

# The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 2.

MAY 1875

No. 7.

---

## CONTENTS

Page 2.	Notes On The Psalms	Bro. S.G.Hayes
Page 5.	Armageddon At Hand	Francisco Chronicle
Page 5.	Assyria and Mesopotamia	Gleaner
Page 7.	The Giving of The Law from Sinai	Jewish Chronicle
Page 8.	The Christ Sinless	H. Brittain
Page 9.	Europe in The 16 <sup>th</sup> Century	Jewish Chronicle
Page 10.	Ninevah: Its Past Glory and Present Desolation	New York Times
Page 13.	Emotional Revival – Preaching to Children	S. F. Chronicle
Page 14.	The Talmud	Jewish Chronicle
Page 14.	The Jewish Jubilee	George Riggott
Page 18.	Remarks on Bro. Charles Reid’s Letter of Last Month	Editor
Page 19.	Letters to The Editor	
Page 21.	The Gospel of The Kingdom (2 <sup>nd</sup> Article)	Bro. John Cameron
Page 27.	Questions Answered	
Page 27.	Children’s Columns	
Page 28.	Hosanna	Selected from Quiver
Page 28.	Intelligence	
Page 31.	Foreign Intelligence	

“But, what is the “element of evil” on our side? Bro. Reid’s answer, so far as can be gathered from the letter before us, is this: “Your theory seeks to supplement the word by the use of unscriptural terms, such as free life.” But in what way free life is an unscriptural term Bro. Reid has not attempted to show. All will agree that our lives are either free or bond; that is, we ourselves are either slaves or free men; for when we speak of life we mean living men, not life in the abstract, if such a thing can be. Now the question is very simple and easy of decision. Instead of its being, as Bro Reid intimates, an untaught question, it is a question as distinctly and impressively taught as any question in the Word, and for the very reason that it is a question second to none in vitality... We repeat the question, then. Are we the professed disciples of the Christ - free or bond? FREE! will be, doubtless, the unanimous response. Being free from sin, and our life hid with Christ in God, is not our life a free life - free from the penalty to which we were obnoxious previous to our purchase by the blood of Christ? It must be so, otherwise redemption has availed us nothing. Now with respect to freedom and bondage, in this sense, we ask, was there ever a moment when our Redeemer was not free? Was there ever a time when death, the wages of sin, had a claim against the Christ himself? No more emphatic negative could be given to this query than what is apostolically given, namely, that “He did no sin,” and further that “IN Him is no sin” To his immediate brethren John wrote, saying, “ye know” this to be true, but now there are some who do not know it, and who affirm the opposite teaching that Christ died for Himself, and that He was a son of Adam!”

*“But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is Spirit: and they that worship God must worship Him in Spirit and in truth.” - John 4:23 & 24.*

# NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

## SECOND ARTICLE. - Ps. 11.

IN the first volume of the Christadelphian Lamp some observations were made on the second Psalm, and among other things attention was called to a peculiarity in the fourth verse of that Psalm, in which the word rendered Lord is different in the original from that used in all other places where the name Lord occurs. A reason was suggested to account for the variation, which, it was concluded, could not be accidental.

The reader is now invited to the consideration of another peculiarity which is presented in the last verse of the same Psalm, where the word translated Son is in the original "bar," whereas in the seventh verse it is not "bar" but "behn." The latter Hebrew word is found in a multitude of instances in the Old Testament Scriptures, both in the singular and plural forms, and is rendered son and sons, and frequently also children. The former term, namely, bar, is comparatively of rare occurrence in the Bible; in the sense of son it is employed only once in the Psalms, and in this particular place. It is met with a few times in the New Testament in connection with proper names, as Bar-Jonah, Bar-Timeus, Bar-Jesus, etc., signifying Son of Jonah, Son of Timeus, etc. The same word is rendered son three times in the second verse of the last chapter of Proverbs, and in the same signification it is used four times in Ezra, and four times in Daniel. In the last mentioned Book there are eight passages where it is translated 'field.' There are a few instances also where it is rendered corn, and a few others in which it is given 'wheat.' As an adjective, it occurs in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Canticles, altogether seven times, in which places it is rendered by four different English words, namely, 'clean,' 'pure,' 'choice,' and 'clear.' Strictly speaking, it is said to be a Chaldee and not a pure Hebrew word; this is confirmed by its occurrence in the Chaldee portions of the Books of Daniel and Ezra. It will doubtless appear strange to our readers that the same term can admit of being turned into English in such a variety of ways, and be made to express such different meanings as are conveyed by the nouns son, corn, and field, and by the adjectives clean, pure, choice, and clear. A little explanation will suffice to remove the difficulty. Hebrew is a language of ideas and not of arbitrary sounds, and every Hebrew root has a precise idea attached to it, indicative of some quality, which idea is retained in all the derivatives from that root, however numerous they may be. Now, the idea which attaches to the word 'bar,' at present under investigation, is that of 'purity' or 'cleanness.' It remains therefore, to show that this idea is contained in the various renderings of this word 'bar.' The first is 'son,' or 'child,' considered pure in the sense of being free from actual guilt. It is applied to corn when separated or cleansed from chaff, and thus made pure. In John xii. 24, Jesus speaks of Himself as the "corn of wheat," and there is no believer in Him but will admit that He was pure.

