spirit, and put into the mouth of the Apostle Paul, to denote a certain "man," whose characteristics are presented in the following summary: -

1. The man of sin. 2 Thes. ii. 3.
2. He opposeth and exalteth himself above all, being called a god, or an object of veneration.
3. He sits in the temple of the god, demonstrating that he is a god.
4. The lawless one.
5. With all power and signs and lying wonders.
6. With all deceit of injustice.

Equally plain and striking is the remarkable delineation of the features of this official man. If such an official personage has ever appeared in this mundane kosmos of ours, the foregoing "hue and cry" is surely precise enough to enable anyone of ordinary powers of observation and comparison to identify him with unerring accuracy. But other prophets were favoured with a glimpse of the same man, and in the Scripture of Truth have "noted" what they beheld. Daniel recorded the subsequent items.

He descried :-

1. A little horn having eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking very great things.
2. I beheld, then, because of the great words which the horn spake.
3. His look was more stout than his fellows.
4. The same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them.
5. Before this horn three of ten horns were plucked up by the roots.
6. He shall be diverse from the first horns.

The student will mark the close resemblance between the sketches given by Daniel and Paul; by the former five hundred years before the latter wrote on the theme of this wonderful man to his watchful brethren in the city of Thessalonica. It seems to be the pleasure of the Eternal Spirit to develop His mind more fully upon a subject as time advances; hence we may observe that the same lines in the portraiture by Paul are sharper and clearer than those traced by Daniel in his penograph. The symbolic "horn" of Daniel "dissolves," as it were, and re-appears in "the man" seen by Paul. The "stout look" of the interloper mentioned by Daniel comes out fully in the self-exalted god of the Pauline vision; the diversity from the companion horns discerned by Daniel is seen disclosed in the lawless peculiarity of the god-man depicted by the apostle, and so forth.

A very brief consideration of the "horns" will suggest that "the little horn" could not be intended to represent one individual, for the horns - namely, the ten - are explained to Daniel by the angel interpreter to signify kingdoms. This is evident, from a comparison of the vision of the image with the vision of the four beasts. Chap. ii. 39, 40. This being the case, "the man of sin" must be a figure denoting a class of official agents pertaining to the same system, which is made plain by the circumstance of "the man," or "little horn," being contemporary with, and lifted up above, the ten horns, even exacting the obeisance of them all. Analogical proof is also found in the fact that the Man Christ (Jesus) is not one person, but many in one, in which the man anti-Christ agrees. There is also a singular compactness in the affairs and elements of the latter, running parallel with the oneness and unity demanded of the constituents of the former.

Certain Papist writers have held that the Arabian prophet was the man of sin, probably because from their stand-point no other phenomenon having any likeness to the description could be perceived between themselves and the political horizon. The identity however, of the Mahometan system with Paul's "Son of Perdition" is effaced the moment we come to the details of the figure. It cannot, be maintained that the leaders of Islamism placed themselves above the laws of their empire; it rather appears that they were, on the whole, as scrupulous in keeping the laws as anxious to enforce their obedience. It was not at all incident to their constitution to exhibit themselves as gods, nor to claim that kind of adoration usually paid to the Divine Being. There is nothing in Saracen annals like a special and continued "war with the saints," unless it be admitted that the saints are the worshippers of the beast in whose vitals "the sword of God" so deeply fleshed itself. Failure in these primary points being manifest, we need not multiply negative

evidence, beyond the remark that “the Son of Perdition” was to be reserved for capture and destruction by the Sun of Righteousness, by whose fiery rays he will be consumed at his ascent from the east; whereas that order of things which issued from the Arabian pit has long since been abolished. The locusts rose up out of the smoke, and in the smoke they have been lost for ever. There has been no institution in all the Eastern Hemisphere answering to the prophetic photograph of “the man of sin.” This “man,” or “horn,” started up among “the horns of Western Europe, audaciously shouting “surrender”! The prophetic-historic tide rolls from East to West, and the political navigator finds himself tossed amid the billows of “the great sea,” lashed into a fury astoundingly prolific of political “mire and dirt.” This is the habitat of the eleven amphibious monsters of the Hebrew prophetic bards. Nothing has escaped the “teeth” and “claws” of these savage “beasts.” They have preyed upon each other, and all of them upon “the flock of God.” The student will not fail to recognise, sometimes prowling craftily, at others loudly roaring above the rest, that singular brute which so much attracted the eye of the ancient seer as he “considered the horns.”

“The man” before us consists, up to the present time, if we are to accept his own account of himself, of two hundred and fifty-nine Popes, from the apostle Peter to Pius IX., who was elected out of five cardinals on June 11th, 1846, and crowned on the 21st of the same month. His family name is John Maria Mastai Ferretti: he was born at Sinigaglia, in the Legation of Urbino and Persaro, on the 13th of May, 1792, and will consequently be 83 years old if he live till the 13th of May next. The French Revolution of 1848 made the Pope very unpopular, and he was obliged to leave Rome. He remained at Geata and Portici, in the Neapolitan territory, about a year and a half. Only a few days ago the Pope, in speaking upon the present situation of the Holy See, said that the troubles of his house dated from 1848. There is no doubt of it. A new spirit was then let loose among the peoples of the West utterly irreconcilable with the policy of “the Man of Sin;” it was a spirit inaugurating the very “perdition” of which the Eternal Spirit, 1800 years before, had declared him to be “the son.” The workings of this spirit ought to be of profound interest to every disciple of Christ, for each is, even now, a constituent of the wondrous “Name,” and soon, in a new and astonishing phase, will be a visible element of the other Son, who will consummate the irremediable “perdition” already begun. It is the spirit of Republicanism, of the Commune, of the International, of Fenianism, and its vibrations are strongly felt in the present struggle between capital and labour; in a word, it is that spirit of unrest which will shake the ancient foundations of Nimrodian society, and hurl all their superstructures into the abyss of oblivion.

“The Man of Sin” is specially obnoxious to its attacks. He means eternity of despotism; it proclaims a radical change. Such a spirit, emanating whence none can tell, flowing and circulating with an incomprehensible subtlety, uncontrollable as the air we breathe, seems to be an unrevealed item of the Divine plan indispensable to the break-up of human government; it distils upon all peoples, but particularly upon those of the prophetic “earth” with an occult miasmatic power. It is volcanic, disintegrating, and dissolving in its action; stratifying, as it were, the vast overgrown fauna and flora of a steamy carboniferous age, utilizing, or rather preparing, almost exhaustless magazines of solid wealth for the calm enjoyment of a golden and protracted aeon.

But ere it has devastated “the house of the wicked,” demolishing “the wood, hay, and stubble,” and purifying what there may be of “silver and gold,” let us glance at the historic counterpart of some of the lineaments of “the Son of Perdition.” His present features indicate extreme age; dotage is indelibly chiselled upon that once terrible countenance; memory fitfully recalls the days of youth and vigour, and the attenuated and decrepit “man” displays a transient peevishness at the prospect of dire fate looming in the not far distant horizon; then, like a murderer, lapses into a stupor of resignation, awaiting the hour of doom.

There is a time for all things, and we may rejoice that we are living witnesses of the declining age of this MONSTER MAN. He is powerless to harm those who stand and mock him to his face. Few, comparatively, are willing to do his cruel bidding, and those who are dare not. He is a grey, muzzled, clawless, toothless, old lion, pitiable enough but for the remembrance of his former habits of ravaging among the helpless flock. He is, as we sometimes say, but “the shadow of his former self.” It will be understood that we are speaking of the collective, not the individual “man.”

In middle life his mien was “dreadful and terrible,” and his voice like the roll of thunder. On the 25th of March, in the year 1514, one Tristano Cugna was sent as ambassador from the King of Portugal to the Court of Leo X., the then reigning Pontifex Maximus. The envoy had with him rich presents of wild animals, brought by the Portuguese from the far Indies, and among them a tolerably well trained elephant, for on approaching Leo the creature stopped and bowed himself three times. This was regarded by the lookers-on as a sign that the Divine supremacy of the Pope was instinctively felt even among the beasts of the forests. But the reader will be more struck with the address of the ambassador than the submissive

performance of the elephant. At the sight of Leo, the general exclaimed, "Fear and trembling have come over me, and a horrible darkness;" whereupon the Pope signified by his gracious manner that the envoy was received with favour. The latter then ventured to add, "That Divine countenance, which, shining as the sun, has dispersed the mists of my mind." He then proceeded to narrate to Leo the splendid conquests in the East, and addressing him as the Supreme Lord, ascribed to him all the glory thereof considering the work as a fulfilment of prophecy, "Thou shalt rule from sea to sea and from the river (Tiber, at Rome) to the world's end; the kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring gifts to thee; yea, all princes shall worship thee; and under thee there shall be one fold and one shepherd." In this scene the reader is presented with a clear fulfilment of Paul's prediction, "He exalteth himself above all, being called a god, or an object of veneration."

On the occasion of the coronation of Henry VI, Baronius, the Papal historian writes, "But our Lord the Pope in the Pontifical chair, holding the imperial crown between his feet, and the Emperor, bending his head, received the crown, and the Empress, in the same manner, from the feet of our Lord the Pope. But our Lord the Pope instantly struck with his foot the Emperor's crown, and cast it upon the ground, signifying that he had the power of deposing him from the Empire, if he were undeserving of it. Cardinals, however, lifted up the crown; and placed it on the Emperor's head." This was Pope Celestine III., who was elected in his 85th year, A.D. 1191, and died at the age of 92, on January 8th, 1198.

Boniface VIII., in excommunicating Philip, king of France, informed him that "He was set as prince over all nations, to root out and to pull down, destroy and to build." This was A.D. 1294.

But we obtain, perhaps, the best idea of the vast authority assumed by "the Man of Sin" from a decree of Hildebrand, which Gregory VII. Issued against Henry IV. of Germany, when he excommunicated him the second time. Henry had crossed the Alps into Italy, in the depth of winter, to beg the Pope's forgiveness. The Pope was then spending his time with the Countess Matilda, at the Castle of Canusium. Henry informed him of his approach, but the Pope treated him most barbarously, compelling him to stand barefoot three whole days, fasting from morning till night, in the month of January, with very little very little clothing, except a coarse woollen tunic.

As to the plucking up by the roots of the three horns, the only feature, perhaps, remaining to be spoken of, there are several threes set down by expositors; so that there is no scarcity of facts resembling the prediction; the question for decision seems rather one of selection. Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and many others, understood the three horns to stand for the Lombard power, the Greek Exarchate, and the Dukedom of Rome, under the Exarchate. Brooks thought that ' the three horns plucked up are with tolerable unanimity declared to be Rome, Lombardy, and Ravenna, which formed the Papal territories for more than a thousand years.' Peyrani, the Vaudois minister, marked the Herulian, Ostrogoths, and Lombards as the three. But, without entering here into the various arguments in support of different threes, the three which to our mind appears best sustained are the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, and Lombards. In 533, the Vandal horn in Africa, Corsica, and Sardinia, as well as the Ostrogoth horn, in Italy, was "plucked up by the roots," by the strength of Justinian's general, Belisarius. The Vandals were Arians, and consequently very hateful to the Pope. At this epoch the Longobards, or Lombards were far away in Pannonia, but about 40 years later they conquered Lombardy, and extended their conquests to the neighbourhood of Rome itself. They grew rapidly, and during the eighth century became so formidable that the Popes Stephen II, and Adrian I. appealed to the Franks for assistance.

This appeal was responded to by Pepin and Charlemagne, whose force "plucked up" this third horn; also, never to take root any more among the Powers. The Man of Sin-power was now predominant, lord temporal and spiritual. The temporal power has departed, perhaps never to return, but that long career of spiritual domination which is marvellously strong, has yet some considerable time to run before the predicted "perdition" is consummated. If Daniel's time times and a half be lunar, something short of two ordinary life times will suffice to fulfil the prophecy; and, as far as conjecture is worth anything, it would seem that such a period would allow of several great political changes among Jews and Gentiles, corresponding with the requirements of the prophetic word. Another generation, then, may be laid in the dust; the next may be living at the rising of the Sun of Righteousness. To those who sleep the event is always at the door, and to those who wake it approaches stealthily, like a ship to land; may we not, even now, liken it to the points of the tall masts rising, as it were, out of the sea, and nearing as they rise. Let us be always ready.

THE SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

"But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall." - Malachi iv. 2. Our last thoughts were running upon "the Son of Perdition." The evidence adduced for his identification showed that he was not one person,

but many; each successively the chief of a gigantic system of spiritual and political fraud; the very god-head of black deceit clothed in the snow-white raiment of purity and peace. We now turn to a pleasanter theme. The Sun of Righteousness rises on the scene. The prophets of old have heralded His approach, and sung beforehand His universal praise. The celestial hosts wonder and admire. They fill His train to earth, and glory in His warming healing power among the wrongs and woes of mortal men. The trumpet's blast proclaims from the mountains and the little hills, peace by righteousness! (Ps. Ixxii. 3). The slave casts down "his broken chain, the tyrant lord his crown, the conqueror his wreath, the priest his book," to list "the mighty breath" from the lips of Him who is the truth, scattering all "human mockeries," and speaking rest to a way-worn world. His presence unlocks every secret, dissolves every doubt; false science and matter-deifying wisdom cower in shame and dread; the people are now near to God, they see His form and hear His voice. With this in view, each rapid hour seems long. We have faith, but our utterance is feeble. We wish for Emanuel's presence to silence the "scoffers," and could die satisfied to know His Advent "no longer is delayed." How much hangs on this event! History, prophecy, Christianity! The whole history of man, past, present, and future, went down into the rich man's grave in the olive garden at the foot of Mount Olivet. The word of truth declares He rose and lived again; we therefore say to our souls "Peace, be still!" and wait in patience till we see Him for our self and not another. Till He come let us remember Him. Let us think of all the glad things recorded in ancient times; the songs and the visions of our rising Day-star, and feel, as poet and prophet felt of old, as with "fire shut up in our bones," enrapt, and "our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing." Yonder He stands, "binding His foal to the vine, and His ass's colt unto the choice vine; He washed His garments in wine, and His clothes in the blood of grapes, His eyes are red with wine, and His teeth white with milk." He sits as "the lawgiver; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be." "The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth, and He shall give strength unto His king, and exalt the horn of His anointed." "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him."

The sun is the grandest figure in universal nature. From him the moon borrows her pale soft light; the stars fade at his presence; the ice and snow vanish before his beams - "his going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof." We may call him the heart of the universe. The Papal sun has scorched and withered the world of spiritual thought for more than a thousand years, and does so still. We wait the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in His rays, to chase away the night, to resuscitate the world's mind, to cause truth to spring out of the earth and righteousness to look down from heaven. This is the True Light. For fifteen centuries and more it has been hidden from men. The expected speedy return was not realised. The heart grew sick. Hope declined, and desires, wrong only as to time, gradually gave place to the un-promised, and the unreal. Vain man imagined and sought a distant rest, spurning this promised sublunary home, coupled with the deathlessness of his real bodily self; and now, like a rudderless ship, without chart or compass, he knows not where he stands nor whither he is tending on this restless ocean of mortal existence. It requires that He who walked upon the sea should step on board this frail and wildered bark, and repeat the tranquillizing words, "Peace, be still."

We understand this long absence: it is needful: it is a time of solemn preparation. The brethren of the lost Joseph must be moved to wonder and desire by new and providential circumstances, as a necessary prelude to His appearance in their midst. "A little while," and He shall be known to them. The twelve stars of Israel shall yet make their obeisance before Him; then will there be weeping and joy - a mournful retracing of all the chequered past, and a fresh irradiation of the many gracious promises of their covenant-keeping God. But this great work is small by comparison, for the prophet saith, "it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth."

- EDITOR.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY ON THE SOUL

"Who should tell them whether the soul, according to the material hypothesis, did not reside in any of those which no known power of nature had ever been supposed to be capable of dissolving? How could he know that the soul which had been in him ever since he was a baby, which had passed with him

through all the changes of his changeful life, which seemed altogether independent of the outward organization of his frame, was altogether to go out like the flame of a candle when he had come to that part of his existence which they called death; and if it were so, that the soul and mind were to live, how was their conviction of that strengthened by the fact that all the great intellects that had ever lived had recognized the immortality of the soul - that the poets, the philosophers, the theologians, all the men who had ever given themselves to that great subject, all who had influenced the human race in the highest stages of its civilization, had been convinced that there was that within them which death could not destroy! He was not a true philosopher who told them they need not trouble themselves as to what would happen when they came to that great event which they called death. There was every reason to believe, as a matter of science, that death was not the end; and if death was not the end, the man was mad who did not make preparations for that which lay beyond death.”

This same “venerable prelate,” we were credibly informed a good while since, ordered his secretary, in answer to the following question put to himself personally by one of his servants, - “Which is the strongest passage in proof of the immortality of the soul?” - to write the following answer: “That text in Corinthians in which St. Paul says this mortal shall put on immortality.” (! ! !) On reading the above extract from the archbishop’s speech at Margate, we were reminded of this extraordinary answer. His Grace still holds the same language on the nature of the soul. It is lamentable indeed to observe the incorrectness of his statements, as also the total absence of scripture proof. Did the Archbishop of Canterbury reflect upon what he was saying, when he told his hearers at Margate that “all the great intellects that ever lived had recognised the immortality of the soul?” Surely not. It would be altogether superfluous to refresh such a memory as the archbishop’s with a long list of names, including great poets, philosophers, and acute logicians - to bring to his remembrance the names of Macaulay, Whately, Locke, Milton, Tillotson, &c., &c. - great intellects, indeed, who repudiated the unfounded dogma so blandly insinuated by himself in his recent speech. But logically, of what value is the fact that certain great men have held certain doctrines? There are other men, equally great, who have held the contrary. This counterpoise leaves any question as though it had never been put into the balance. And, beside this, what is truer than that hundreds of great intellects in all times and in all countries have held that which afterwards has been demonstrated to be false. Great intellects are, merely as such, not a satisfactory court of appeal. The Creator of the human soul has defined its nature; has made a provision for its future existence; has declared it mortal in a hundred testimonies; has promised it life; has threatened it with death; therefore, what is the use of such baseless speculation. One line of the Inspired Oracles would have infinitely out-weighed all the supposition arising out of what great intellects have believed. Why did not the head of the English Church quote that one line? We do not intend just now to expound this subject, but cannot refrain from quoting the Apostle to the Gentiles - “All have sinned; death hath passed upon all men;” to which we couple the Almighty’s first denunciation, “the soul that sinneth it shall die.” - EDITOR.

PAPAL OATHS.

THE OATH OF A ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP.

“I, N---, elect Bishop of M---, from henceforth will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord Pope and his successors. I shall never, to their prejudice or detriment, reveal to any man the counsel they shall entrust me with, either by themselves, their nuncios, or letters. The Roman Papacy, and the Regalities of St. Peter, I will help them to keep and maintain against all men. I will take care to conserve, defend, increase, and promote the rights, honours, privileges, and authorities of the holy Roman Church, for our Lord the Pope and his successors. I will observe with all my power, and make others do the same, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinations, depositions, reservations, provisions, and mandates. I will persecute and fight against all heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our Lord the Pope and all his successors. I shall visit personally the shrine of the apostle every third year,” etc., etc.

THE OATH OF SECRECY OF THE JESUITS.

“I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and

secret host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his Holiness the Pope Urban is Christ's Vicar-General, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or universal Church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his Holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his Holiness's rights and customs, against all usurpers of the heretical (or Protestant) authority whatsoever; especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother Church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allowance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare, that the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of other of the name of Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of his Holiness's agents in any place wherever I shall be, in England Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume religion heretical for the propagation, of the mother Church's interests, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time, as they may entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance whatsoever; but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father, or any of this sacred convent. All which, I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament, which I am now to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably: and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist; and witness the same further with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent, this . . . day of . . .

An. Dom." etc. - Extracted from Archbishop Usher.

EGYPT REVISITED.

BAYARD TAYLOR ON EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

The discoveries of Mariette Bey – Chronology of ancient Egypt
- the Museum at Boolak - Egyptian Art before its decadence.
[From the regular Correspondent of the Tribune.]

CAIRO, April 2 - In the beginning of November, 1851, as I was slowly plodding along on a donkey over the sandy spurs of the Desert between the Pyramids and Sakkara, the Fellahs who accompanied me had much to say of a strange Frank who had hired people to dig holes in the earth in the hope of finding golden chickens. I paid no great attention to these stories until, on reaching the sandy plateau behind the village of Mitrahennv (the site of ancient Memphis), I saw a number of Arabs carrying sand in baskets, and my donkey-drivers cried out, "There is the Frank!" On the brink of the excavation, overlooking the workmen stood a man of 28 to 30 years of age, tall, blonde, terribly sunburnt, and apparently worn with exposure and the endless annoyances of his task. I approached him, and entered into conversation. He was French, and seemed a little reserved in his manner until the accidental mention of my being an American and not an Englishman restored his confidence and communicativeness. We descended the excavation, walked two hundred yards in one of the exhumed streets of Memphis, and there I learned of the magnitude of the discoveries he had already made. Few men have ever given me such an impression of patient enthusiasm. At that time only a few scholars knew of his labours, and when he wrote in my note-book the name "Auguste Mariette" it was as new to me as the world at large.

Since then there has been no pause in M. Mariette's devotion to his self-imposed task. He was at first supported by contributions from France – very inadequate and irregular, I suspect - and was obliged to work without the favour of the Egyptian Government, if not covertly opposed by the influence of England. European diplomacy in the East moves in ways that are dark and oftentimes contempt - (rather let me finish the word otherwise) - lative. During the reign of Abbas Pasha, M. Mariette worked steadily against discouragements: under Sayd Pasha there came a new if incomplete freedom: and finally the Khedive,

Ismail Pasha, has turned the dauntless archaeologist into Mariette Bey, “Director of the Department for the Preservation of the Antiquities of Egypt,” granted him an annual sum for the prosecution of his researches, founded an Egyptian Museum at Boolak, and promises further support, which may be given in case no more viceregal marriages take place within the next few years.

Knowing how ruthlessly Egypt has been plundered, since the days of Denon - what obelisks, statues, and sarcophagi, have been conveyed to London, Paris, and Berlin – how Belzoni, Lepsius, Abbott, and many others have rummaged temples, tombs, and pyramids, for the sake of their pockets and button-holes, and, moreover, how the rage of winter tourists for relics has not only exhausted the legitimate supply of scaraboei, papyri, and pottery, but given rise to a manufacture of new articles of the sort, - was prepared to find the Museum at Boolak only a depository of cast-away odds and ends, as confused and unsatisfactory as the collections you see in the Louvre or the British and Berlin Museums. These latter, every traveller knows, are not Egyptian, any more than an old Roman brick is a part of the majesty of the Coliseum. But I never quite understood their lack of interest, even to one who has seen Denderah and Karnak, until the exact historical arrangement of Mariette’s collection had opened my eyes.

Now - one can say without fear of contradiction - the most valuable Egyptian Museum in the world is in Cairo. That which was previously carried away being, for the most part, easily accessible, proves to belong to the later rather than the earlier dynasties. Unwearied digging has enabled Mariette to reach the records of the Ancient Empire, and to show what we never before suspected – that the glory of Egyptian Art belongs to the age of Cheops, and only its decadence to the age of Rameses II. (Sesostris). Not only the art, but the culture, the religion, the political organization of Egypt are carried back to the third Dynasty (4450 B.C.) and Mones, the first historic king, dawns upon our knowledge, not as a primitive barbarian, but as the result of a long stage of unrecorded development. I do not hesitate to say that since Champollion discovered the key to the hieroglyphics, no scholar has thrown such a broad and clear light upon Egyptian life and history as Mariette. It is understood that the Museum at Boolak is only temporary. It hardly contains half of the inestimable collection, and some of the halls, undermined by the current of the Nile, have already been vacated in order to preserve their contents. The Khedive promises a spacious and appropriate building, fronting on the great square of the Ezkebiyek, and he cannot have it erected too soon. It makes one shudder to think what irreplaceable wealth is accumulated between those low mud walls at Boolak, and how easily some accident might lose it to the world.

There has been so much discussion in regard to the chronology of Ancient Egypt that a few words on this point may be an advantage to the reader, in perusing the brief account which I must necessarily give of the more ancient monuments. Let me, therefore, repeat what many already know, and some may have forgotten, that our only former authority was Manetho, an Egyptian priest, who lived under the Ptolemies, Soter and Philadelphus, in the beginning of the third century before Christ. He wrote, in Greek, a complete History of Egypt, compiled from the records preserved in the temples of Memphis and Heliopolis. This work, which is quoted by Josephus, Eusebius, and other authors, is unfortunately lost, except a chronological table of thirty dynasties, beginning with Menes, and terminating with the invasion of Egypt by the Persians. This table gives the names of the kings and the length of their reigns; and the sum total is so immense, carrying the duration of the Egyptian Empire to such a remote point in the past, that most scholars have shrunk from accepting it, preferring to suppose that a number of the dynasties were contemporaneous (that is, existing side by side, in Upper and Lower Egypt), and not successive. For the sake of convenience, I will take Mariette’s division of the dynasties into historic periods, together with the dates conjecturally given for the commencement of each, by the older scholars, by Bunsen, and finally by Manetho and Mariette:

	Dynasties	Wilkinson Poole, Etc.	Bunsen	Manetho
Ancient Empire	I. to X.	2700 B.C.	3623 B.C.	5004 B.C.
Middle Empire	XI to XVII	2200 B.C.	2925 B.C.	3061 B.C.
Later Empire	XVIII to XXXI	1520 B.C.	1625 B.C.	1703 B.C.
Greek Rule	XXXII to XXXIII	332 B.C.	332 B.C.	332 B.C.
Roman Rule	XXXIV	30 B.C.	30 B.C.	30 B.C.

Edict of Theodosius, introducing Christianity, 881 A.D.

It will be noticed that the discrepancy which is only 105 years, at the beginning of the XVIIIth dynasty (that of the Theban, Amosis, who expelled the Hyksos or Shepherd King's) increases to 2,300 years on reaching the first historical king, Menes. But it is precisely upon this earlier period that Mariette's discoveries throw the most astonishing light. The names of the king's, their order of succession, and the length of their reigns, correspond with Manetho's table, and there is no evidence of two dynasties, among these records, having existed side by side. Although fully aware of the difficulties which may be created by this extension of Egyptian chronology, and by no means inclined to accept it as exact, Mariette frankly acknowledges himself unable to dispute it. The character of the monuments, now for the first time properly contrasted, indicates great changes, even within the rigid boundaries of Egyptian art; and these are so clearly marked that the age of a statue or sarcophagus may often be approximately estimated before reading the inscription upon it. In short, the same process of study and critical knowledge of details, heretofore so successfully applied to Greek and Roman antiquities, now opens a way for us into the shadows of the mysterious "forty centuries," which passed over Ancient Egypt before our synchronous history begins.

Enough by way of prelude. On reaching the Museum at Boolak, which is free to all visitors except on Fridays, you first enter a dusty garden-court, on the high crumbling bank of the Nile, with a glimpse of the opposite shore, and the dim overlapping triangles of the Pyramids. On the left is an ordinary Turkish dwelling, the residence of Mariette Bey; on the right is the Museum, a very plain, cheap structure, but so admirably arranged that its treasures can be at once discovered and profitably studied. I saw large square granite boxes on both sides of the entrance, and was about to pass them without special notice, when Herr Brugsch, brother of the Vice-Director, said: "These are the oldest sarcophagi yet found." They were of the IVth dynasty (Cheops), and imposing from their very simplicity - each a mass of hollowed granite, with a flat lid having two square projections at each end, as if two men might be expected to take them in their hands and thus lift off the cover. One contained the words, in hieroglyphics, on each of the four sides, "The King's Son."

Mariette's collection (that is, so much of them as there is room to exhibit) are arranged in seven vestibules and halls. There is no such attempt at effect as in the Museum at Berlin, where the frescoes of the Theban tombs are imitated on the walls, and a beautiful doorway, violently torn from its original place at Lepsius, is stuck together again. The relics are simply arranged according to their civil or religious character, those of the earlier dynasties having the most conspicuous places, and these latter, by their higher artistic character, are the first objects which attract the eye on entering. There are plenty of statues of the gods, coffins, and sarcophagi, as in other museums; yet, towering over them, instinct with life and character, are those marvellous forms of carved wood or painted limestone, belonging to the IIIrd and IVth dynasties, which flash upon us a new revelation of the oldest civilization of Egypt. No other statues like these have yet been recovered; they give the Museum a distinct and separate value.

In the court there are three statues belonging to an age, from which no other monuments have been found - that of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, whose invasion of Egypt, about the year 2200 B.C. (Manetho), and usurpation of the government for nearly five centuries, are sufficiently attested by other records. It has been a matter of conjecture who these shepherds were, and few archaeologists could have been prepared for the marked Turanian or Tartar type, which is so distinctly given in their statues. The eyes are long and narrow, the brows are prominent, the cheek-bones projecting, the mouth large and wide, and the beard thick upon the jaws and chin. They are certainly neither Egyptian nor Semitic: I have seen just such faces among the Calmucks, in Russia. Two of them were found at Tanis (the Zoan of the Old Testament) in the Delta, and the third in the Fyoom, which shows that the Hyksos possessed at least all Lower Egypt. They have been savagely battered and mutilated, probably during the dynasty which overthrew the rule of their originals; but the hard dark granite still holds the type of the race. If the pre-Trojan city discovered by Dr. Schliemann should prove also to have had Turanian inhabitants, here would be a new link, of the highest importance, in the chain of the earliest migrations.

In the main vestibule, crowded with precious relics, I can only notice those extraordinary specimens of the oldest Egyptian Art, which are to be seen nowhere else in the world. The eye is at once drawn to two life-sized statues of painted limestone, which, from their pedestals, seem to overlook and guard the late remains. They are nude, save a cloth, folded in front like an apron, which falls from the hips to the knees. The arms and legs are rather stiffly modelled, but quite free from the conventional rigidity of Egyptian statues. Indeed, the hands, feet, and joints show a careful study not only of nature, but also of the individual. The trunks are excellently rendered, in their main masses, like the half-finished clay model of a modern sculptor. But the heads are simply amazing, in their correct embodiment of life and character. In them there is no prescribed solemnity of expression, in closed lips, steadfast eyes and hands resting

flatly on the knees, as in the statues chiselled two thousand years later. They beam with a frank, free, naive apprehension of nature, and exhibit the activity of an Art which is just about to overcome the last stubborn resistance of the material. There is no representation of the motion, as in the crowning days of Greek sculpture; the figures stand or sit, but you feel that a slight effort would enable them to rise or walk.

One of the statues represents a priest named Rla-Nefer, another a civil official, Tih, whose tomb still remains entire at Memphis, where these and other similar figures of smaller dimensions were found. The most of them date from the IVth or Vth dynasties. The colours are as brilliant as if but yesterday applied to the stone. The climate of Egypt and the sand under which the sepulchral chambers have so long been buried, seem absolutely to prevent decay, and thus these most ancient covered monuments appear to be modern in comparison with those which were exposed to the air. In 1851, shortly after my meeting with Mariette at Memphis, he discovered the unviolated tomb of an Apis-bull. On first entering he saw upon the light layer of dust covering the floor the distinct footprints of men who had placed the mummy in his sarcophagus, 3,700 years before! Passing on to the main hall, the first objects I sought were the wooden statues belonging to the IVth dynasty (that of Cheops, about 4235 B. C.), discovered not long since. The light from the ceiling, falling on the close-cropped crown of the old "village magistrate" (shekh-el-belled), as he is now called by the Egyptians, gave him the reality of a living figure, among so many which seemed to be dead or asleep in the shadows. The statue, which is about three feet eight inches in height, is carved out of sycamore wood, which has now become hard and resonant as metal. It represents a corpulent man of about 45 years of age, holding in one hand a long staff of office, while the other, clenched, hangs at his side. His only garment is a cloth wound around the loins and falling to the knees. The face is remarkably intelligent, cheerful and benevolent - a Shakespearean head, one might say, it gives such evidence of a large, rich and attractive nature. The nose is slightly aquiline, with sensitive nostrils of only moderate breadth, the lips large and half-smiling, equally ready to open for a joke or a blessing, and the cheeks and chin fall but firmly rounded and not puffy. The eyes, especially, are remarkable specimens of the earliest Pre-Raphaelite attempt to represent nature. They are inserted, and with a finesse of invention which almost seems a higher art. The lashes are thin rims of bronze; the whites are formed of white opaque quartz, the iris of rock crystal, and in the centre of each is set a small crystal with many facets, which from every side reflects a keen point of light, like that in the human eye. Herr Brugsch said to me, "there are times when this head absolutely lives," and I could well believe him. The statue is probably 6,000 years old, thus antedating by 3,700 years all other relics of art which are in any way worthy of being placed beside it.

There are two other heads of wood, with torsis, of the same era - whether broken or mutilated I could not ascertain. One, a woman, possesses the same distinct individuality as the good and just magistrate. There are differences in the two sides of the face, which show the most careful study of the original. She is neither handsome nor ugly, but you see at once that she was no ordinary person, and that, in her day, you would much rather have had her for a friend than an enemy.

I will hasten through two intervening chambers to reach what impressed me as the most interesting group in the whole collection. It was found only 18 months ago, in an ancient necropolis, beside a very singular pile of masonry, called by the natives the Harem-el-Kedab, or Lying Pyramid, on the western bank of the Nile, about 50 miles south of Cairo. On a broad pyramidal base rises a tower, the sides of which are nearly perpendicular, terminating in a platform, from which springs a smaller tower; the entire height cannot be less than 250 feet. This singular structure has never been opened, or even adequately examined, but the conjecture of some archaeologists that it was built by King Sne-frou, the predecessor of Cheops, is possibly confirmed by Mariette's discovery of the x x x x x x to the IIIrd dynasty. The inscriptions show that they represent the prince Ra-Hotep and the princess Nefer-t, who may have been either his wife or sister. The size of life, they sit side by side on plain, massive chairs; but the attitudes are easy and natural and the hands are not laid upon the knees. Only the drapery - a loin-cloth for the man and a simple white garment, without folds, for the woman - is stiffly and awkwardly represented. The muscles of the chest and loins, the joints, hands and feet, are carefully modelled, and the heads might be boldly set beside the best portrait busts ever made. Ra-Hotep's flesh is painted of a fresh, ruddy colour, and Nefer-t's a pale olive; yet, the features indicate that they belonged to the same race. Nothing can be finer than the delicate individuality expressed in the two faces. His is strong, proud, asserting authority; hers kind, sympathetic, yet carried with the air of one to whom respect is inevitably paid. The type is the same as that of the "village magistrate," but greatly finer and nobler. The eyes are inserted in the same manner, and are of even more admirable workmanship; for they fairly gleam and sparkle, and there are moments when a human intelligence suddenly lights up the face.