So far, the matter can be easily comprehended. The appropriateness of the same idea to the case of a field, is not at first sight so evident, yet even here, due reflection will exhibit the connection. What is a field? Is it not the clear, pure, open country, as contrasted with the dwellings and cultivations of men? This will be plain, from the consideration of such passages as the following, from the Prophet Daniel: "They shall drive thee (Nebuchadnezzar) from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen." - Dan. iv. 25, 32. Used adjectively there is no difficulty in understanding the various applications of the term. For example, in the expression the choice one, Cant. vi. 9, is intended selection or separation from others on account of some good quality, such as purity, cleanness, etc. After what has been advanced, the propriety of applying to the Son of God an epithet having such significations, will be abundantly manifest to the Bible student. While on this subject it may be remarked further that the Hebrew word "berith," meaning "Covenant," and used with reference to the Lord Jesus in Isaiah xlix. 8, is derived from exactly the same root, namely, bar; concerning this something more will be said presently.

On this point of purity indeed, in relation to the Lord Jesus, the Holy Scriptures are most emphatic and explicit, it is mentioned many times and in a variety of ways by the inspired teachers, from the record of His conception to the period of His offering Himself without spot to God, thus in response to Mary, the angel Gabriel answered and said, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke i. 35). "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as He is pure." "And ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin" (1 John iii. 3, 5). "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (Heb. vii. 26). And, in allusion to the Messiah, Solomon says, "my love, my dove, my undefiled (Cant. v. 2, vi 6). David speaks in the same strain concerning Him in (Ps. Ixxiv. 19), saying, "O deliver not the soul of thy turtle-dove unto the multitude of the wicked." This passage will remind the reader of

the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus in the form of a dove, (emblematic of purity) at His baptism in the Jordan, as recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

Conceived of Holy Spirit, begotten of the Father, born of a virgin, doing always those things that were pleasing to God, anointed with Holy Spirit without measure, a dwelling place of Deity, an embodiment of truth and love, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, a cleanser from all unrighteousness (and He must needs Himself be clean), such was Jesus the Son of God, Jehovah's turtle-dove! How truly significant, then, we repeat the word 'bar', as applied to Him!

The Hebrew word 'behn,' which recurs so often in the Old Testament, has no affinity in its root signification with the preceding, though both are alike translated Son in the second Psalm. This word 'behn' is derived from the Hebrew verb 'bahnah,' signifying to build, build up, restore, repair. In this respect a son is, so to speak, built up by his parents, and moreover is one who builds up or continues his father's house or family. In illustration of this, the following passages may be quoted: "That man that will not build up his brother's house - Deut. xxv. 9: and again, "It may be that I may obtain children by her," - margin, be builded by her. Gen. xvi. 2. Having thus endeavoured to trace the etymology of the original words translated Son in the seventh and twelfth verses of this second Psalm, our next object is to show how appropriate they both are to the Lord Jesus in the particular connection in which they stand in these two verses respectively. That the personage alluded to in the phrases "my Son" and "the Son" is none other than the Lord Jesus is proved beyond all question, by the fact that the Apostle Paul quotes the very words of the Psalmist and applies them to Jesus. See Acts xiii. 33, and Heb. v. 5.

With this inspired commentary to guide us, we feel that we stand on sure ground, and can confidently affirm that the day referred to in the seventh verse of the Psalm was the day of the resurrection of the Son of God from the dead, when it was declared by His Heavenly Father, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee." This wonderful display of Almighty power was the crowning proof that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, and this grand event was at the same time an earnest or pledge of the future resurrection of "all the blessed who put their trust in Him." Let us dwell a little on this great fact, with the view of pointing out the fitness of the original word translated Son and applied to Jesus in this place. The "prepared body," for a time the dwelling place of the Spirit, had been taken, and by wicked hands crucified and slain. The Spirit which tabernacled there had forsaken it; life had departed from it; and, marred by the nails and the spear of the Roman soldiers, it had been deposited in the tomb; where, though not suffered to see corruption because it was God's "Holy One," it nevertheless remained for three days and three nights. Now, what was the resurrection of Jesus but the building up, repairing, and restoring of that same body by the Father who raised Him from the dead? It was the destroyed temple rebuilt and thus perfected. "Destroy this temple (said Jesus) and in three days I will raise it up." Jno. ii. 19 ; Luke xiii. 32. "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore." Rev. i. 18. Thus built up and restored Himself, Jesus becomes the restorer and builder of "a great multitude which no man can number," all of whom will bear His image and be in His likeness, for He is "the resurrection and the life." With regard to the twelfth verse, some commentators have suggested that the phrase, "kiss the Son," should read "kiss purity," but such a version would neither harmonise with what follows, nor throw additional light on the passage. Others again have candidly confessed themselves unable to assign a reason why the Psalmist used such a different word for Son in this verse from what he did in the seventh. The reader must judge for himself whether the remarks presented in this article tend to solve the question. The idea contained in the words "kiss the Son," is evidently that of submission. The kings and judges of the earth are commanded to bow to the authority of Jehovah's Anointed King, lest by their contumacy they cause His wrath to kindle to their destruction.