It is a remarkable circumstance, and one over which the ethnologists will doubtless break their heads, that these remains of the earliest, freest, and highest art yet discovered in Egypt should represent a quite

different physical type from that of the later dynasties. That they are Caucasian, or Aryan, is evident at the first glance; that they possessed intelligence, energy, and those moral qualities which we express by the word "character," seems equally certain. Looking at Ra-Hotep's face, your first impression is "Here's a gentleman!" The remains of the Ancient Empire suggest a certain amount of freedom - continuous development among both rulers and people; those of the Later Empire, on the contrary, are rigidly stamped with x x x x x . Here, for instance, is a splendid granite statue of King Sha-fra (Cephrenes, the builder of the Second Pyramid), which Mariette found at the bottom of a well in the very ancient granite temple, which he discovered eight years ago, near the Sphinx. It bears all the marks of the same ardent, struggling art which we detect in the wooden and limestone statues. The head is slightly lifted; the features are modelled with a care which attests to us the exactness of the portrait; the eyes look, and do not simply dream, as in the forms of the Later Empire; and while one hand rests, but not flatly, upon the knee, the other is closed and brought down upon the thigh, as who should say: "Such is my will!" The figure speaks and commands, while the later Thothmes and Rameses sit, like Brahma, in endless passiveness. It will be found, I am sure, that the decadence of the art of Egypt, during her most illustrious historical periods, was due to the despotic limitations of her religion. It was the same spirit which, during the Middle Ages and since, has compelled the artists to give a particular colour to the drapery of each Apostle, and to design Annunciations, Assumptions, Transfigurations, Judgments, according to one easily recognisable pattern.

Mariette's discoveries, thus far, have thrown less light upon the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, than many might have expected or wished. We are apt to forget, in the great importance which the Biblical narrative possesses for us, that a small subject race, like the Jews, could only be accidentally mentioned in the annals of such a proud and powerful people. A few strong probabilities, however, are worthy of being noticed. The conjectured period of Joseph's arrival in Egypt corresponds with that of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, who, being strangers themselves, would the more readily confer high authority upon a stranger. Moses, almost certainly, was educated as an Egyptian priest under the reign of Rameses II., and the Pharaoh of the Exodus and the latter's son, Monophtha,, a superb bust of whom is in Mariette's museum. The name, Moses, is the Egyptian Mesu, signifying "child" or "boy." A recently deciphered papyrus contains an official report concerning a certain "Mesu," who is declared to have much influence over "the foreign people," as the descendants of the Hyksos, the Israelites, and other Semitic tribes settle in the Delta, were collectively designated. Bricks made with and without straw are to be found in quantities among the ruins of Bubastis and other Egyptian cities in the land of Goshen.

It is difficult to make an end, while so much remains undescribed, yet I must try to avoid the formality of a catalogue. A large glass case in one of the eastern rooms is quite filled by the magnificent jewels of the queen, Aah-hotep (of the XVIIth dynasty, about 1700 B. C.), supposed to be the mother of King Amosis, who overthrew the Hyksos. The splendid gilded coffin was found intact, only two or three feet below the soil, at a small village near Thebes. It appears to have been stolen from the sepulchre by thieves who were pursued or became alarmed, and hastily buried it by the way. No modern queen would hesitate to wear the exquisite chains, diadems, ear-rings, and bracelets of this Theban woman. It would require a professional jeweller to do justice to the admirable quality of the workmanship.

Of even greater interest are the household articles, implements of trade, food, etc., which, like the spoils of Pompeii, restore for us the domestic life of the people. Here, for instance, are stools, cane-bottomed chairs and work-boxes, 4,000 years old, yet no more dilapidated than if they came out of a garret of the last century; nets, knives, needles, and toilet ornaments; glass bottles and drinking cups, as clear as if just blown; earthenware glazed in blue and yellow patterns, the very counterpart of old Majolica; seeds, eggs, and bread; straw-baskets, and a child's ball for playing; paint boxes with colours and brushes, and boards for - - - *collection almost; as varied and complete as the ashes of Vesuvius preserved for us of the Græco-Roman life of the year 79 of our era. But these Egyptian relics date from 1,000 to 3,000 years before our era began. I have left myself no space to speak of the stele of Alexander, or the Canopic Stone, which, like the Rosetta Stone of Champollion, contains the same document in Greek, Hieroglyphic, and Demotic characters. It is a limestone slab, six feet high, beautifully engraved, and in the most perfect state of preservation. This additional proof of the correctness of Champollion's interpretation of the hieroglyphics was really not needed, but the confirmation it brings will be a comfort to many hesitating minds. I have purposely paid less attention to the later and more exact historical records in the Museum, because the revelations of the earliest periods, which Mariette has very recently brought to light, are still comparatively unknown to the world; and they are certainly of incalculable value.

**(four words of the original print are obscured)*

BENEVOLENCE.

THIS charming word, which comes to us through the French, from the Latin tongue, signifies good will, or the disposition to do good. To speak phrenologically, benevolence is one of the finest "organs" of the human brain; and it is a fact easy of observation, that where the "organ" is "large" it usually graces the head and face with an aspect answering to the meaning of the term. It imparts to its possessor a kindly look and sympathetic manner, which are intensified by the knowledge of suffering and want. Our intention, however, is not to write phrenologically upon benevolence but to offer a few remarks under this head which may be of some value in their daily life to all who read them.

Benevolence is most commonly regarded as consisting simply in giving money or money's worth, and those who are reputed the most liberal are esteemed the most benevolent. This is a very superficial and narrow view of benevolence. There are many persons of means who so dislike exertion and inconvenience, that they are glad to disburse their money to save themselves the trouble of investigation, and the unpleasantness of a just refusal. This sort of giving can hardly be called benevolence, inasmuch as it is not accompanied with a sincere desire to do good. There is also manifest pride in giving. Mere love of display is sometimes the only motive that sends the hand to the pocket to extract and parade a coin as it is thrown to the craving recipient. This is not true benevolence. It has been well said that real benevolence is seen most in little matters, and in the ordinary occurrences of life. Constant good will to one's wife, children, relatives, neighbours, and mankind at large, is a sure sign of the presence of the virtue and its flourishing state. But where the soil is frequently irrigated with the water of bitterness, and the atmosphere disturbed by the storms of contention, this lovely plant cannot grow and thrive. We would rather have a small intellect and large benevolence than be a giant in thought and imagination, with the hard, fierce, unyielding disposition of the Roman warrior. A capacious mind without benevolence is like perpetual winter. It may be vast and strong, but it resembles the condition of lofty mountains towering above the snow-line, unfit for the habitation or society of men, or domestic animals. We may wonder at the magnitude and admire the grandeur, but it is a region too cold for the existence of warm and tender feelings.

Many so-called great men in the world are only known as grumbling, peevish boors in the family circle. Beyond their own threshold they don the mask of benevolence, while the main-spring of action is too often sheer selfishness. Their wives and children, who behold them without the polite disguise, hear and see little besides gruff, blurring authority, and a sour, wolfish countenance. But genuine benevolence transforms the home into secret paradise, and the occupants into ministers of bliss. The outer world, with all its charms - and it has many for those whose vision is not distorted by wilful obliquity - must always lose by comparison with the inner life of what every Englishman is proud to call "his castle." We rejoice to hear a man say after a long absence, "I am glad to get home; I have seen no place like it." If this sentiment find a practical correspondence in all his ways, an increasing solicitude for her whose duty and privilege it is to "guide the house," and for those who, like "olive branches," adorn his table, there can be no doubt that such a man tastes and diffuses the sweets of genuine benevolence.

Some men are benevolent in a public capacity, but detestably greedy and inconsiderate in private. It is here that what they really are appears while in society they may be anxious to carry some project, or to gain popularity, and so assume what they are not, but ought to be. There can be no stronger incentive to the culture of this virtue than frequent reflection upon the unbounded benevolence of the Deity. His care to gratify His creatures is exhibited in them all. His arrangement of the senses of touch, taste, smell, sight, and hearing affords evidence of His great goodness. The pleasure felt every moment in the use of the organs of sense is immense, when we regard the extent of the animal kingdom. In youth it shows itself in physical activity. The very motion of their limbs seems to enchant all young animals, including man. And the recurrence of the warm season fills the world with undoubted signs of delight. The air vibrates with vocal melodies, and the sea teems with darting, splashing life and enjoyment. Inasmuch, as the Almighty could have provided for the wants of His creatures without super-adding all this joy in the supply of them, it presents itself to a reflective mind as a signal proof of His benevolent Spirit. What He is, therefore, to us, we should strive to be to one another, ever disposed to do good. Among the short, expressive sayings of Jesus, so easily remembered, by the disciples, and sometimes quoted by men of the world to add point to their conversation, is that in which He declared "It is more blessed to give than to receive." The feelings which, in some instances, are produced by the reception of a gift are indeed full of pleasure, but on the whole that pleasure which accompanies the offering of sincere gifts is of a higher order. The donor is not only gratified by his act, but there is a sense of duty performed, which is always attended with solid satisfaction. The pleasure arising from duty fulfilled cannot be experienced in the

former case. In the saying of Jesus just cited, there seems to be a world of useful and beautiful meaning. It is a rule of universal application, reaching even unto "the unthankful and the evil." Benevolence must be active to be of benefit to its possessor. Happily, its field is so large and its products so various that none can possibly be so poor as to have nothing to give. Here again we may aptly repeat another aphorism of the Great Teacher, "Where much is given much is required." The poor, in the exercise of benevolence, are excluded almost entirely from the bestowal of money and goods. What then is left at their disposal? Those things which often do more good, namely, kind words and kind acts. Some little service to a neighbour or a friend - neighbours are not always friends - graciously done, though it may not cost a farthing of money, is of intrinsic value; an accumulation of such services amounts to great riches, and lays up "a good foundation against the time to come."

The well-to-do classes of Christians are under obligations on every side. We mean that they are not only constrained by the laws of benevolence to give freely and cheerfully of their substance, but it is also incumbent upon them to manifest the spirit of benevolence in their deportment and conversation. They generally do so towards their superiors, and perhaps their equals. The sin which chiefly lies at their door is a want of condescension to persons of low estate. We seldom see a proper bearing and address towards the uneducated poor. If there is freedom it runs to the extreme of dangerous, because misunderstood and mis-appreciated, familiarity; or else we observe the chilling pretentious manners of the would-be grand. Between the two lies the golden link of courtesy, which makes those who are bound to it agreeable to their superiors, as well as to their inferiors in either learning, intellect, or temporal possessions.

In conclusion, we have insisted especially upon benevolence of behaviour, because that appears to be more generally lacking than the benevolence of gifts. But it is not to be imagined that the one can supply the place of the other, or that the latter should take a secondary rank. No, they must be conjoined, where it is practicable. In the case of the very poor this cannot be, and is, therefore, not required; but in the case of the rich, benevolence will only advance limpingly unless upheld by both supports, i.e., kindness in word and kindness in deed. The reader knows Christ's mind upon this subject, and what His Apostles inculcated: let him also consider the great power arising from the due exercise of this virtue, to augment his own happiness in life, and we are sure he will not fail to indulge in a luxury so easily procured.

- EDITOR.

THE FATHER AND THE SON.

IN combating the charge of "Mere Manism," Hebrews ii. 16, has been quoted with an alteration not justified by the text; at the beginning of the verse the word Jesus is substituted for he: "Jesus took not on Him the nature of angels; He took on Him the seed of Abraham."

Now, Paul, or whoever penned the Hebrews, did not write "Jesus," but, "He," and the proper antecedent of the pronoun "He" is God. Jesus was incapable of taking hold of any nature, for the best of all reasons - viz., there was no such person as Jesus in existence until the Child begotten in Mary by Holy Spirit power was born and so named by His Father. Jesus was the result or effect of the Father's taking hold of the seed of Abraham.

GOD MANIFESTATION.

This phrase is often used without a sufficiently definite meaning being attached to it. I feel persuaded that Paul's idea was that God was manifested in a Son, and employed the words "in the flesh" to convey that idea, because it was not the phenomenon Jesus Christ "as a whole," but Jesus the Christ, who was justified in spirit, seen of angels, believed on in the world, received up into glory. Neither was God the Father crucified but Jesus His Christ, His only begotten Son. The expression God Manifestation, as defined by the phrase "Jesus Christ as a whole," is unscriptural in idea, in addition to being so in word. Even those resorting to this language believe that the "phenomenon Jesus Christ as a whole" was crucified, for the spirit or power, which dwelt in Him, left Him before He died and did not die with Him; therefore God Manifestation was not justified in spirit while Jesus, who manifested God His Father, was. I fail to see the correctness of the statement that "the Holy Spirit dwelt in the 'vile body,' as in a temple, with the materials of which it could not combine, in view of the fact that it is the same Body which was raised from the dead by the Spirit, and with which it has become eternally combined. Man-kind presents a living illustration destructive of such an idea, for they live and move, have their being in the same Spirit in

combination, and should He withdraw His Spirit and His breath, which is in active combination, all flesh would perish together. Now, the Body of Jesus had within it this same Spirit common to all mankind, although He did not, as they, receive it through the medium of a human father, but direct from God, as did Adam. The combination in the first Adam would have been as eternal as it is now in the second had he remained obedient to the Edenic Law. Jesus was not changed from flesh to Spirit because He died, but because He was obedient to His Father's will even unto death.

To make His death as absolute a necessity for His own salvation as for ours, is to destroy its voluntary character, unless you believe in the possibility of voluntary compulsion. I must also take exception to the following proposition: "As it was not until after His baptism He began to manifest God, it could only have been at this point He became the Word made flesh, or God in flesh made manifest."

The premises here being false, the conclusion deduced is without value. The Word, or Power, or Spirit of God underwent no change in relation to Jesus from what it was before His baptism to what it was after. The prophets lived before the Word of God came to them; and it could be said of them as appropriately as of Jesus, the Word was made flesh, if the possession of Divine power formed the charge.

Jesus was the Word made, or changed, into the flesh when He was conceived of spirit-power in the womb of His mother. The result of that operation was a Son of God of the seed of the woman. That He was afterwards filled with the Spirit at His baptism is true, but that is not what is described as the Word made flesh.

The recurrence of the phrase, God Manifestation, is the best refutation of the idea in question. Something must exist before it can undergo a change. What existed? The reply offered is, God existed. Who was changed into flesh? The answer is God. Then was God flesh or Spirit after He was changed? There can be but one response, flesh. "Who then bestowed those spirit powers? Whence did they come? Thirty years before they were given, the Almighty, it is alleged, changed Himself from spirit into flesh. Now, all this absurd nonsense is set aside by the simple truth that God's Word of purpose, afterwards of promise, was made flesh when He, according to His promise, raised up unto Israel a Son, the Saviour of the World. It is admitted that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, but as soon as the confession is made, the individuality of our Lord is denied by confounding Father and Son to such an extent that both Father and Son are dishonoured, and the object the Father designed to accomplish through His Son is defeated.

It is allowed that Jesus was the only begotten of the Father, but the value of that fact is destroyed; first, by underrating it, and next, by attempting to apply the reference to His birth, in the phrase, "the Word became flesh," to His anointing with spirit power at His baptism. The existence of Jesus as a living Man was in itself a greater manifestation of God's power than any which He gave during His ministry. The dead had been raised to life, the lepers cleansed, and the Gospel preached from the foundation of the world, but one begotten of the Almighty was never seen before or since. And yet this keystone of the whole structure of redemption is, through misapprehension; rendered of secondary account.

Let me notice that it is an error to suppose that the Word and the Spirit are interchangeable terms. God's Word was not His power, but a pledge that His power would be manifested. When manifested, the effect was a Son. The mission of John the Baptist was not; as some imagine, to bring about the change of the Word from spirit into flesh, but for manifesting to Israel Him who was brought into existence in fulfilment of the promise to their fathers, that God would raise up unto them a prophet like unto Moses. The raising began with the conception in the womb of Mary, and terminated in the change from flesh to spirit of the Body which resulted from that conception.

That flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God is true; but this was the case before transgression as much as after. From the circumstance of Adam and his wife being placed under law, it is justly inferred that they might, at some future time, be able to inherit; but until they could prove themselves obedient subjects it would have been unsafe to make them rulers except in a subordinate sense. There is a vast amount of unlearned wisdom written about Jesus Christ not suffering the penalty of Adam's transgression. Some, who profess to believe the Scriptures, would lead us to conclude that, "without shedding of blood," there could have been remission of sin. If the remission of Adam's sin was a thing possible, then there must be for Adam the shedding of the blood of another to form that possibility. Whose blood was shed to create that possibility? The blood of Christ alone. Would the blood of Adam not have done as well? No. Had his blood been shed for his own sin there would have been no remission for him; nor any resurrection after death had taken place. Jesus Christ was fore-ordained to be slain as the ransom or price of man's redemption before the foundation of the world.

It has been asserted that all the children of Israel, in passing through the sea and under the cloud, passed from under the penalty of Adam to under the law: They were baptised into Moses " (1 Cor. x. 2).

Up to this period, all men not sons of God had sinned in Adam. I do not see the grounds of these statements.*

**[If they were true, then it would follow that without the shedding of blood there could be remission.]*

Were the sons of God not descendants of Adam? Moses was born in Adam, and being baptised into Moses, could not of itself take any son of Adam out of him.

One fact is overlooked, viz., that upon the day of transgression God took Adam out of himself by promising a second Adam, and by slaying certain animals and covering the guilty pair with their skins. The redemption of the first Adam and all in him was thus perfected in purpose and in type through one who was not a son of Adam, but a second Adam, the Son of God. The Almighty designed the transfer of Adam and all in him to Christ, the seed of the woman, and illustrated His purpose by the animals He slew. All that was necessary on the part of Adam and all his posterity was, that they should have faith in the promise of redemption by the seed of the woman, and give expression to that faith by offering the divinely appointed sacrifice. Cain did not die because he was in Adam, but for want of faith in God's promise, and for refusing to offer the sacrifice, which showed that remission of sins could be obtained by the shedding of the blood of one who was not a sinner.

The sin of the Antediluvians consisted in corrupting God's way (of life), and in despising His long suffering towards them while the ark was being prepared. The Sodomites brought down upon themselves the vengeance of eternal fire for their personal transgressions; and Jude says they are set forth for examples to all who live ungodly lives. It is absurd to infer, from anything Paul has written, that there was no law from Adam to Moses because there is no record of any written law. If the rejection of Cain's offering, the destruction of the world by water, and the overthrow of the cities of the plain be the effects of righteous judgment, we presume such judgment would be according to law, as apart from law there is no transgression. On the other hand, if some could become heirs of eternal life upon a principle of faith, and others be condemned for the want of faith, it must be conceded that the promise of life was sufficiently known to produce these results.

Jesus Christ never was in the first Adam. Had there been no transgression there would not have been any Jesus Christ. It is equally true that had there been no determination to redeem the first Adam from the effects of his transgression no seed of the woman would have been promised. The determination to redeem was the cause; the effect was Jesus the Christ of God. That the fact that Jesus was born of a woman proves He was a son of Adam is a popular error. It would be quite as reasonable to say that as the first Adam was taken out of the ground he was a son of the ground.

The first Adam came into existence as the result of a determination on the part of God to make a man like Himself, and, when the first man involved himself in death, the same Almighty power which decided his creation again stepped forth and devised a plan for his re-creation in Christ Jesus, the second Adam, who would destroy the works of the first. Had the scheme of the Almighty been to allow Adam to re-create himself the deliverer, our Saviour, would of necessity have been a son of Adam or Adam himself, but in the nature of things this was impossible. It behoved the Deliverer to be his brother, equally the Son of God with Himself, a second Adam related to the first not by descent, but by being taken out of him as his wife Eve was at the first, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; a son of Adam's father, not by relationship involved in the crime of His elder brother, being related only by having the same father and the same flesh and blood as the transgressor; He the just one could die for the unjust; not to reconcile Himself to God, neither to reconcile God to Him, nor to us, but to lay a foundation whereby God could be just and the Justifier from all sin of everyone who believes in Jesus.

Another fallacy claims attention; it is said that "under the law God required man's obedience, and, because man could not obey, the law required man's life." This places the Almighty in a most offensive position. He is first made to baptize all Israel out of Adam because death reigned over them; and then it is affirmed that they are placed under a law which consigns them to death for not doing what they could not do. Between this and the making of bricks without straw the balance is in favour of the latter; the idea defeats itself. As where there is no law there can be no transgression, so where the law cannot be kept it is impossible to break it. It would be a breach of the law to keep it, seeing it was constructed not to be kept. But we shall believe such was the case when the law-maker so declares. The death of Jesus was a voluntary act of obedience to His Father's will, not to any command given in the law.

That Jesus was a substitute I have no doubt. Had the transgressor found out the ransom, brought it in his hand, and offered it up for himself, this would be his substitute whose death might relieve from all past sins, but it could not avail for after-offences. It is very evident that had it been left for the transgressor to find a substitute for himself all flesh would have perished. The law-maker whose authority had been trampled upon was the only one who could provide a substitute to meet all the circumstances of the case. The Father was graciously pleased to form and substitute a second son, proving Him by trial similar in

principle to that under which the first one failed. The second having overcome sin, consummated His obedience by laying down His life, in the full assurance that on the third day He should be raised from the dead and receive a name above every name in heaven or in earth.

Jesus was the substitute of the Father, who was the prime mover in the scheme of redemption from the first - and He it is who will give the last touch to the work when He shall be the "all in all" to those who believe His promises.

On another topic I cannot refrain from penning a few remarks - and that is, confounding the tendencies which, unrestrained, lead to sin with the sin itself. "Every imagination of the heart may be evil, but the same heart when subjected to different principles will give forth imaginations of another character, so that "as the heart panteth for the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God," becomes the normal state. Sin, and the man who is conceived in it are two things. The world lies in wickedness, but every individual is not wicked. If so, how could the following passage of Holy writ be true? - "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things." In the parable of the Sower we are taught that some of the seed fell into good ground. Are we to contend that the flesh of those represented by the good ground differed from that of those defined as thorny, stony, etc.? Were they not born in sin as well as the others? If every imagination of their hearts had been evil they would not have received the word of the kingdom. Again, were those Bereans, who acted nobly in listening to the apostles and in searching the Scriptures, full of evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, etc., etc.? The character of the majority cannot be regarded as universal. From the foundation of the world until now God has not left Himself without witness. There are ever a few righteous, who reverence and observe His testimonies. Many seem to think that because in the flesh dwells no good thing, of necessity there does dwell in it every bad thing. But although every abomination should be found in a man, that would not prove the essentially evil character of his flesh; many guilty of the worst of crimes have been cleansed and become temples of the living God. Death cannot transform that which is evil into that which is good; neither does it extract poison from the blood. Those who are to be the subjects of approval by the Lord at His coming are those only who have "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Now, what did they wash? Evidently their behaviour and not the nature of their flesh. Their members which at one time practised sin then practised righteousness.

To entertain the idea that flesh and blood are essentially evil, and can only be purified by death, resurrection, and change into spirit-nature is to set aside the possibility of redemption from sin. Violation of law constitutes sin, it is not an inherent quality of flesh, but an act contrary to the will of God; it came in by transgression, and has been atoned for by the obedience unto death of Him who was without sin. - W. D. Jardine. (to be continued)

CO-OPERATION WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

For twelve years there has been an unhappy separation among those who in truth have believed the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, and who, so believing, have been baptised into Jesus Christ. Into the causes of this estrangement it is not my purpose at present to enter. I wish rather to excite interest in the inquiry, whether, now, that the lapse of so many years may be expected to have removed the excitement of personal feeling, regarding these causes of division; and to have made all concerned wiser by experience - whether the amount of truth we hold in common is not sufficient to warrant a hearty co-operation in disseminating the knowledge of those grand truths of the Gospel which we believe, and which are so much lost sight of by the community at large? The question is surely an important one and demands an earnest and deliberate consideration.

In the course of these twelve years a considerable number have been added to the several churches, who were not at all concerned in the divisions; and are very likely, in many cases, ignorant alike of the circumstances which led to the separation, and of the amount of agreement in matters of faith and hope that really exists amongst those who are "out of fellowship" with each other. It is therefore necessary in their case and may be beneficial to all concerned to have a clear statement of the matters wherein we are agreed, and wherein we differ. This statement, I shall endeavour to give as fairly and concisely as I can.

Well then. We are agreed, that the One God - the Almighty Creator of all, will establish a kingdom upon earth, which shall destroy and supersede all other kingdoms; and shall be universal in extent, and everlasting in duration.

That this divine, universal, and eternal kingdom shall be given to Jesus, the Messiah, the Son of the living God; and be exercised by Him, as the absolute monarch of all the earth.

That the throne of His divine administration shall be established on Mount Zion; and that the city of Jerusalem shall become the metropolis of the world.

That the twelve tribes of Israel, now scattered abroad throughout the world, shall be gathered again, and placed by God in the territory promised to Abraham, and that thus gathered and established, they shall be made the chief nation in the kingdom of God.

That the throne of the Lord to be established on Mount Zion is "The throne of David," announced to Mary as the inheritance of His Son Jesus; and that it is in consequence of His being anointed for this throne that He is called "The Christ."

That the humiliation and death of the Christ were appointed by His Father to be a sacrifice for sin, and perfect Him for being our High Priest and the Captain of our salvation.

That the race of man is absolutely mortal by nature; and, in consequence of sin, under the sentence of death and that God, in His great love, has appointed that those alone who believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, shall live for ever. That in order to the obtaining of this salvation, God requires of those who thus believe in His Son that they be immersed in water into Christ and submit to Him in all things as their Lord.

That all who thus believe in Jesus as Lord and Christ, and are immersed in His name, are accounted by God as the seed of Abraham to whom the promises were made: and are joint partakers with Him of His eternal power and glory.

That God bestows these favours on believers because of the death of His Son Jesus the Christ.

That the resurrection and glorification of the faithful in Christ Jesus, and the establishment of the kingdom of God shall take place at the return of the Lord from the heavens; and this return of the Lord should be expected, and waited for, by the faithful in Christ Jesus.

We are agreed, that all these things are embraced in the gospel announced to Abraham, and appointed to be preached among all nations to be believed for salvation.

In all these matters we are at one; yet we are in a state of division!

It is proper that the points on which we differ should also be fairly noted. I find I cannot do this without also noticing still further points of agreement. Thus - We differ as to whether "The Word" that became flesh, was personal being, separate from the Father, and existing with God in the beginning before all other created beings - or whether the phrase "The Word" simply denotes an attribute, or the purpose of God. But we are agreed that He who was born of Mary in Bethlehem, and died on the cross for our sins is indeed the Son of God, and the seed of David, of whom Moses and the prophets did write - the Messiah of Israel, the Saviour and Judge of this world, and Lord of all.

Again; we differ as to whether "the resurrection of the just and the unjust" shall be simultaneous, or whether an interval shall lapse between "the resurrection of life and the resurrection of damnation;" but we are agreed that there shall be "a resurrection of the dead both of the just and of the unjust."

We are agreed that the faithful who are asleep in Jesus shall, at His coming, be made "incorruptible;" but we differ as to whether this incorruptibility takes place in the act of resurrection, or subsequently, after appearing at the judgment seat.

We are agreed "that we must all appear at the judgment seat of Christ" to receive according to our works whether good or bad; but we differ as to whether all appear at the same point of time, or whether those who receive the rewards "appear at the judgment seat" at a different time from those who receive punishment. And we differ as to who or what "the Devil" or "Satan" of Scripture is; but we are agreed that whoever or whatever the devil be, he or it is doomed to utter destruction; that all sin, and everything opposed to God and His Christ, shall be destroyed without remedy.

Having thus fully, frankly, and fairly stated the main points of agreement and difference between us, I earnestly commend the careful consideration of the enquiry stated at the outset, and shall anxiously await the issue, leaving further comment in the meantime. W. LAING.

THREE SERMONS A WEEK FOR TWENTY-FIVE SHILLINGS

A curious correspondence has come into our possession, for the authenticity of which we can vouch. It consists of a series of letters which passed between a person who made it his trade to write sermons and a clergyman, who made it his business to preach them, some forty or fifty miles from Liverpool. The

sermon-writer would appear to have been an obscure newspaper reporter out of work. The clergyman, who carried on the correspondence under a feigned name, and had his letters and MSS. addressed under cover to his grocer, was a much esteemed rector - none of your wild young curates, but a reputable middle-aged parochial personage, with a living of his own to subsist on. The ball seems to have been opened by the sermon-writer with an advertisement in a Manchester paper addressed "To clergymen," and offering "original sermons" on terms to be ascertained of the advertiser. To this the clergyman replies, asking what the terms are, and intimating that, as he is not blessed with a "long purse," there will be no trade done "unless the price is very low indeed." The sermon-writer replies that his "usual terms are a guinea per sermon;" but that if the clergyman "is likely to become a regular customer" he will "put them in for half a guinea each." The clergyman writes back that he is likely to become a regular customer; offers to take twelve sermons a month, "if he can have them at the rate of three for five-and-twenty shillings;" and states, finally, that "if these terms are accepted, the sermon-writer may at once send the first "on approval." The sermon-writer replies that he will do the work for the sum stated, on condition that no MSS. are returned if the first three are accepted. The clergyman assents, the sermon writing begins, and the correspondence becomes more interesting. It would seem that two of the sermons have been delivered, and the writer of them, being either distrustful or "hard up," has applied for something on account. At all events, he gets this letter: - "Dear sir, if you will send me a sermon forthwith on the Christian's victory over death, founded upon a similar passage to the one in 1st Corinthians, 15th Chapter - 'The last enemy, etc., and I approve of it, then I will remit you the 25s, upon receipt of which you can send as soon as possible three more on stirring subjects, suitable for Sabbath evening uses." The sermon goes, and in reply comes this letter - "Dear sir, I have just received MS. Shall not need it to-morrow. Approve of it with one exception, which I should like you to remedy. Will then remit you. Having given then a description of man when death entered into the world, I think in as glowing language as possible a description should be given of Christ's resurrection from the dead, when death was conquered and the devil defeated. Let me have this appendage as soon as possible. Will then fulfil before mentioned agreement, upon receipt of which you will please send two more at once on striking subjects, dressed in as glowing flowery (*italics in original*) language as you like." At this point the correspondence, except so far as it relates to remittances, breaks off for a month, from which we judge that the writer laid on the colour with a sufficiently unsparing hand. Then we get this:- "Dear sir, - Having been from home, I did not receive yours until this day. Approve of it if you please append a graphic description of God's love manifested in the gift of his Son for sinners, coupled with a glowing description of Christ's dying on the cross, the consummation of love. Was too late this evening for P.O.O. Will send it on Monday." The next letter sets forth that "one of the last sent (that on 'wheat and tares') could not be used, having taken the very same subject only a few Sundays before." "Can you take this back," the clergyman proceeds, "and send me two, one on the nature and advantages of faithful prayer, founded on such a subject as the Syrophenician woman - should like that subject - the other on the rewards of a holy life, founded on such a passage as "Say ye to the righteous," etc., or "There remains, therefore, a rest for the people of God." Your attention will oblige." The sermon-writer replies that he is quite willing to write on either of the subjects suggested, but he declines point blank to take back "Wheat and tares." "The compact was, that no MSS. were to be returned if the first three were accepted. What became of that unhappy sermon, therefore, must remain a mystery. Perhaps it was "saved up" for future use. After this however, the clergyman is prudent enough to furnish his own texts (which he seldom did before), and even to sketch out the form of treatment to be adopted. For instance - "Please send me a sermon on the words, "Work while it is yet day." First, the introduction then on 'the day.' Secondly, on the nature of the 'work' - firstly, the sinner's work: salvation; secondly the Christian's 'work'; to aid in mending this bad world in diffusing and spreading the gospel, with a glowing description of the evil that surrounds us; and thirdly, the reward of 'work;' the wages paid." Later on, again, we get this: - "Dear sir, will you send me the second sermon of present course from these words - 'And yet there is room.' My idea of the passage runs something after the following - First, introduction. Bring in forcibly and clearly the reason and occasion of the words. First division, the gospel provision in the Church of Christ, with a bold and striking glance at the number of believers of every cast and character who have been admitted into its pale. The church on earth compared to a railway train, passengers of all ages, etc. A vessel playing on the waters of the sea, etc. Secondly, the 'room' in heaven, with a pathetic picture of the saved - and yet there is 'room' - room for all - room for me, etc. The third text will send in a few days, when please enclose account." The next and concluding letter of the series is too long to quote in full. It begins about "the account" and "the remittance," and goes on to ask for a sermon on the words, - 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." The writer is to "adopt his own course in introduction," but he is to get in a description, "in as forcible and graphic language as possible," of the "first apostles - fishermen, tax-

gatherers, etc., “and contrast them with “the great ones, the leading ones of this day.” He is also to “bring in the Reformation, Martin Luther,” etc., in “as glowing language as possible,” and then to describe “the position of the Church at the present day - perfect machinery - every advantage taken for a glorious ingathering of souls,” etc. After this there is to be a “vivid picture” drawn of “the sinner saved, not by a visible hand stretched from heaven, not by a perceptible voice, ringing forth from the throne, not by an angel with his brilliant wings, not by might nor by power, but by,” etc. Lastly, the “door of heaven” is to be “seen distinctly open,” with the saved Christian triumphantly entering it.” “You will perceive from the above sketch,” says the clergyman, “that I like the flowery style. Will you try to accommodate me?” This last sermon seems never to have been written. Whether it was beyond the reporter’s power, or whether he got something better to do, does not appear. All that does appear is that the correspondence suddenly ceases, and does not get resumed. - Liverpool Mercury.

GRADUAL APOSTACY.