This Psalm is parallel with Psalm Ixxii, and both are indicative of that period when the Lord Jesus will have returned to the earth "to execute the judgment written," as well as to give reward to His servants the prophets, and to the saints and them that fear His name, small and great; and to destroy them which destroy the earth. - Rev. xi. 18. He comes to exercise authority both as King and Judge, and to rule the world in righteousness. David declares 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Now, Jesus is emphatically the "just one" and the pure one, and therefore the divinely chosen ruler of the nations. Thus it is written of Him in the forty-fifth Psalm, "Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips; therefore God hath blessed thee for ever. Gird Thy sword upon Thy thigh, O most Mighty, with Thy glory and Thy majesty. And in Thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth, and meekness and righteousness: and Thy right hand shall teach Thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the King's enemies; whereby the people fall under Thee. Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." - Ps. xlv. 2-7. At this crisis it is that, in the words of Malachi, He will be "like a

refiner's fire and like fuller's soap. And He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." - Mal. iii. 2, 3. Then will be fulfilled the covenant made with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob, and confirmed by the shedding of the precious blood of Him who was made a covenant (berith) or purification sacrifice for this very purpose. As already stated, this word Covenant is derived from the Hebrew, and signifies a purifier, a purifying sacrifice, and is especially applicable to Jesus the great antitype of all the sacrifices offered under the law. The word berith also signifies a purifying or cleansing herb, from the ashes of which soap was made. In connection with this, let the passage just cited from the Prophet Malachi be particularly noted. While it is certainly true that Jesus was perfected on the third day, which was also the day of His resurrection. His offering of Himself and His acceptance by the Father transpired not on earth, but, in harmony with the type, took place in the anti-typical most holy; that is, according to the Apostle Paul, "Heaven itself" - see Heb. ix. 24, from which, not having descended, He has not yet acted the part of a purifier of the sons of Levi. And when He returns in power and great glory, He will not only restore and build up His sleeping saints but purify them from every particle of earthiness, making them like Himself immortal, and incorruptible, and equal unto the angels, so that they can die no more. Their nature will then be assimilated to His, pure, Spiritual, and holy. Previously they were the subjects of a moral and intellectual purification, and now of a physical, so that they are "complete in Him," without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, "holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight;" therefore able to "abide the day of His coming," and to stand before Him "who is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap." Though all power has been given to Jesus both in Heaven and on earth (Mat. xxviii. 18) He has not yet exercised that power; when He uttered these words He was about to leave the world, and it is not until He comes again that He assumes the character of the restorer and the repairer. - Is. Iviii. 12.

Such, it appears to us, are the reasons why these two different words are applied to Jesus at these two different periods of His manifestation.

A writer in the Jewish Chronicle of January 1st, in answer to the request of "An Unprejudiced Enquirer" to furnish some explanation of the second Psalm, disposes of it in the following cursory manner: "The Christians think the summary of this Psalm is the kingdom of Christ, and that kings are exhorted to accept it; whereas, our summary is that, at the time of the Messiah, all men will acknowledge God. The people subdued by the Israelites revolted against a Jewish king and wished to recover their liberty (verses 1 to 3); their efforts are vain; God has instituted this king and has given Him the dominion over the people (verses 4 to 9); exhortation to these people to submit to the Jewish king in order that God in His anger may not annihilate them; with Him alone is the salvation (verses 10 to 12). The form of this Psalm is dramatic; there is a difference of scenes, of persons, of speech, and of action. Raschi, Kimehi, and Aben Ezra, think that the king referred to is David, and that it relates to the war with the Philistines (see 2 Sam. v. 5, 17 and 24). Others apply it to Solomon and the Messiah. Aben Ezra's opinion seems the most probable. He says: It appears to me that this Psalm has been composed by one of the singers upon David on the day of his anointment, which is the reason why it is said in verse seven, This day I have begotten thee. In verse seven we find: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. 'My son,' is a title given to every king of Israel (see 2 Sam. vii. 5-14), it is even given to the kings of other nations (see Ps. lxxxix. and xxviii). The word behn signifies not only SON, but an adopted son (see Ex. ii. 5-10). 'Begotten' means 'instituted thee king.' 'Raschi explains also that the word hyyom signifies, this time, now, as well as, to-day (Gen. iv. 11; Dent. i. 39). This day that I have instituted thee king over them I have begotten thee, in order that thou may be called my son, is a poetical expression to indicate the origin (see Jer, ii. 27). The twelfth verse, "Kiss the son lest he be angry" has been for centuries a subject for controversy, among theologians of various creeds; the Septuagint renders it, 'Accept the discipline,' and also the Chaldaic. The largest number of commentators render nashshekoo by kiss or render homage, an Eastern, custom of kissing the hand of a superior. Samuel, after having consecrated Saul as king, embraced him (1 Sam. x. 1). Idols were also worshipped in this manner (1 Kings xix. 18; Hosea xiii. 2). Bar is son in Chaldaic (see Pro. xxxi. 2); the poet wished to avoid the assonance of behn, with pen which follows." This is about an average specimen of what may be expected from Jewish unbelievers in Jesus, when they attempt the interpretation of the Messianic Psalms. The very pith and marrow of the subject is either entirely overlooked or misunderstood. How true it is that the veil is still upon their hearts! Let us unite with the Apostle in hoping the time will soon come when they shall "turn to the Lord, and the veil shall be taken away."

- S. G. Hayes.

## **ARMAGEDDON AT HAND.**

A CAREFUL survey of the existing European situation seems almost sufficient to justify a belief in the prediction of the enthusiasts who declare that the true interpretation of John's Apocalyptic vision shows that "the battle of the great day of God Almighty at Armageddon" is actually at hand. All Europe is at present like one vast camp. The nations are arming from the British Channel to the Ural Mountains; from the Mediterranean to the Baltic, as if with a prophetic understanding that a terrible and portentous crisis is at hand. According to the Paris Republique Francaise a German camp of manoeuvres for 150,000 men is about to be formed near Treves, under the immediate command of the Emperor. According to the Kolnische Zeitung (Cologne Journal) the French are about establishing a similar great camp for drill and military manoeuvres near the German frontiers. The nations are becoming armies; the general masses of the people are being turned into soldiers. Russia has a greedy eye on India and the Sick Man. Austria has long coveted a portion of the territory of Turkey. France is said to be still cherishing feelings of bitterness, and revolving schemes of revenge. There are also those who predict a great Ultramontane combination for the restoration of Rome and the temporal power to the Supreme Pontiff. Rumours of schemes of conquest, of plots, conspiracies, and new alliances fill the circumambient air, as motes people a sunbeam. The arsenals are busy shaping more deadly implements of destruction than were ever before known. The foundries are casting colossal cannon, compared with which those heretofore used in warfare are but children's toys. The powder with which these mighty engines were to be charged was not thought to have sufficient power, and the world is now given to understand by the Baltic Gazette that the German Government has discovered or secured the secret of a new "prismatic powder" for its heavy guns, which is immensely superior to any used or known elsewhere in Europe. When we contemplate the present attitude of the Continental Powers; when we estimate the vast numbers of their standing armies; when we consider the amount of interruption to the arts of peace, and the crushing burdens upon the people, which they entail; when we see Germany and France arming to the teeth, and by their vast preparations compelling their neighbours to strain every nerve and tax every resource for the same purpose, in order to be ready for the fearful crisis which all seem to anticipate - when we see these things we may well feel thankful that our happy position, with no powerful nations upon our border, exempts us from such necessities; that with a feeble navy, and a standing army inferior to that of any fourth-rate Power of the old world, we still draw peaceful breath, and sleep untroubled by dreams of danger from any external foe. - San Francisco Chronicle.

---

## **ASSYRIA AND MESOPOTAMIA.**

(Continued from may page 207)

FOR a long series of years the foreign relations of the Jewish kingdom turned upon Assyria, and from the commencement of that period we consequently meet with its empire in the sacred writings. This may be regarded as the second historical period of the Assyrian empire. The first king of Assyria named in Scripture is Pul or Phul, who appeared in the countries west of the Euphrates, in the days of Menahem, king of Israel (772 B.C.), upon whom he made war, and carried off two tribes of his subjects, finally exacting from the weak monarch a tribute of a thousand talents of silver as the price of his maintenance on the throne (1 Chron. v. 26; 2 Kings xv. 19, 20). We find the prophet Hosea making frequent allusions to the practice common to both the Hebrew kingdoms, of throwing themselves for support on the kings of Assyria. The next Assyrian monarch mentioned by name is Tiglath Pileser (Diglath-pul-Assur, great Lord of the Tigris, called in Aelian, "Thilgamus"), whose accession and intercourse with the Jewish nation are repeatedly mentioned (2 Kings xv. 29; xvi. 5, 10 ; 1 Chron. v. 26 ; 2 Chron. xxviii.16; Isaiah vii. 1). The usurper Pekah (2 Kings xv. 25), who, by the murder of the hereditary monarch, had established himself as ruler of the ten revolted tribes composing the kingdom of Israel, entered into treaty with Rezin, king of Syria, with the objects of expelling the race of David from the throne of Judah, and of putting upon it a tributary of his own. Ahaz, king of Jerusalem, whose throne was menaced by the movements of the confederates, called Tiglath Pileser to his assistance, offering him feudal allegiance and the temple treasures as the price of that service. "So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, saying, 'I am thy servant and thy son; come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the

hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me.” And Ahaz took the silver and gold, that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king’s house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria” (2 Kings xvi. 7-9). The king of Assyria advanced at the request of Ahaz, and laid siege to Damascus, subdued Syria, Galilee, and all the country east of Jordan, and sent the chief inhabitants of Syria to the banks of the Kir or Kur, - a river which, uniting its stream with the Aras or Araxes, flows into the Caspian, in N. lat. 39 - while those of Galilee were transferred to Assyria. Tiglath-Pileser soon proved not less dangerous as an ally than he could have been in the character of an enemy. The accumulated wealth of three centuries of prosperous trade was exposed to the view of the wily Assyrian, and with it the weakness of its possessors. The Syrians were subdued; but Tiglath-Pileser, instead of retiring to his own dominions, hovered dubiously about Jerusalem. From this point it would have been easy for him to move against the Philistines and Edomites, who during the Syrian war had invaded the southern and western frontiers of Judah, and made themselves masters of its strong cities; but it is said that “Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, came unto the king of Israel and distressed him, but strengthened him not; for Ahaz took away a portion out of the house of the Lord, and out of the house of the king and of the princes and gave it unto the king of Assyria; but he helped him not” (2 Chron. xxviii. 16, 21). Ahaz and his successors had now to contend alone with the whole force of the king of Assyria, instead of with that of two petty princes.

The successor of Tiglath-Pileser was Shalmaneser, called in the apocryphal book of Tobit, Enemessar, who ascended the throne about 729 B.C. Ahaz still occupied the throne of David, and Hoshea was king of Israel. Shalmaneser now resolved to complete the subjugation of Israel begun by his predecessor. He commenced by exacting of Hoshea a tributary acknowledgment of subjection - “Hoshea became his servant, and rendered him presents” (2 Kings xvii. 3-6). Growing weary of this dependance, the king of Israel attempted to negotiate a defensive alliance with So, king of Egypt, then the only power that could pretend to rival the Assyrian, and proceeded so far as to withhold the annual tribute. Upon this rebellion Shalmaneser advanced into Samaria, where he carried on a campaign of three years, finally imprisoned its king, and carried away the Ten Tribes into his own country. The captive Israelites were sent to Halah and Habor, two cities by the river of Gozan, and into the cities of the Medes, a fact which shows that Media was not yet separated from Assyria. In their stead a number of Assyrian families from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, and Sepharvaim, were settled in Samaria, and mingling with the few remaining Israelites, form the Samaritan people, whom we subsequently meet in the New Testament.

Mr. Dickinson (article on “the fate of the Ten Tribes of Israel”, in Jour. Royal As. Soc., vol. iv., p. 217) remarks on the foregoing passage in 2 King’s, that the interpretation cannot be other than this, “To the Habor, the river of Gozan,” as the particle “by” has been interpolated. As regards Halah, there are no means of ascertaining precisely whether this is the name of a river or of a town; but he surmises it to be a river. The Greek translation of the Septuagint renders the passage “about the Halah, and about, the Habor, rivers of Gozan.” In substantiation of this view, Mr. Dickinson quotes Edrisi: “And from Al Habor to Karkasiah is two marches; and Karkasiah is a town on the east side of the Euphrates, and under it flows the Hermas, commonly called Al Habor.” This Al Habor is 250 miles west of Baghdad, near the left bank of the river Euphrates; and the name is extended to the district, stretching for miles along the banks of the river. Not many miles west of the source of this stream stands the mined town of Haran or Hara, the Charrac of the ancient geographers. About fifty miles from Kerkisyah, up the Habor, at its junction with another stream, stands the town of Naharaim, or the “Town of the two Rivers.” The one is the Habor, which flows down to Naharaim from a westerly direction; the other is called Al Halih and Halah by the Arabs, and the country on its banks is called by Ptolemy, Gauzanitis; when, therefore, Mr. Dickinson observes, “In the very places where it is most probable that the Israelites were deposited, we find every name recorded in Scripture so little changed in the lapse of centuries,” it is reasonable to believe that we have ascertained the locality in which the captives from Samaria were placed. Another argument in support of this theory, is, the probability that the conqueror would exchange the captives for people of his own country, as he would thus have vassals on whom he could rely, at distant points of his empire, while the malcontent foreigners being more immediately under his own eye, would be more likely to become incorporated with the Assyrians.