THE Bible was not proscribed till the fourth century - the idolatry of Popery did not commence till then - the clergy were not forbidden to marry till then - Infallibility was not claimed till the seventh century - the service was not performed in an unknown tongue before that time - purgatory was introduced then - Transubstantiation was not introduced till the eighth century. Half communion was not begun till the eleventh century. Priestly absolution and excommunication were powers not claimed till the twelfth century; nor till then was it determined that there should be seven sacraments. The sacrifice of mass, the worship of the host, and auricular confession were established only in the thirteenth century.

THE WICKED GOD’S SWORD.

A correspondent of the Standard, signing himself “Conservative,” corrects an error into which its able Paris correspondent has been led, by taking upon trust what M. Richard of the Gaulois advances. The chronicler of the French paper, whose knowledge of arms is about on a par with that of a supernumerary in a Drury-lane pantomime, pretends that the garrison of Paris is “a good deal more than fought at Solferino - to wit, 83,000 bayonets and 9,600 sabres, besides the artillery, or an aggregate (say) of considerably less than 100,000 rank and file.” Taking his statistics in the case of Paris as gospel, his comparison with Solferino is not borne out by fact. At that engagement 135,000 was the strength of the force that fought on the side of the French (unless their Sardinian allies he excepted), and 136,000 of those who fought on the side of the enemy; making a total of 271,000.

As I address you on the subject, it may be interesting to add statistics to the number of men engaged in the decisive continental battles since the opening of the century, with the ascertained amount of casualties in each action.

At Marengo, in 1800, there were but 28,000 French pitted against no more than 30,000 Austrians, and the losses in killed and wounded for both were 13,000. At Austerlitz there were 90,000 French opposed to 80,000 Austrians and Russians; losses 23,000.

At Jena 160,000 French faced an equal number of Prussians, and the losses rose to 34,000.

At Wagram the French were 150,000, the Austrians 130,000 ; losses 24,000.

At Borodino 125,000 French met an equal host of Russians, and the casualties rose to the extraordinary figure of 80,000.

At Leipsic, where the largest number of men of any were engaged, the French were 150,000 strong, and their allies 280,000; the losses were 50,000, or nearly a third less than at Borodino.

At Waterloo there were only 67,000 on one side, and about 69,000 (on their own admission) on the side of the Bonapartists, and the losses were only 14,000.

Koeniggratz (which I allow the victor the right to name, though it is better known to us as Sadowa) was a combat of giants, there being but 10,000 men less than at Leipsic - that is to say, 220,000 Prussians and 200,000 Austrians. The losses were proportionably far inferior, not reckoning up to more than 28,000.”

JUSTICE.

We ought always to deal justly, not only with those who are just to us, but likewise with those who endeavour to injure us. And this too for fear lest by rendering them evil for evil, we should fall into the same vice.

MEEKNESS.

FROM the Scriptures we find that meekness was the chief characteristic of the great author of our religion. "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before his shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth." "Take my yoke upon you," said He, "and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." It is to the meek, the humble, and the poor in spirit, and to those alone, that divine illumination is promised . . . "The meek will He guide in judgment, the meek will He teach his way." "He that hateth his brother is in darkness even until now." When the Apostles grew angry, and were ready either to strike with the sword, or to call down fire from heaven upon the adversaries of Christ, - "ye know not," said their meek and peaceable master, "what spirit ye are of; my kingdom is not of this world." And, if the person of Christ is not to be defended by violent means, neither was His Gospel to be propagated in a spirit of violence. "For the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men - apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," etc. The Apostles were to "speak the truth in love." That regeneration, the necessity of which they were to affirm, consisted much in laying aside the fierceness of nature, and putting on "the meekness and gentleness of Christ." "Ye were sometimes (or once)," said the Apostle, "disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and passions, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." "But now ye put off all these: anger, wrath, malice, evil communication out of your mouth," "be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you." In perfect conformity with these passages, the works of the flesh are described to be not only adultery, etc., but likewise emulation, wrath, strife, envying, heresies, and such like; and with these the fruits of the spirit are contrasted, which are "love, joy, peace, long suffering, meekness, faith, patience, temperance;" terms clearly designating that subdued; state of the passions for which I am pleading . . . I am aware it will be said that the doctrines of religion are so important they must be contended for with zeal, and even also with warmth. I grant the truth of this observation, but in doing so I would most carefully guard the admission. The warmth which is to be used in this case is, in a great measure, the warmth of love. It ought chiefly to arise out of a tender and affectionate solicitude for the very person against whom we contend. Now, if we feel that love, we shall be careful not so much to excite his prejudices, or to affront his pride, by exposing him; as to gain him by the very candour, as well as kindness, of our conduct, and thus to render him a brother. With what care did Paul accommodate himself to the prejudices of the Jews, "becoming all things to all men, that by all means he might save some." When he was converted he laid aside the spirit of the persecutor; he was no longer the man of wrath and violence, he was "gentle even as a nurse cherisheth her children." Zeal for doctrine is easily learnt. Some, it is to be feared, having been throughout their lives, violent and contentious, and having adopted new tenets . . . continue to exercise their old temper while contending for the new subjects. They were impatient, forward, conceited, or fiery, before they had learnt these doctrines; they are no less so afterwards. Their Gospel has merely furnished them with a new topic, in the discussion of which the same unhallowed passions may be habitually indulged . . . I value the doctrines of Christianity. They are, in my mind, of inestimable worth; when rightly received into the heart they form in a man the very temper which I have endeavoured to describe. What can more effectually teach humility meekness, and patience, than the knowledge of our unworthiness, and of our redemption by Christ? What can have a greater tendency to calm the turbulence of our minds than the exercise of prayer . . . and meditation on the glories of the celestial world - S. P., The Christian Observer, August, 1802, pp. 506, 507. - ECLECTIC.

CRITICISM ON ISAIAH LIII, 9

**“And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death;
because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.**

THE original Hebrew is as follows: “Wyyotayn eth reshaim kivero weeth ashir bemothav.” The first verb in this verse should probably, as Dr. Kennicott observes, “be rendered passively, in analogy to the verbs preceding;” and the particle “wav,” which begins the second clause of this passage, may be translated but; that it frequently has this meaning is well known to Hebrew scholars. “Bemothav,” I would render “after his death.” This rendering is authorised by Noldius, who, among other passages, cites this which we are considering as one in which the particle “baith” signifies after (Conord. Partic. Ebr. Chald., p. 151). “Bemothav” is in the plural number, emphatically, by a poetical figure common to the Hebrew writers and the classical poets. Jeremiah xvi. 4, “Memothay thachaluim;” Ezek. xxviii. 8, “Memothay chahal;” 10, “Mothay araylim;” Virg. AEn. x. 854, “Omnes per mortes animam sontem ipse dedisse.”

This passage may therefore be translated thus: “And His grave was appointed with the wicked, but it was with the rich man after His death;” i.e., it was, before our Lord’s death, appointed, or intended by those who crucified Him, that He should be buried in the same manner, perhaps in the same place, in which malefactors were commonly buried (see the quotation from Geier, in Mr. Faber’s “Horae Mosaicae,” Vol. II., p. 240); but after His death this purpose was frustrated by the providence of God, and He was actually interred in the tomb of a rich man. This prophecy may be further illustrated by observing that it was not till after the death of our Lord that Joseph of Arimathea applied to Pilate for permission to bury Him.

Bishop Lowth renders “Bemothav” his tomb, but this sense of the word is not supported by any ancient version, nor by any other passage in the Hebrew Scriptures; it is, in fact, a meaning invented for this particular place, in order to get rid of the supposed difficulty of the common rendering. - ALBANUS, The Christian Observer, April, 1803, p. 20.

Boothroyd gives the lines thus - And He was placed with the wicked in His death; but with the rich man in His sepulchre.

In his note he observes, “Kennicott supposes the words “kivero” and “bemothav,” as he reads, have changed either by accident or else by design. He has proved that many such transpositions have occurred. (See his Diss.) In this supposition the prophecy will correspond with the event. Lowth takes another method to reconcile the event and prophecy, but in my opinion he fails.”

Scott, in his remarks on the passage in question, advocates the reading contended for in this article, and adds, “Pilate, convinced that He (Jesus) had committed no crime, readily granted Joseph’s request.” Otherwise, probably, he would not have consented to deliver up the body of a crucified malefactor.” ECLECTIC.

THE STONE-CUTTER’S SIX WISHES. CONTENTMENT IS HAPPINESS.

ONCE upon a time there was in Japan a poor stone-cutter. He worked much, gained little, and was not at all contented with his fate. “Oh! if I could be rich enough to rest, to sleep wrapped in soft silk!”

Such was the sigh he breathed to heaven. An angel heard it. “It shall be according to thy desire,” said the angel to him. And he at once became rich, and slept wrapped in soft silk.

It happened that the Emperor passed by. He was followed by soldiers, and surrounded by persons who held over his head an immense parasol shining with gold.

“What good does it do me to be rich,” said the man, “as long as I have not the right to go out with my head protected by a golden parasol? Why am I not the Emperor?”

“Thou shalt be,” said the angel. And he became the Emperor. He had soldiers before and behind him, and people who held above his head an immense parasol shining with gold.

However, the sun with its hot beams dried up the country, and the dusty road tired his eyes.

“It is a great gain to be Emperor,” cried the man, “when the sun never fails to make you feel his power! But if one could be the sun!”

“Behold! Are you satisfied?” the angel asked, for he had become the sun; and he darted, his beams up down, right and left, and all around him. But now a cloud thrust itself between the earth and him. It

held back the rays of the sun, and prevented them from falling upon the earth. "There is strength!" cried the sun - "a cloud able to resist my power! It would be better if I were a cloud!"

"Very well," said the angel.

At once he was a cloud. The new cloud placed itself between the sun and the earth. The earth was covered with its shadow. Then it caused the rain to fall on the land, until the rivers spread over and destroyed the fields. Nothing resisted the force of the water but a rock. In vain the bellowing waters beat it in their fury; the rock yielded not, but the foaming waves died at its foot.

"I would rather be the rock," said the cloud.

"You shall be," said the angel.

And he was turned into a steep, unshaken rock, feeling neither sun nor rain. But he saw at his feet a man, poorly clothed, armed with a chisel and a hammer; and the man struck off pieces of the rock, which he made into stones proper for cutting.

"What is that," cried the rock. "Has a man the power to break me? Shall I be weaker than he? I must be that man!"

"Have your will," said the angel.

And he became what he had been, a poor stone-cutter. His life was rude, he worked much, and gained little, but he had learned contentment with his lot.

Aladdin's lamp would make us no happier than the stone-cutter's wishes made him. So let us learn from him that contentment is happiness. - "The Rock."

THE JEWS. - The Jews exhibit one of the most striking instances of national formation, unaltered by the most various changes. They have been scattered for ages over the face of the whole earth; but their peculiar religious opinions and practices have kept the race uncommonly pure; accordingly their colour and their characteristic features are still the same under every diversity of climate and situation. - LAWRENCE'S LECTURES.

SELF-EXAMINATION.

CHRISTIAN morality consists in the observance of right conduct flowing from right principles. Politicians, and even moralists, often aim to produce beneficial actions through the medium of wrong motives, but "the Lord trieth the heart." It may be said, however, that when the actions of our neighbour are good, we ought not to impute to him a bad motive, and that to do this is to be guilty of the sin of judging others, which the Scriptures condemn. I reply that I am not now judging any man, but am requesting everyone to judge himself. It is not persons, but principles that I am about to examine. A man acts, for example, from pride and a sense of honour; he himself professes to be influenced by those motives; we are agreed on this point. The question is, whether such principles are Christian.

I have observed that, in order to constitute Christian virtue, the motives must be good, and not the action only: I now add, that motives, in order to be good, must be religious. Let us proceed to enumerate some of those religious motives which the Scriptures set before us. They are such as these: Reverential fear and love of God. (1) gratitude and love to Christ, (2) the desire of holiness, (3) and the love of man, particularly of our Christian brethren, for the Lord's sake. (4) It is true that many other feelings and principles are allowed, and even enjoined in Scripture; but let us carefully consider what place they ought to occupy. Husbands are commanded to love their wives, and children to obey their parents; but is it not also written, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." Again, compassion for the poor is urged in the New Testament as a Christian duty; but then it is to be an expression of our love to Christ; the inferior motive is to be sanctified by its association with a still higher principle - "Whoso giveth a cup of cold water to a disciple in the name of a disciple, shall not lose his reward." "Forasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me." That charity which proceeds merely from natural compassion, and is utterly unconnected with religion, is not erected into a virtue by the Scriptures; the compassion must spring out of a sense of Christ's compassion towards us, and though exercised towards the afflicted in

general, it must have a special reference to the afflicted part of the flock of Christ. "Brethren, if God has so loved us we ought also to love one another."

Let us next speak of some of those marks which shew the absence of the principles that have already been described as Christian.

The absence of the fear of God cannot be proved more distinctly than by the prevalence of the fear of man. A supreme regard to reputation, and an extreme dread of reproach; a habit of speaking and acting with a mere view to the approbation of the persons around us: these are some of the indications of the want of the fear of God. When, indeed, we merely "please men for their good to edification, then the motive becomes good, and sanctifies the action.

The want of love to God is proved by a supreme love to any other object. If, for example, love to any fellow-creature entirely engrosses us, then the will or command of that fellow-creature will be obeyed instead of the will of God; and, even though the beloved object should command the same thing which God commands, still, since the act will not be done because God commanded it, that religious quality will be wanting which is necessary to render it acceptable to our heavenly Father, viz., a regard to His will. Want of love to God is proved in the same manner as want of love to our fellow-creatures; to think little of Him; to be willing to do nothing, to venture nothing, to sacrifice nothing for His sake; to mention His name, or to hear it mentioned by others, without the least emotion; to feel no painful sensibility when we see His authority trampled upon, and His cause hindered; to love the society of those who shew no reverence for Him, and to dislike the company of men by whom His name is had in the highest reverence; are unquestionable proofs of want of love to God.

The love of worldly happiness is perfectly allowable in its due degree, but in proportion as spiritual objects are greater than temporal, so ought to be the desires excited by the one or the other. Moderation in respect to all our expectations here, and a disposition to sacrifice any present advantages which interfere with our heavenly hope, are some of the surest proofs of our possessing this hope; and are, perhaps, also some of the best means of promoting our temporal enjoyment.

The desire of holiness is proved by the aversion to sin, and the degree of it by the degree of this aversion. The aversion, however, must be to all sin, otherwise it cannot be presumed to be against sin as such. Ambitious, envious, covetous, polluting thoughts; inordinate desires and misplaced affections; all the various workings of evil in the heart, will be lamented and resisted by the person who has a sincere desire of holiness. The means of promoting holiness will also be attended to, and whatsoever obstructs its growth will be avoided. The general plan of life will be regulated, with a view to the sanctification of the heart.

That love of our neighbour, which is spoken of in Scripture, implies much more than natural benevolence. Religion softens as well as enlarges the heart, restrains the evil passions, and forbids inordinate selfishness. It thus improves every principle of humanity and secures their constant exercise.

. . . If we are Christians, we shall love those who are our brethren in Christ Jesus; we shall sympathize with them, whether they are high or low . . . We should, however, beware of mistaking attachment to a sect, for that love of the brethren which is made in Scripture a test of Christianity. We must love others, not merely because we contend together for the same opinions, but because we trace in them the image of our common Saviour.

- B. R.

The Christian. Observer, July, 1803, pp. 401-403.

ECLECTIC.

1. 1 Peter ii. 17; Luke xii. 5, and x. 27.

2. 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; 1 Peter ii. 21-24; 1 John iii. 16.

3. Matt. v. 8; Eph. iii. 14-19; 1 Peter i, 15,

4. 1 John iii. 11, 14, 15.

HE IS COMING.

HUSH! a strain - seraphic music -
Bursts upon the eager ear;
Herald brightness, swifter swelling,
Hope without alloy foretelling
He is coming.

Through the clouds, and through the shadows,
Through the mist of many a tear,
Angel voices break triumphant -
Waiting nations watch expectant:
He is coming.

See! the dawn o'er time's dark mountains;
See prophetic ages pass;
On beyond to-day's brief sorrow
Beams a bright transcendent morrow:
He is coming.

Shout, O shout, the joyful tidings,
Let it ring to earth's far poles :
O'er life's surging sea of sorrow
Let it echo and re-echo
Till He come.
- The Rock.

THE DISCIPLINE OF TRIAL.

BEAUTIFUL is old age - beautiful as the slow-dropping, mellow autumn of a rich, glorious summer. In the old man, nature has fulfilled her work. She fills him with the fruits of a well-spent life, and, surrounded by his children, and his children's children, she rocks him softly away to a grave, to which he is followed with blessings. God forbid we should not call it beautiful. There is another life - hard, rough, and thorny, trodden with bleeding feet and aching brow; the life of which the cross is the symbol, a battle which no peace follows this side of the grave; which the grave gapes to finish, before the victory's won; and - strange that it should be so - this is the highest, life of man. Look back along the great names of history; there is none whose life has been other than this. They to whom it has been given to do the really highest work in this earth - whoever they are, Jew or Gentile, Pagan or Christian, warriors, legislators, philosophers, priests, poets, kings, slaves - one and all their fate has been the same - the same bitter cup has been given them to drink. - Froude.