Sennacherib, who succeeded Shalmaneser, appears in Scripture as a worthy follower of his warlike predecessor. Since the inglorious reign of Ahaz, the kingdom of Judah had been numbered with the many states which confessed the superior lordship of Assyria. Hezekiah was the first king of Judah who “rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not” (2 Kings xviii. 7). For fourteen years the Assyrian refrained from chastising this presumption; but in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah’s reign, Sennacherib advanced against the fenced cities of Judah, and took them. The approach of the conqueror having opened Hezekiah’s eyes to the consequences of the quarrel he had provoked, while the Assyrian camp was yet at Lachish, he sent thither messengers bearing a full and complete submission: “I have

offended; return from me; that which thou puttest on me I will bear” (2 Kings xviii. 14), was the brief but expressive supplication of the penitent king. Sennacherib received the submission, but paid no regard to the conditions by which it was accompanied. In the exercise of his re-acknowledged power, he appointed to Hezekiah a tribute of thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver – a weight of bullion equal to about £266,850 sterling. When, to raise this large sum, Hezekiah had drained his own treasury, borrowed all the money of the Temple, and even stripped off the golden ornaments with which he had overlaid its doors and pillars, Sennacherib resumed the campaign, and sent his lieutenants with a large force to require the surrender of the king with his capital. The gasconading communications of these commissioners, as preserved by Isaiah, mark the arrogant and boastful character of the Assyrian people, and agree remarkably with the tone of the sculptures lately brought to light at Nimroud. Rabshakeh pretends that his master is the especial messenger of God, deputed to subjugate the earth; he is the Great King, the King of Assyria, and is ready not only to conquer the Jewish army, but, in pity to its weakness, to lend Hezekiah two thousand horses, etc. “Now, therefore, I pray thee, give pledges to my lord the king of Assyria, and I will deliver thee two thousand horses, if thou be able on thy part to set riders upon them” (2 Kings xviii. 23).

The signal catastrophe which cut short these insolent boastings is described with beautiful simplicity by Isaiah: “Then the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and four score and five thousand: and, when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses” (Isaiah xxxvii. 36).

Thus, in one night, perished 185,000 fighting men, a number which, considered as forming but one division of the invading forces, gives an exalted idea of the military power of Assyria at this time. The prophet, in the figurative style of his age and country, states that the enemy were smitten by “an angel of the Lord.” Isaiah’s words threaten the insolent conqueror with a “hot blast,” and Jeremiah speaks of them as being cut off by a “destroying wind;” words that favour the probability that Sennacherib’s army was destroyed by one of those hot winds which, to this day, sometimes destroy whole caravans.

A tradition preserved by Herodotus, who received it from his favourite authorities, the Egyptian priests, is too curious in resemblance to the Bible narrative to pass unnoticed. The priests’ transferring the entire event to their own country and the empire of their own deities, related that, after the reign of Anysis, there succeeded to the throne a priest of Vulcan, named Setho, who treated the military caste of Egypt with extreme contempt; and, as if he had no occasion for their services, among other indignities, he deprived them of their arurae, or fields of fifty feet square, which, by way of reward, his predecessors had given to each soldier. The result was that when Sennacherib, king of Arabia and Assyria, attacked Egypt with a mighty army, the warriors whom he had thus treated refused to assist him. In this perplexity the priest retired to the shrine of his god, before which he lamented his danger and misfortunes; here he sunk into a profound sleep, and his deity promised him in a dream, that, if he marched to meet the Assyrians, he should experience no injury, for that he would furnish him with assistance. The vision inspired him with confidence; he put himself at the head of his adherents, and marched to Pelusiam, the entrance of Egypt. Not a soldier accompanied the party, which was entirely composed of tradesmen and artisans. On their arrival at Pelusiam, so immense a number of mice infested by night the enemy’s camp, that their quivers and bows, together with what secured their shields to their arms, were gnawed to pieces. In the morning the Arabians, finding themselves without arms, fled in confusion, and lost great numbers of their men. There is now to be seen in the temple of Vulcan a marble statue of this king, having a mouse in his hand, and with the inscription, “Wherever thou art, learn from my fortune to reverence the gods.” (Euterpe cxili).

Such is the narrative of Herodotus, which, confused as it is, and evidently made up by the priests, is yet obviously connected with the true story. The visit to the temple, the prayer, the vision and deliverance are as nearly as possible, alike in both versions, and grammarians have discovered that the title under which the Egyptian god, who interposed on this occasion, was worshipped, was also ascribed to the supreme Deity of the Jews. – “Nineveh and its Palaces” by Joseph Bonomi, F.R.S.L. pp. 52-57. Gleaner

To be continued).