ON THE PASSOVER OF THE PASSION WEEK.

To an attentive reader, a difficulty presents itself in the text of John xviii. 28, "They themselves (viz., the chief priests and elders of the people) went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover." Whereas, it is evident that our Lord had kept the passover the preceding night with His apostles. Some have, indeed, to clear the difficulty, supposed that the peace offerings, which belonged to the feast of unleavened bread, are here meant as what the priests, etc., were to eat; but beside the impropriety of calling these the passover, satisfactory arguments may, I think, be brought to prove, that the Sanhedrim did not keep the Passover till the Friday evening. Had they eaten the paschal lamb on the Thursday night, the following day being the first of the feast of unleavened bread would have been a day of holy convocation, in which no servile work might be done; (see Lev. xxiii. 7), it would, therefore, have been not only improper, but unlawful, to have spent the time in trying a criminal, bringing the accusation before the Roman governor, and being present at the crucifixion; instead of attending to the solemn ritual of the day; not to urge from Luke xxii. 52 that they must have come forth to seize the Lord Jesus immediately upon rising from the paschal supper. But by attending to the narration, we perceive that they were obliged to hold their council late at night, renew it very early in the morning, and hasten the conclusion of the trial before Pilate, because "it was the preparation of the passover." The killing of the paschal lambs (see footnote 1) commenced soon after the declination of the sun at noon, when the evening sacrifice had first been killed, namely, between the two evenings, Exod. xii. 6 (marg), the first of which was reckoned to begin as soon as the sun had passed the meridian, and the second at sunset. It was

evidently contrary to the intention of the chief priests, that our Saviour was put to death at this time; for they had determined “not on the feast, lest there be an uproar of the people,” Mark xiv. 2. But our Lord’s open declaration at the paschal supper of the treachery of Judas, which He had before only confidentially intimated to John (Chap. xiii. 26), on a former night (see footnote 2) rendered it necessary for the traitor to hasten the execution of his design; since he could no more appear among the disciples.

I apprehend that Judas abruptly quitted the chamber, before the institution of the eucharist, when our Lord replied in express terms to his enquiry, “Master, is it I?” On the former night, the rest of the disciples had only expressed their anxiety and surprise by their looks; but when the Master repeated His assertion that one should betray him, they severally put the question, “Is it I?” and therefore, Judas was obliged to do the same, or by silence, confess his consciousness of guilt. His confusion and indignation at being thus discovered urged him to an immediate perpetration of the crime he had premeditated: he went immediately to the chief priests to inform them no time was to be lost; and, by their orders, procure the band of soldiers.

But it ought to be noted, that if the Sanhedrim had kept the passover that night, Judas would have had no opportunity of making his application to them, since each master of a house would have been engaged in his own family, according to the Law. But it is obvious, if this statement be admitted, that a considerable difficulty will occur respecting our Lord’s anticipation of the passover; since the paschal lambs might be slain only in the temple, where the blood was to be offered, consequently no private passover could be kept; and since the three Evangelists, who recount the celebration, all speak of it as the day on which the passover was properly to be killed.

Dr. Cudworth has very ably discussed this point in a small treatise, entitled, “The true notion of the Lord’s Supper,” as a feast upon sacrifice, from which, it being less known than it deserves, I will as briefly as possible state the argument. “The Greek church held, in opposition to the Latins. that the passover was kept the year of our Saviour’s death, on two days together; many learned men, as Munster, Scaliger, Causabon, etc., have since closed with the Greeks. The question is, how this might legally be done? and the true answer must be derived from the manner of determining the beginning of their months, in use at that time, which was according to the phasis of the moon, for they had then no calendar as a rule to sanctify their feasts; but they were sanctified by the heavens, as the misna, speaks. This is clearly stated by Maimon, (Kiddush Haccodesh), who, having spoken of the rules of observing the phasis, adds, that these were never made use of, since the Sanhedrim ceased in Israel after the destruction of the temple; since that time, they have used a calendar, calculated according to the middle motion of the moon, except the Karraites who preserve the ancient custom as sacred, in opposition, to the Rabbinitis whom they abhor for giving it up.”

The manner of reckoning by the phasis is thus described in the Talmud of Babylon in Rosh Hashanah and by Maimon in Kiddosh Hachad: “In the great or outer court of the temple, where there was a house called Beth-Jazek, where the Senate sat all the 30th day of every month to receive the witnesses of the moon’s appearance, and to examine them, entertainment being provided to encourage men to come the more willingly. If there came approved witnesses on the thirtieth day of the phasis being seen, then the chief men of the Senate stood up and pronounced meknnddash, it is sanctified, and the people standing by repeated it; whereupon notice was presently given to all the country. But if, when the consistory had sat all the thirtieth day, there came no approved witnesses, then they made an intercalation of one day in the former month, and decreed the following one and thirtieth day to be the calends. And yet, notwithstanding, if afterwards witnesses came from afar, and testified that they had seen the phasis in due time, and after all possible trial of their integrity, if they remained constant to their testimony, the Senate was bound to alter the beginning of the month, and reckon it a day sooner, viz., from the thirtieth day. Here we see how the difference of a day might arise about the calends of a month, on which the feasts depended. Now, it was a custom among the Jews, in such doubtful cases, to permit the feasts to be solemnized, or passovers killed, on two several days together. Maimon affirmeth, that in the remoter parts of the land of Israel they kept the feast of the new-moon two days together; nay, in Jerusalem itself, they keep the new-moon of Tisri, which was the beginning of the year, twice, lest they should be mistaken in it: and in the Talmud (Gamarah Rosh Hashanah, cap. 1.) we have an instance of the passovers being kept two days together, because the new moon was doubtful; nay, the rabbinical Jews themselves, in imitation hereof, still observe to keep the passover two days together iisdem ceremoniis, as the learned author of the Jewish Synagogue reports, and Scaliger also, not only of that but also of the other feasts: *Judaei post institutionem hodierni computi cundem solennitatem celebrant biduo propterea quod mensem incipiant a medio motu lunde; itaque propter dubium conjunctionis luminarium, Pascha celbrant 15 et 16 Nisam, Pentecosten 6 et 7 Sivan, Scenopegia 15 et 16 Tisri; idque vocant, festum secundum exsiliorum.*”

Hence it appears how our Saviour, according to His desire expressed (Luke xxii. 15) could eat the passover with His disciples, and yet He Himself be offered up at the very time when the paschal lambs were sacrificed at the temple. Mark notes, chap. xv. 25: "It was the third hour," i.e., nine in the morning (the time of offering the lamb of the daily burnt sacrifice) when He was nailed to the cross; "and when the sixth hour was come (i.e., noon) there was darkness over the land till the ninth hour." On the passover day, they anticipated the killing of the evening sacrifice, which, on other days was done at half-past two, and offered at half-past three; but now, on account of the number of paschal lambs to be slain, was hastened, as soon as the sun declined to the west, because the blood of the daily sacrifice must be sprinkled before that of the paschal. This super-natural darkness, therefore, took place whilst the blood of the evening sacrifice, and of the paschal lambs, was offering; and may be considered a token of the divine dereliction of the legal sacrifices, as their being consumed by fire from heaven (2 Chron. vii. 1), when the first temple was dedicated, was of their acceptance. "And at the ninth hour, when the incense was to be burnt on the golden altar (which was done when the evening sacrifice was wholly consumed on the altar of burnt-offering)," Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished" bowed His head, and gave up the ghost, "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour;" upon which the vail of the temple was rent, before which the golden altar stood, where the priest was officiating.

John remarks (chap. xix. 31) that the following Sabbath (during which the body of Jesus lay in the grave) was an high day. The same word translated (chap. vii. 37) 'great day' is the word used by the Septuagint (Isaiah i. 13) for the "calling of assemblies," namely, on the first and last days of the solemn feasts; which plainly points out this Sabbath as being the first day of unleavened bread, and, consequently, that the passover had been eaten on the preceding night. It was, therefore, this year, on two accounts, a Sabbath, or day of rest, of divine appointment; prepared by Him "who hath put the times and seasons in His own power," as fitly typifying that rest which followed the great work of redemption.

The next day, when our Lord rose from the grave, was the second day of unleavened bread (the 16th of Nisam), on which the wave sheaf, the first fruits of the harvest, was to be presented before God. The words of the law, Lev. Xxiii. 11, are "Ye shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath (i.e., the rest of the holy convocation on the festival day) the priest shall wave it" They were then to reckon seven sabbaths, and on the morrow of the seventh sabbath was the feast of weeks or of pentecost; on that day the wave loaves (see footnote 3) were offered, called (Exodus xxiii. 16) 'The first fruits of thy labours.' On this day was the promised effusion of the spirit, by which the disciples were anointed as "first fruits," at once the earnest means of fulfilling that glorious prophecy, "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." Is. liii. II, (comp. Matt. xiii. 33).

The clearing of any seeming difficulties in the narration of the evangelists is of real importance in any controversy with the Jews; they have not failed to urge what they supposed might impeach the veracity of the sacred historians, and they have, from the passages which have now been under consideration, too often perplexed an unprepared opponent. On the other hand, no Christian can meditate on this exact conformity to the ancient types, (whose fulfilment the Jewish priesthood were certainly very far from studying thus to accomplish,) but he must find his faith confirmed, and his devotion animated; and even a rational sceptic must be constrained to acknowledge, if he admit the facts, that these are coincidences which no human foresight could preconcert, and no human power could bring to pass. - C..L.

The Christian Observer, June, 1803, - pp. 330 - 333.

ECLECTIC.

Footnotes:-

1). *The vast number of lambs sacrificed at the Passover may be gathered from the answer of the priests to the enquiry of Cestias, viz., twenty-five myriads, five thousand six hundred.*

2). *It may be very satisfactorily proved that the supper – John xiii. 1. – was not the paschal supper but a private one distinct from that when our Lord was anointed at the house of Simon. John neither mentions the Passover nor the institution of the eucharist, both having been done by the three preceding evangelists. It may not be improper to note that it will be found on examination that St Peter was at least twice warned by his Lord of his fall, at the supper – John xiii., - and after, at the paschal supper, - Luke xxii.*

3). *Ye shall bring two wave loaves of fine flour, they shall be taken with leaven, they are the first fruits unto the Lord. And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs, etc., see Lev, xxii., v. 15-21.*

SNEERERS. - The most insignificant people are the most apt to sneer at others. They are safe from reprisals, and have no hope of rising in their own esteem but by lowering their neighbours. The severest critics are always those who have either never attempted, or who have failed in original composition.

- HAZLITT.

ON OF THE USES OF HISTORY. - The villain who has imposed on mankind by his power or cunning, and who experience could not unmask for a time, is unmasked at length; and the honest man who has been misunderstood or defamed, is justified before his story ends. Or if this does not happen, - if the villain dies with his mask on, in the midst of applause, and honour, and wealth, and power, and if the honest man dies under the same load of calumny and disgrace under which he so undeservedly lived, driven perhaps into exile and exposed to want, - Yet we see historical justice executed, the name of the one branded with infamy, and that of the other celebrated with panegyric to succeeding ages.

BOLINGBROKE.

A good conscience is more to be desired than all the riches of the East. How sweet are the slumbers of him, who can lie down on his pillow and review the transactions of every day, without condemning himself. A good conscience is the finest opiate. *Nemo malus felix.* - Knox's Winter Evenings.

EARTH TO EARTH, AND DUST TO DUST:

Eccles. xii. 7:

“EARTH to earth, and dust to dust!”
Here, the evil and the just,
Here, the youthful and the old,
Here, the fearful and the bold,
Here, the matron and the maid,
In one silent bed are laid;
Here the vassal and the King
Side by side lie withering;
Here the sword and the sceptre rust, -
“Earth to earth, and dust to dust!”

Age on age shall roll along
O'er the pale and mighty throng;
Those that wept and those that weep,
With those sleepers all shall sleep.
Brothers, sisters of the worm:
Summer's sun, or winter's storm,
Song of peace, or battle's roar,
Ne'er shall break their slumbers more:
Death shall keep his sullen trust, -
“Earth to earth, and dust to dust!”

But a day is coming fast,
Earth, thy mightiest and thy last!
It shall come in fear and wonder,
Heralded by trump and thunder;
It shall come in strife and toil,
It shall come in blood and spoil,
It shall come in empire's groans,
Burning temples, trampled thrones:
Then, ambition, rue thy lust, -
“Earth to earth, and dust to dust!”

Then shall come the judgment sign
In the East the King shall shine,

Flashing from heaven's golden gate,
Countless myriads round his state,
Spirits with the crown and plume:
Tremble then, thou sullen tomb?
'Mid the blaze of living light,
Heaven shall open on our sight!
Kingdom of the ransom'd just, -
"Earth to earth, and dust to dust!"

REV. GEORGE CROLY, M.A.

THE LAND OF MOAB.

WHO that has stood outside the walls of Jerusalem, or on the Mount of Olives, has not gazed with wistful interest on those blue hills, rising with clear outline beyond the thin haze which overhangs the deep hidden lake of salt, nor wondered what the land of Moab might reveal? Those hills which look so near yet are in reality so inaccessible, have whetted the curiosity of many a traveller.

The discovery of the famous Moabite stone drew more attention to the exploration of Moab than the country had hitherto received. Dr. Porter had only ventured to hint that research among its bleak highlands and lawless tribes might reward the adventurous explorer; but the almost accidental discovery of the monolith was a pledge that the antiquities of Moab must certainly repay investigation. The highlands south of the Arnon, the true country of the ancient Moabites, were never included in the allotment of Israel . . . Moab is absolutely destitute of supplies, even of corn; only kid and game could be counted on as procurable on the spot.

Few boundary lines are more clearly laid down than that of the Arnon dividing Reuben from Moab. The ravine of the Arnon does not show till we are close upon it. In this treeless land a fair-sized terebinth, just at the edge where the path begins to descend, was a conspicuous guide-post; and certainly without it a stranger might search long for the track. The rolling slopes come close to the precipitous descent, the plain being perfectly level on either side, breaking away abruptly in limestone precipices to a great depth. No idea of the rift can be formed till the very edge is reached. As far as we could calculate by observation, the width is about three miles from crest to crest; the depth, by our barometers, 2,150 feet from the south side, which runs for some distance nearly 200 feet higher than the northern edge. This may possibly be accounted for by the fact that on the south edge is a bold basaltic dyke or stream overlying the limestone, while the north is destitute of basalt.

The boulders have rolled down the slopes in wild fantastic confusion, and add much to the effect and grandeur of the southern bank. We were much struck by the contrast between the two sides, and this impression was confirmed when, next day, we viewed the southern from the northern edge. The protrusion of the basaltic dyke has been subsequent to the formation of the wady, and the continued detaching of its fragments has made the slope less precipitous, giving a variety to the colouring and the vegetation, wanting on the other side. The northern bank, on the contrary, looked an almost unbroken precipice of marly limestone, faintly tinged with the green hue of a very sparse vegetation, and occasionally protruding cliffs and needles, shining pink in the sunbeams. No search could detect at this distance any path, or apparent possibility of a path, up the rugged terrace in front. Though indeed not very difficult, except among the basaltic boulders, the path was not easily made out on the south side, even when upon it. Once it has been a chariot road, and as we descended the zig-zag we frequently met with its traces, and the piers of the Roman (?) bridge at the bottom still stand in the stream. An almond tree was in full blossom near the top; tufts of asphodel and gorgeous scarlet anemones pushing out among the stones told of a different climate from that we had left, where scarce a symptom of spring could as yet be seen.

We enjoyed our scramble down this wild pass. Only at the upper part, where the track descends among a torrent of basaltic boulders, was it prudent to dismount from our goat-like horses. Pigeons and partridges abounded, and the younger members of the party left their horses, or were left by them, to find their own way, and went on foot throughout. One of them was landed aloft with each foot on a boulder as his horse pushed between them, and passing from beneath him, scrambled whinnying after the leaders in front, taking his own short cut to the bottom, and leaving his rider astride.

Steep as the descent looks, yet it proves to be rather a rugged water-worn ravine than a precipitous cliff.

A faint shade of budding green tints the slopes and in a few days will evidently clothe the whole brown surface. Three-quarters-of-an-hour down, we passed an old fort in ruins, with broken columns strewn about. A little above this was a broken Roman mile-stone, and two others lower down. Twenty minutes after this fort, we passed another of larger size, with fragments of shafts, bases in situ, and many old foundations, some of them crossing the old Roman way, which here was very distinct. In other places, what seemed to be the foundations of buildings must have been "walls of masonry, built across the path to prevent the torrents from washing away its material.

In the steeper parts of the pass many piles of stone were heaped on the boulders, said, by Burckhardt, to be provided as missiles for travellers in case of attack; but more probably only placed there to guide them on their way, as we have noticed elsewhere. The arch of the bridge which Irby describes has now disappeared, and only the base is left.

The mules were behind us, and after a bathe and a draught of the Arnon, we paused to enjoy the rich tropical vegetation and genial warmth of this great depth. Water never fails; the pools were full of fish; the dark green oleanders were budding for bloom. Above the Roman bridge are some faint remains of early buildings; perhaps "the city that is in the midst of the river" (Joshua xiii. 16). At least, it is scarcely possible that such exuberant vegetation, with perennial moisture, should have remained unappropriated in the time of Israel's greatness; and, whether the place so vaguely spoken of were above or below the fords, "cities" or villages there "were sure to be in the midst of the "river," or wady.

"The Land of Moab," by H. B. Tristram, M.A., LL.D., F.B.S., Passim.

GLEANER.

(To be continued.)

Who can over-estimate a woman's worth in the relation of mother? The great Napoleon said; "A man is what his mother made him"

THE CHILDREN'S COLUMNS.

AN ARAB ENCAMPMENT.

OUR little friends must have heard of persons going to visit the Holy Land and other countries mentioned in the Bible, on account of the interest they felt in those places, which were the scenes of the events recorded in that sacred Book. The narrative of what they have seen and heard enables us to understand many things in the Scriptures that would otherwise be difficult to explain, and we ought to be grateful for the information they have given us.

The following description of an Arab encampment, not many miles from the Dead Sea, may be both amusing and instructive to our young readers. It will give an idea of the inconveniences and hardships that are encountered where there are no inns or hotels, and where often no shelter at all is to be obtained, unless the traveller takes his house with him in the shape of a tent.

Now, picture to yourselves a four-sided erection of canvas, made of camels' hair, quite black, and with a roof only three or four feet above the ground, one side opening into a sort of square surrounded by similar abodes, and you have an Arab encampment. The author, from whose work this account is selected, goes on to say, that in the centre of the tent in which he and his companions were entertained, was a fire of broomsticks, the smoke and ashes blowing into every one's face; all the party sat on the ground; the canvas dwelling was full to overflowing. An old man stood in the middle, who held a little flat pan with coffee berries in it over the flame and stirred them with a stick, then with great care pounded the roasted coffee in a mortar, turned it with his hand into a little tin pot of boiling water, let it simmer a minute or two, then turned it into another little pot, let it simmer again, and when it threatened to boil over poured it, or part of it, into three blue china cups, without handles and without saucers. He courteously handed the cups to the chief guests, first sipping the coffee to show that there was nothing baneful in it, the rest of the company being supplied afterwards as the cups were emptied. At nightfall the sheep and goats, with a few camels, came trooping from the hills to the camp; from every side the flocks appeared almost at the same moment, led by the shepherd, a little boy, the sheep and the goats gambolling after him as he

sang an Arab song. Some of the creatures kept close to his heels and joined in the music with the tinkling of the bells suspended to their necks. The writer continues – We neglected the trenching of our tents, and as the rain poured down in torrents, we awoke before day-break to find a river flowing through the camp. It was necessary to move onward. We took our breakfast of coffee and stale brown bread in the open air, and in the wet. The weather was dreadful; we were caught in a hurricane: the storm of rain and hail became so fierce that our terrified horses refused to stir, so we had to sit on our trembling steeds soaked to the skin. The mules carrying the baggage objected to cross the swollen streams, and every now and then contrived to get rid of the burdens on their backs: the sheepskins intended for our beds were rolled in the water and were like a wet sponge. We arrived at our journey's end bitterly cold. To sleep in a macintosh with damp bedding over it, when it is nearly freezing, is a trial.

No doubt you remember that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob dwelt in tents, and removed with their flocks and herds from place to place. Various tribes in the East live in the same way to this day, roaming from one spot to another to find fresh pasture for their cattle. Their manners and customs remind us of the holy men who lived so many hundred years ago.

You will notice that the little boy leads his flocks, instead of driving them before him, as a shepherd would in England. In the East it is the custom for the shepherd to go first. Jesus is spoken of as the Good Shepherd, and in the Gospel of John we read, that “when He putteth forth His own sheep, He goeth before them and the sheep follow Him.” You will understand that “His own sheep” mean the Saviour's own people, those who believe His Word and obey it according to His commands.

ANTS.

Solomon, in the book of Proverbs, tells us, that “the ants are a people not strong,” yet those little creatures are wonderful workers; they labour most diligently: for this reason they are set before us as examples of industry.

In some countries they swarm in immense numbers and are often very destructive. They feed chiefly on flesh of some sort or other. They will eat up a sheep in a night, and a fowl only serves to amuse them for an hour. In Africa they have even been known to devour a cow in her stall. It is related that these insects sometimes march in such multitudes that the whole earth seems to be in motion. A large number of them attacked and covered an elephant quietly feeding in a pasture. In eight hours nothing was to be seen but the skeleton of that enormous animal completely picked. The business was done, and the enemy moved on in search of fresh prey.

AT THE BREAKING OF BREAD.

(BY BROTHER GLOVER.)

WE are met again around the table of the Lord. We must all feel that there is a deep necessity for our thus meeting together. It is more than human nature could bear to always stand face to face with the enemy. Intercourse with the world has a chilling influence on the heart of a believer. We, therefore, need hours of respite - times of seclusion - when we can be shut out from the world, and shut in with Christ, and one another. In our thus gathering together, each one by his presence brings a little fire with him, and thus a mutual warmth is promoted, which could not otherwise be secured. We need, so to speak, to come into a different atmosphere where the air is pure and invigorating, that so our spiritual strength may be renewed.

In partaking of these emblems we are reminded of those significant words of the apostle, “He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death.” Had Jesus been in the position in which some represent Him to have been, these words could not be true. Were He under condemnation from His birth, He must have been already in a state of degradation, and therefore there could have been no scope for humbling Himself. If His life was already under forfeiture, pray, what manifestation of obedience could there have been in His laying it down? The apostle's words, therefore, entirely disprove such a theory respecting the Christ. Jesus saw that the accomplishment of His Father's purpose - obedience to His Father's will - and the salvation of sinners necessitated His death, therefore, out of supreme deference to His Father's will, and deep love for the sons of men, He freely gave up His life a ransom for all, even

despising the shame of so ignominious a death as the death of the cross. We must also remember that this humiliation and obedience constituted the basis of His present and future exaltation. Because He stooped so low, the Father has raised Him so high, even exalting Him to his own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, far above all principality and power. Because He was obedient in all things, even unto death, the Father raised Him from the dead, and will give Him the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession, in the age to come.

Dear brothers and sisters, let us not forget that the same principle of divine procedure obtains with regard to ourselves - that God does not bestow His favours irrespective of character. It is true that He gives the present life with its attendant blessings without regard to character; for in the universality of His goodness He causes the sun to shine and the rain to descend on the evil as well as on the good. But there was a necessity for this in the first instance, since man could not render obedience until he had an existence; yet, inasmuch as on the part of the ungodly, there is no appreciation of His goodness - no response of gratitude - no rendering of obedience in return, God has decreed that they shall ultimately and eternally perish; plainly proving that it would be altogether out of harmony with the plan of divine wisdom perpetually to bestow His favours on such conditions. In the creation of man God contemplated His own glory as well as the happiness of His creatures. That glory can only be secured by their faith and obedience; God has therefore made their future and eternal well-being contingent on the same. Therefore, meeting as we do, around this table, in hope of eternal life in the kingdom of God, let us never forget that incorruptibility of being will be bestowed on the basis of incorruptibility of character.

THE VATICAN.

PIO NONO, loquitur.

RASH Driver, Thought! Arrest this swift desire,
This search for Light, 'twill set the World on fire.
Stop! stop! I say; 'tis my command, my will!
A more than Joshua bids the sun stand still.
Is not the Church the way direct and straight,
The only path that leadeth to the Gate?
Is not the Church unselfish, generous, free,
Giving up all, like them of Galilee?
Is not the Pope poor, humble, meekly bred,
Like him who had not where to lay His head?
Where would you go? You reach no happy land
Except by guidance of the priestly hand.
Come to the Church; it sanctifies and saves,
And from her bosom gives the "milk for babes;"
Rock'd in her arms, you'll hear her sing divine,
"Sleep, restless Thought! Sleep, human children, mine!
Here, on my breast, is balm for all your woes, -
The true Nirvana, - dreamless, deep repose."
Ye pious souls, learn then of Church and Me,
For I am Pius in the ninth degree.
Hearst thou, world? and wilt thou not obey ?
O, yes, it hears - "Pero si muove." THOUGHT, replying.
No Prelate, Priest, or Church of any kind
Can henceforth stop the onward march of mind.
Wist ye not, brothers? ought ye not to know?
"About his Father's business" each must go?
The Father's business! Is not that to strive
Upward to Light, and keep the mind alive?
Oft on the way, through clouds and darkness borne,
Blinded by mist, or baffled by the storm;

O'erwhelmed by Doubt and Mystery in the air,
Thought faints, and seeks refreshment in a prayer;
And yet from Love and Beauty comes a ray
To cheer the toiling spirit on its way.
But whether calm, or storm, or Joy, or woe,
If Duty urges, Thought must onward go.

E.A.

THE DOCTRINE OF ANTICHRIST.

“Every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.” 1 John iv. 3.

The meaning of the apostle in this passage seems to be that everyone who came teaching that Jesus Christ was not flesh was not from God, and was, consequently, antichristian in his doctrine, not to be received into the houses of the disciples, neither were they to bid him God-speed. If the question were put to the apostle John – who was Jesus Christ? he would have answered - He was the only begotten Son of God. The Word, promise, or declaration of God made flesh, John the Baptist bare record that He was the Son of God. Nathaniel confessed to Himself, “Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel.” And Jesus declared of Himself, “I am the Living Bread which came down from heaven” “The bread of God which came down from heaven and giveth life unto the world.” “And the bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.”

The sum of these testimonies is, that Jesus the Christ who had been the subject of promise from the foundation of the world was now flesh, living flesh, living bread, the gift of God, the Son of the living God, the Christ spoken of by Moses and the prophets. But a bystander asks, was not Jesus Adam's flesh or Mary's flesh? No, neither Adam, nor Mary his daughter, ever were in heaven. The power of Almighty, Father of Jesus, came down from heaven and caused a son to be born of Mary, in other words, gave a son to the world, not a gift of Adam's son, nor of Mary's, but of His own, His only begotten. But another says, was not Jesus the father? Certainly not. The Father was the cause; He the effect. No effect can be at the same time its own cause. But it is again suggested, Jesus was the Father in flesh. This introduces confusion between Father and Son. The Father was manifested in a Son, who was flesh and blood, born of a daughter of Abraham. But He was not spirit, although begotten of spirit. Neither was He flesh of Adam, although born of his descendant, but as He testifies Himself living flesh, which came down from heaven, or whose origin was in the bosom of His Father.

But did not the Christ exist in spirit before He became flesh? Yes, the Father, who is spirit, determined to have a son, and uttered His declaration of that purpose many times from the foundation of the world. The Christ existed in the bosom or mind of the Father, but in no other form.

To affirm that Jesus Christ existed in spirit-form or angelic form before He was begotten of spirit-power is to affirm what is contrary to the testimony of the Scriptures.

To affirm that He existed before John the Baptist as allying intelligence, and that He laid aside that living intelligent existence in spirit-form, to assume that of a babe of flesh, is also to add to the scripture testimony, and thereby defeat its object.

The Truth is simple, and easily discerned by those who wish it and nothing else. Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, built up of the substance of His mother, and therefore flesh, but related to His Father more than to His mother, inasmuch as His Father was the cause of His existence, while she gave Him birth as the effect. Trinitarianism and Unitarianism have added to and taken from the divine testimony.

The more recent doctrine, called by its promoters God-manifestation, is also to be rejected because it fails to distinguish between the Father and the Son. It proceeds upon the idea of exalting the Father, and in so doing, says the Christ was not flesh, but the Father in flesh. If these well-meaning friends would give up the use of words which obscure their meaning, and content themselves with saying that God manifested Himself, or His purpose of redemption in a Son, contention on that matter would cease. Amen. - W. E.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - I am pleased to inform you that the two young persons mentioned in my last (Elizabeth Webb Turner, and Emily Jones), were immersed into the saving Name, on the 18th December and received into the Ecclesia the Sunday following. The lectures delivered in the Assembly Rooms during the past month are as follows: - December 6th, "The way of Salvation, as shewn by Jesus and the Apostles," - David Handley. December 13th, "The second coming of Christ, to establish His kingdom on the Earth: the one Hope of the Gospel," - William Ellis. December 20th, "The World's future; political, social, and religious, as set forth in the Scriptures!?" - James Martin, instead of F. N. Turney, who was prevented by a severe cold. December 27th, "No more War - the Prince of Peace is coming!" - James Martin. January 3rd, 1875, "No more Death - the Prince of Life, and Author of Immortality!" - William Ellis. The attendance at the evening lectures is improving, and though the weather has been very severe, we continue to find the audiences larger each evening owing no doubt, to our weekly bills placarded about the town, and the growing interest of the public in the treatment of the various subjects. We therefore fondly cherish the hope that, to those whom we know are endeavouring to seek the kingdom of God, and His righteousness, there may be added many others, who will see the necessity of looking into these things, and wash away their guilty stains in the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which cleanseth us from all sin. On Tuesday, December 29th, we had a Tea Meeting, to which interested strangers were invited, also Brethren Farmer, Handley, and Richmond, of Nottingham; Brethren F. N. Turney, Cope, junior, Sis. E. Jardine, and Bro. and Sis. E. Turney, of Stourbridge, and Sis. H. Turney, were present. After tea, the evening was pleasantly and profitably spent, in hearing wholesome words of advice and comfort, from Brethren John Butler, W. Ellis, J. Martin, D. Handley, Richmond, H. Turney, and F. N. Turney. The addresses were interspersed with singing the praises of God, and the glorious themes which are given us by the Spirit in the word, for our mutual refreshment, while in the race for the coronal wreath of life; the meeting was closed with prayer, by Brother W. Trigg, who presided. The quarterly accounts and reports have just been presented by the Treasurer and Secretary, which shew us how much has been done, and the necessity for our continued exertion in order to succeed in the labour we have undertaken. A good Harmonium has been purchased, and other useful things have been done to ensure decency in our arrangements, and, in patience waiting for the seed of the kingdom to grow in the hearts of those who come to hear, we ask the prayers of our Brethren for our prosperity as the household of Deity in this town, during the coming year. We have a Bible meeting every Tuesday evening at the Assembly Rooms, to which the public are invited. - CHARLES JENNINGS. - In accordance with my promise, I send you the facts concerning Shelton and Roberts, which I have just now ascertained from Brother Williams myself. After seeing the paragraph in the Christadelphian, at which he was much irritated. Brother Williams asked Brother Shelton if he had read the letter in the Lamp? He answered no, he had not, but that he had been told of it by some of Roberts's party, and that he had (without having read the letter) been to Roberts. He (Shelton) further said, in reply to Brother Williams, that Roberts did not ask him if the letter in the Lamp were true or not, and also said that he did not think that Roberts himself had read it. Roberts advised Shelton to take no notice of the letter, "to take the misrepresentation patiently," etc., but instead of acting on his own advice, inserted the paragraph in the Christadelphian, pretending to be in answer to a letter from W. Shelton. I am writing this in Brother Williams' kitchen, where the conversation with Shelton took place in the presence of Brother Butler. I have read this to Brother Williams, he says it is correct. This of course fully bears out my statement that Roberts contradicted this letter without having consulted Shelton. Brother Butler has just come in, and confirms what Brother Williams has said. - F. N. TURNEY.

LEICESTER. - It affords me pleasure to ask you to place on record in the Lamp the introduction, in the appointed way, of two new brethren and one sister into the family of the God of Israel. On the 1st of January Mr. John Tailby, 32, and his wife, Nellie Tailby, 27, were baptised by Brother Handley into the saving name; and on the following day Mr. Benjamin Moore, 48, took the same important step; so that they "are now no more strangers and pilgrims, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God." This was beginning the new year well. The late controversy has no doubt been the means of hindering them from taking the step before; but after a patient, and I believe careful, weighing of the matter, they now rejoice in being made one with Him who was truly the Son of the living God, and not a Son of Adam; what there is to rejoice over in the latter case I fail to see, certainly Paul regarded the situation as a calamity, and except for the Redemption - which was wrought by the laying down of the life of a "holy, harmless, and undefiled One" - would have been an unmitigated calamity. There are some others, I am pleased to say, taking a deep interest in these things; I trust they may soon come to see that "delays are dangerous," and that the Master of the house may at any moment rise up and shut to the door,

when clamouring for admittance from the outside will be unavailing. The Bible Discussion Class continues to keep up its interest; we have some very good meetings, - of course it is difficult to say whether it may be effectual to bring others into the Truth; at any rate, many have been shown that their feet are on slippery places, and not, as they thought, upon a rock. The old stock references of orthodoxy, so called, have been brought up over and over again, only to be slain on the spot and shown to be delusive. - Yours, dear Brother, in the hope of the Gospel, CHAS. WEALK.

LIVERPOOL. - Brother Terry reports a visit from Brother Ellis on Christmas day. A tea meeting was held in Brother Lind's house, when the evening was spent in an interesting and profitable manner. On Sunday Brother Ellis delivered an address, according to the following bill: - "Christadelphian Meeting Room. 98 Soho Street, (No. 3, Room). A Lecture will be delivered in the above room, on Sunday evening, the 27th inst., by Mr. W. Ellis. Subject - 'Jesus Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King; or, Jesus Christ in the past, present, and future.'" This being the first time the room was advertised, the audience was not large. Visits from lecturing brethren are desired. We have commenced the distribution of "The Old Sun Dial," and other tracts. Hoping to see some fruit of our labours in due season.