-----

## The Giving of The Law from Sinai

Why is Sinai chosen as the scene of this phenomenon? Surely not for the loftiness of its peak for it is not three thousand feet high. Surely not for its picturesque beauty, for it would be difficult to imagine a more unsightly mountain in a more desolate situation. Palestine could have boasted of finer mountain

scenery; there is Lebanon with its stately cedars, fruitful Carmel and lofty Hermon. But, as the Psalmist tells us, it was the mountain upon which God desired to descend. Sinai was elected henceforth to be the most sacred spot on earth, not for its stately proportions, not for its fruitfulness, not for its picturesque scenery, but because it was the lowliest of the mountains of the East. Say the Sages, "Wherever there is a display of God's magnificence, His humility is likewise portrayed." To this day a sweet awe creeps over the wanderer in the desert of Sin, as he nears the spot, sanctified by the presence of its God. To this day the wild Arab, and the uncultured Bedouin, slackens his pace to look up to the summit of the sacred mount with holy reverence.

- From "Sermon by the Rev. Isidore Harris." Jewish Chronicle.

---

## THE CHRIST SINLESS.

ALTHOUGH not a Christadelphian, I have thought it possible that the sayings of an old writer, on the subject of a Sinless Christ would be none the less acceptable to your readers. In the year 1604, Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, published a work entitled "The Survey of Christ's Sufferings for Man's redemption, etc.", in reply to the statements of some "brethren" concerning the nature of Christ and His work of redemption. I do not think that any truth ceases to be truth, because they who assert it are not entirely with myself or others on any other point about which difference may arise. (I have modernised the spelling of the words in my quotations).

These "brethren" had denied utterly a previous statement of the writer's that, "No similitude can prove Christ in taking our person on Him to be sinful, defiled, hateful, and accursed."

In this reply, pp. 266, 7, 8, he thus writes: "Come now to your terms of sinful, defiled, and accursed; and see how well they agree to Christ. First, if the holiness of God were so great in His person as to purge our uncleanness, much more was it able to resist our corruption and to keep Him from being defiled with our sins, from which He cleansed us. Again, if He were any way defiled with our sins, He must needs offer sacrifice, first for Himself, and then for us. But this is quite repugnant to the Apostle's doctrine; who saith, Christ needed not to offer up (any such) sacrifice for Himself (Heb. vii.27). Thirdly, if He were defiled by our sins, His office must defile Him; His nature, nor Adam's could not. That which was born of the Virgin, was HOLY (Luke i. 35), His life was innocent and just; He did no sin (1 Pet. ii. 22), nor knew no sin (2 Cor. v. 21); His office was more Holy than either of these; for these resisted sin, but His office cleansed sin. Now, to cleanse others from sin, required more holiness, than to keep Himself from sin. The one is the holiness of the creature, the other of the Creator. And how should the Priesthood defile Him, when the Sacrifice was holy, and undefiled? Christ offered Himself without spot to God (Heb. ix. 14), saith the Apostle directly speaking of His sacrifice. And Peter called Him the Lamb unspotted and undefiled (1 Pet. i. 19), which must be in respect of His Sacrifice. For He was the Lamb of God, which took away the sins of the world (John i. 29), else how could He be a Sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour unto God (Eph. v. 2), whose eyes are pure, and cannot behold wickedness (Hab. i. 13.) If He were any way unclean with His own, or with our sins, and if our sins could then defile Him, or make Him unclean, He is at this day sitting in the heavens, defiled and unclean.

For we have the very same connection with Him now, that we had then, being members of His body, as then we were, and He our head; and He still presenteth us to God, as then He did, and even by the virtue of those sufferings which He sustained here on earth for us. So that His mediation is now by the power of that passion which He then endured; and if His assuming sinners into His body, or being the propitiation for our sins, could then touch Him with any uncleanness, He cannot be free from it at this present. But His priesthood was holy then and undefiled, and so remaineth still both pure and perpetual.

And if, in the figurative Sacrifices of the Law, neither the Priest, nor the Sacrifices were defiled with the sins of the people, but were sanctified and accepted, when the one did offer, the other was sacrificed for sin; what ground of truth can it have, that the true, most Holy, and acceptable sacrifice for sin, which indeed purged the sins of the world, should defile either the person of Christ, or His office, or His action in that oblation. Lastly, since all pollution of soul is inherent, which you grant was not in Christ, how should He be defiled that had nothing in Him but holiness and righteousness, which, I trust are not defiled. If Christ were not defiled with our sins, then was He not sinful. One sin defileth, how much more then doth the fulness of sin make Christ unclean, which is your devotion to the Son of God."