MUMBLES. - Brother W. Clements reports further progress in his district. After mentioning the addition at Neath, he gives the baptism of Sarah Jenkins, of Lanmadoc, a village about sixteen miles west of Mumbles. This is a case of interest; as Brother Clement, when a preacher among the Methodists, used to visit and preach Methodism at Lanmadoc. Before her immersion, sister Jenkins had been staying at Mumbles, and became somewhat perplexed at falling among persons who were anxious to impress her with the belief that Christ was in some sense a sinner, or condemned. On her return home she appears to have investigated the matter, and decided that the Christ of the New Testament was "undefiled," and into Him she wished to be baptized.

NEATH. - Brother W. J. Gregory writes - "The truth is still making a little progress in this place. Besides the regular assembling of ourselves on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread, we do what we can to enlighten others in the gospel. On Sunday, 3rd inst, Brother W. Clement paid us a visit, and in his usual earnest manner, gave us some seasonable exhortation. In the evening he delivered an address based on John iii. 3, 5. On Thursday, 7th inst. we had an addition to our little flock in the person of Miss A. Bartlet, daughter of sister Bartlet. This is the fruit of Brother Heard's labours in the Word. On the 10th, Brother James Martin spent the day with us, preaching and teaching the tidings concerning the name of Jesus Christ to a small audience of strangers, besides brethren."

NOTTINGHAM. - We have the pleasure to record the obedience of Mrs. Mary Alice Storer, aged 30, married, daughter of Sis. S. Goodacre; she was previously a member of the Church of England, and Mistress of the National School, Wolverhampton, which post she has willingly relinquished for the Truth's sake. The following lectures have been delivered in the Synagogue since our last issue, December 20th, "The Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow," Brother Richmond. December 27th, "Peace on Earth, good will towards Men," Brother Turney. January 3rd, "The New Heavens, and the New Earth," Brother Hayes. January 10th, "Jehovah's Name," Brother Turney. On Monday, December 28th, the usual Christmas Tea Meeting was held in the Schoolroom, and although several were unavoidably absent owing to sickness, over 80 adults and 20 children sat down to well provided tables. After the tea had been disposed of, short speeches were made by Brethren Turney, Hayes, Handley, Haines, and Glover, and as several interested enquirers were present, advantage was taken of the circumstance by the several speakers to adapt their remarks more especially to them; it is hoped with good effect. The Meeting was opened and concluded in the usual way by singing and prayer, and all separated apparently well pleased with the evening's proceedings. The Ecclesia laments the removal of one of its members by death, in the person of Sister White, who fell asleep on the 25th December, rejoicing in the hope of a glorious resurrection at the appearing of the Lord. Brother Handley officiated at the grave, and after the reading of appropriate portions of the Scriptures, made some practical remarks, concluding by prayer. Several of the Brethren are now busily engaged in the preparation of Essays on a variety of Bible topics, for reading and discussion at the weekly Bible class. The Sunday School, we are happy to say, continues to prosper.

STOURBRIDGE, January 12th. - Dear Brother, Having omitted to write you last month I now send you the subjects of the lectures delivered here since November - they have been as follows: - December 6th, "Who are the Lord's Messengers? - Modern apostles and prophets so called, weighed in the balance of Scripture and found wanting." Brother F. N. Turney. December 13th, "The Great Miracle of the Nineteenth Century - the Jews - their past, present, and future," Brother F. N. Turney. December 20th, "The Angelic Message on the Plains of Bethlehem," Brother Ellis. December 27th, "The World's Future: political, social, and religious, as set forth in the Scriptures," Brother F. N. Turney. January 3rd, "Handel's Messiah: is it sung with the heart and understanding," Brother H. Turney. January 10th, "The Way of

Salvation, as shown by Jesus and His apostles,” Brother D. Handley. The first of these, as you will see from the title, was aimed against the Irvingites. As these people have lately been making considerable stir in our small town, we thought a word by way of exposing their unscriptural and absurd pretensions would create a little interest. This proved to be the case, for that and the following lecture were very fairly attended; but, although the lecture was reported by one of their party, we have, as yet, heard nothing more of the matter. I am sorry to say that the audiences since have not been so large as we could wish; possibly the recent severe weather may, to some extent, have caused this. On Saturday, December 26th, we held our Christmas tea party. There were between forty and fifty brethren and sisters and friends, including a good number from Birmingham. After tea, short addresses were given by the brethren, hymns and anthems sung, and a very profitable evening spent. I am glad to say that we have another applicant for immersion; a Mr. Powel, who has attended the meetings for some time, and whose father is a leading man among the “Plymouth Brethren” here. We toil on, being careful not to build up “wood, hay, and stubble,” and knowing that “gold, silver, and precious stones” are not to be found in great quantities, and without much labour. - F. N. TURNEY.

SWANSEA. - Just before leaving Birmingham for South Wales, I accidentally met with Mr. F. R. Shuttleworth, with whom I had a long conversation, on the subject of Christ and His mission. It is known to yourself and most of your readers that Mr. F. R. S. believes that the Christ was born a slave, and that the fetters which bind the natural sons and daughters of Adam bound Him also. He assured me that the subject was “for ever settled,” so far as the Temperance Hall people were concerned; and that it was not their intention to make a “crotchet” of it, and therefore it was only dealt with as other subjects, when they came up in the natural order of reading and discussion. It is quite right to avoid making any subject a “crotchet,” but it is quite wrong to speak of any subject in this imperfect state as being “settled for ever.” The wish, in all probability, is father to the thought, but people don’t always get what they wish for, as the cry of “Peace and Safety” means sudden destruction, so it may be with the cry of “settled for ever.” The flimsy way in which the “settlement” has been arrived at makes it possible if not probable for hostilities to be renewed even in their own camp; certain it is that as long as things remain as they are, so long are the people at the Temperance Hall content to look to a Slave for salvation; but it is one thing to “look for,” and quite another thing to obtain. I requested Mr. S., who freely asserted to me that Christ was born in bondage, to name the date of Christ’s life when He became free? The reply was, “on the day of His death.” To this I said, “it appears to me that was the very day He went to bondage; but what proof do you offer in support of the assertion? My proof, said he, is found in the first seven verses of the seventh chapter of Romans. The verses being quoted, Mr. Shuttleworth attempted to establish their meaning to be that men obtained freedom by dying. Your readers must judge for themselves as to how far this theory is correct; for myself I fail to see how the Apostle’s argument in the chapter and verses named can be made to apply to the subject in any way whatever. The teaching is, that the ceremonial law of Moses is dead, and that therefore its dominion has ceased, and the Jews were at liberty to be united or married to Christ, who has rendered the ceremonial aspect of the law null and void by being nailed to the cross; but Paul spoke to men “who knew the law,” and in proportion as the law is understood the Epistle to the Romans will be apprehended. On arriving in Swansea almost the first man I met was Mr. R. Goldie, and as soon as we had exchanged the usual greeting’s, I enquired of him if he had made any progress on the question in dispute since I had last seen him? He replied, “I am further from you than ever, that is, if you are in the same position you were when here six months ago.” I said, are you quite sure you understood my position at that time, because it is just possible you did not, and to tell you the truth, I have some doubt about it myself?” I continued, suppose I were to relate in two sentences what my position is, so that hereafter you will know where I stand. My belief, said I, is, that the Adamic race were born “in the bonds of iniquity, and in the gall of bitterness.” Christ, not being a member of the race by human begettal, He was not born in “bonds,” but in a state of freedom from iniquity. Having the Deity for His Father, He was by birth what we are by adoption. God is our Father and Christ, our brother from the day of our adoption. God was His Father from the day of His birth.” “I believe the same thing,” said Mr. Goldie, and brethren everywhere believe it also, and you know it. I can speak at least for the Swansea brethren, they will believe what you have stated. My reply was, “if this is so neither you nor the Brethren in Swansea are far “removed” from me, since you, as their representative, have stated that we all believe the same things.” At this we parted, and as I walked away I could not help thinking he either does not understand my position or he is strangely inconsistent in sailing under false colours; a belief that does not develop moral courage is worth nothing to anyone. I have since heard that Mr. Goldie has repeatedly told the Neath brethren, who are all rejoicing in an “uncondemned Christ,” that he believes with them. On Sunday, the 3rd ultimo, Brother Clement being at Neath, I was invited to speak at the Mumbles. Here I found the brethren and sisters as hearty as usual, and as actively engaged in the “Holy War” “against everything that exalteth itself against

the knowledge of God.” There is much credit due to Brother Clement, and the “little flock” in the Mumbles. The good accomplished in this “dark corner of the earth,” as Brother C. calls it, will not be known until the day of reckoning, when the Judge of all the earth will descend from heaven and “reward every man as his work shall be.” The service of our brethren in the Mumbles is very scriptural; it is without doubt, from beginning to end, “the Bible and the Bible only,” no hymn or chant book or instrumental music is used; but the presiding brother gives out chapter and verse or verses which he thinks suitable, and the singing is rendered in a very efficient manner, which speaks much for the attention which the brethren and sisters must devote to the service of praise, which is always “comely.” This is as it should be, Hymn-books may be all very well in large meetings; but the words of the Spirit cannot be surpassed. At Neath, a town about eight miles from Swansea, the services are conducted the same as in the Mumbles. Brother Heard was for some time the only representative of the Truth, but now, through his indefatigable perseverance in proclaiming the Gospel, he can rejoice in the fellowship of fourteen or sixteen persons, including several members of his own family, who cherish the same hope and exercise the same faith. Five have been added to their number recently, and several others are enquiring the way to “honour and immortality.” The brethren have but one desire, and that is, that they may so “seek” as to “find” the richest of all treasures, and be freed from the bondage of sin, and become the servants of Him who bought them with His own precious blood. - JAMES MARTIN.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

BUCYRUS. - Brother Walsh is exerting himself for the spread of the truth in the circulation of the Lamp, and hopes that it will enlighten and edify.

CHICAGO. - Brother W. A. Harris and his friends are doing what they can in this city for the furtherance of the Gospel, but the soil appears somewhat unfavourable; men are too busy money-getting, and women too fond of fashion. The circumstances are trying indeed to those who have an earnest zeal for God’s work; but they may take comfort out of the consideration that their reward will not be according to the number of converts, but to the hard work in endeavouring to make them. Brother Harris desires us to mention that he has a pamphlet for sale, entitled “The nature of Jesus Christ, the Saviour” price 3d., post free. Any orders handed to us will be transmitted to him. - Chicago, December 18th, 1874. - Dear Brother Turney, - Your long and interesting letter of the 2nd November to Brother S. W. Coffman, was read by me with very great pleasure. Brother Jno. D. Coffman handed it to me for perusal on his way through Chicago for Maryland, where he at present is. Allow me to congratulate you on the doctrinal position you have assumed, which seems to be identical with our own, and strictly scriptural, and which Brother Donaldson, of Detroit, has been proclaiming by word of mouth, with the assistance of a chart, for a number of years, in fact, from a period prior to the Doctor’s death until now; and this he has done in the face of the most violent opposition, and sometimes personal abuse, as well as with a feeble condition of health, often relapsing into prostration and sickness; so you may judge how pleased we all feel that there is now a prospect of this subject being thoroughly and critically canvassed by yourself - whose ability to take hold and to analyse a subject we all most cordially admit - and therefore, thank God that a door is now open for the brethren to see and consider the doctrine in all its depth, grandeur, and sublimity. It appears to us now, and has for two years past, that this subject must come up among the brethren prior to the Apocalypse of our Lord and Saviour in the same manner as did the subject of the Judgment: for - as I wrote Brother Roberts - “If this doctrine be of God it will prevail, and a man will be found to publish it whether we like it or not” - and now, indeed, this appears to be coming to pass, and though you will find the agitation of the doctrine attended by much unpleasant and violent opposition, yet, this is no more than attended its publication by Jesus Himself in the first century. The servant is not above his master. If they have called the “master of the house” a blasphemer on this account, you may very well expect to be regarded as such by those who are faithless or ignorant. But is it not a duty, as well as a pleasure, to suffer some of the ignominy which He suffered, and, especially so, when on account of upholding the identical doctrine He taught. Is there any occupation more noble than this? I know of none. If we suffer with Him we shall also reign with Him, but if we deny Him He also will deny us, says the apostle. Therefore I wish you God-speed in your efforts to maintain the truth, for in this way it is that you may “honour the Son even as you honour the Father” - quibbles to the contrary notwithstanding - and we shall ever pray that in this work you may be undaunted by all opposition, and with an eye - single to the glory of God and His testimony - you will advocate it, if you have to do it single-handed. O what a glorious thing it is to feel with our feet the solid rock we stand upon, and this more especially when we observe those who are on the quick-sands of infidelity and doubt ever wavering; to-day occupying apparently solid ground and to-morrow washed hither and thither by speculation and a desire to harmonize “what I have written” with

later and contradictory teaching. Our watchword must be now, since the Doctor's death, more than ever, "to the law and to the testimony." This is the rock we stand on, and therefore we can rejoice in the goodness, long suffering, mercy, and love, manifested to us by the mighty Ail, whom we are now able to address as Father, and to approach unto with confidence devoid of fear, through the manifestation of His Son, who took away the sin of the world and became our High Priest within the veil. The thunders and lightnings of Sinai veiling the stern majesty of Omnipotence, and causing those who saw and heard them to tremble, have been put away, and the beloved Son of God Himself preaching peace and glad-tidings of great joy, invites us, in loving words, to "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." That you may be successful in promoting this greatest and most noble feature of the system of God's righteousness is the prayer of yours sincerely, W. A. HARRIS.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind. - Enclosed find twenty-five cents for a few tracts entitled an Answer to the Sacrifice of Christ, which I fully endorse. Wishing you success. - P. R. SHARPE.- *We cannot account for the two extra copies of Lamp as one only is entered in our book. If they belong to someone else we shall be hearing soon, and will let you know; if not, lend them to your friends. - EDITOR.*

NEW YORK. - Brother N. S. Latimer is pleased with the articles on Eve's Tempter, and the temptation of Christ reconsidered. The argument in the latter he thinks clear and good, but the former he intends to investigate more. He refers to our visit to New York, and to the satisfaction felt with our remarks. He could not think that so sincere and earnest a man had renounced the faith, and he does not, after reading the Lamp and other things, believe we have renounced it: but that we are working in a way acceptable to God. Lately he has been enquiring of some, when Jesus became the Christ? and has received various answers. Some say, at birth; others, when he was twelve years old, and so forth; and thinks others would answer, at His resurrection. All this shows that we were not writing superfluously when we penned the leaders in January issue. We hope they will be useful in helping to make that question understood. Brother Latimer regrets that some of the Brethren seem afraid to think for themselves. This ought not to be. No man can be safe from evil influences until he has become persuaded in his own mind by calm investigation. If he has not done this, he is liable to be carried about by different winds of doctrine, just as his feelings happen to be moved. There ought to be a more studious reading of the Word, and a more determined spirit of investigation.

INCOMES OF BISHOPS.

The diocese of Winchester comprises the counties of Hants and Surrey, and the Channel Islands, and Dr. Sumner presided over it for forty-two years, having in 1827 been translated from the bishopric of Llandaff, then worth only £1,000 a year. The value of the see of Winchester has been variously estimated from £10,000 to £30,000 a year, but it is officially stated at £10,417. The diocese of Exeter is the largest in England. It embraces the whole of the vast district west of the county of Somerset, and includes the Scilly Islands. The see, which had for a long time been in a state of ecclesiastical chaos, had been held by Dr. Phillpotts for nearly forty years. The Bishop held a canonry in Durham Cathedral, and his income was £6,700 a year. Within the term of his episcopate Dr. Sumner received £438,514, and Dr. Phillpotts £268,000. It may be added that, on the passage of the Act for the superannuation of the Bishops of London and Durham, in 1865, Dr. Phillpotts strongly adhered to the doctrine of "once a bishop always a bishop," and opposed the measure at every stage. - Daily News.]

WHAT is wanted to make an English bishop? One of our primates says 70,000l at least; or, including all his respectable pertinences of gentlemanly canons, etc., at least 150,000l. Lord Portman tells us that we cannot expect a proper bishop even at a cost of 2,500l a year. The Apostle says, Nothing is wanted but the Grace of God ready to be poured out at any instant through the Hands of the Ascended Head of the Church and Ruler of the Nations. In Parliament or out of Parliament, very rich or very poor, with great social dignity or with little, Jesus Christ gives a bishop to His Church to be an Apostle, an evangelist, a prophet, a pastor, a teacher. That in which bishops externally differ is the little thing; that in which they are one and all alike, is 'grace' which makes them bishops, is everything.

EDUCATION.

Accustom a child, as soon as he can speak to narrate his little experiences, his chapter of accidents; his griefs, his fears, his hopes: to communicate what he has noticed in the world without, and what he feels struggling in the world within. Anxious to have something to narrate, he will be induced to give attention to objects around him, and what is passing in the sphere of his instruction, and to observe and note events will become one of his first pleasures: and this is the groundwork of a thoughtful character.

There is a story of a painter who painted fruits so well, that the birds came and pecked them; and really, when we have passed an hour amongst good pictures, we find no difficulty in believing it.