"It is written," so stated these "brethren," "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh for sin, and condemned sin, in (His) flesh, in which likeness He stood before God." To this our writer replies: The

Scripture teacheth that Christ was made like to His brethren in all things (Heb. ii. 17), and did partake with them in flesh and blood, but the same scripture addeth without sin (Heb. i. v. 15). So that the likeness of sinful flesh excludeth all touch or taint of our sin, though it admits the likeness of our flesh in Christ. And, indeed, between His and ours, there was no difference, save the corruption of sin, which dwelleth in ours, and did not in His. You do, therefore, learnedly collect out of the Apostle's words, that where he saith, Christ was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh, for that He had true flesh, and no sin; you make Christ to be defiled and accursed with sin, for having the likeness of our flesh. [But the Syriac translation saith, God condemned sin in (Christ's) flesh, so the brethren.] The condemning of sin in the flesh of Christ, was the cleansing and abolishing sin by the body of Christ, which the Apostle calleth *ἀθετησι*, the destroying and taking away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself (Heb. ix. 26-28.) The text doth not say that God condemned Christ for sins, but on the contrary, that God condemned sin; that is, pardoned the guilt, weakened the power, removed the sting, and abandoned the memorial of all our sins for the obedience and patience which Christ shewed in His flesh. So that it is you, and not the Apostle, nor the Syriac translator, which would fain bring Christ within the compass of condemnation for sin, where they say quite otherwise, that not He, but sin was condemned, that is, destroyed in or by His flesh. Chrysostom saith rightly (Homil. 13, in Epist. ad Romanes), Thou seest sin everywhere condemned, not the flesh, which was crowned and obtained judgment against sin. And Austen taketh liberty to expound the text against your Syriac translation (Contra Maximinum li. 2), By the similitude of sinful flesh, saith he which was Christ's, God condemned sin in the flesh of sin, which was ours."

H. BRITTAIM.

---

## EUROPE IN THE 16th CENTURY.

THE sixteenth century constitutes one of the most remarkable periods in the history of Europe. The important changes which had taken place at the close of the fifteenth century had awakened thought, stimulated action, and prepared the way for the still more important future. With the fall of Constantinople fell the great Greek Empire, never to rise again; America had just been discovered; printing had been invented; and, by reason of the marriage of Isabella and Ferdinand, Spain had become the greatest country of Europe. But, amidst all this progress, no advance had been made in softening the asperities occasioned by differences of religious opinions; and one of the most cruel acts over which the fifteenth century closed was the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, for no offence other than that of a steadfast adherence and devotion to the faith of their fathers. The map of Europe at that period presented a far different aspect from that which it now wears. Spain then occupied the foremost place.

The Turkish Empire was in the zenith of its prosperity. Next in importance came France, although it was not so great territorially as it is now. Russia had hardly yet emerged from a state of barbarism, while Prussia was but an Electorate. The kingdoms of Poland, Sweden, and Denmark were about equal in status; while England was scarcely a second-rate power. The war of the Roses had so decimated its people that its population numbered but two millions and three quarters. Such, then, was the political state of Europe at the beginning of the sixteenth century: Charles the Fifth was king of Spain. Francis had just succeeded to the throne of France, and bluff king Harry the Eighth to that of England; and among those youthful princes a rivalry soon sprung up. The wars between Charles and Francis, with short interruptions, lasted over thirty years; the chief event of which was the election of Charles as head of the Holy Roman Empire. Meanwhile, a new movement had begun - that of the Reformation. Power was gradually assumed by the Popes, until the modest title of Bishop of Rome became that of Pope of the Universal Christendom and Vicegerent of God upon earth, who could not only control the actions, but also the beliefs and opinions of men, until in time the Papal power became one of the greatest tyrannies the world had ever groaned under. Among the first causes which led to the Reformation was the sale of "indulgences" by the Monk Tetzal; Martin Luther boldly stood up in condemnation of the outrage against religion occasioned by the conduct of Tetzal. Instead of Pope Leo X. treating Luther's action as a mere local broil, he gave it importance by calling upon Luther to renounce his heresy, and so began those great discussions which eventually ended in the famous Augsburg Confession. The Reformation movement spread far and wide; through the wary and diplomatic course of Maurice of Saxony, the pact of Passau was brought about; and the prestige of Charles of Spain was cast into the shade, never to brighten more; his ambition to become monarch of the universe was crushed for ever. Against the marriage of Mary Tudor with Philip of Spain the people of England and the parliament in vain protested. The aspect of

affairs changed on the accession of Elizabeth, but wretched cruelties were perpetrated in her reign in the name of "religion." Elizabeth desired what is an impossibility - to make all men think and believe alike. While under the domination of the "she-wolf," Catherine de Medici there was a general spilling of blood throughout France. We turn with pleasure to the people of the Netherlands at this period; from their small territory came forth the voice to which we owe the greater part of our religious and political freedom. Charles in vain had said that his subjects must not think for themselves. In vain did he slay and burn; for out of each martyr's blood sprang up twenty followers. Spain has gradually lost all her vast possessions, she is thoroughly insolvent, her army is a rabble, her navy a shadow. But in Holland what a contrast; her progress has been continuous. Her possessions are among the most valuable in the world; her credit is as good as that of England, and her people enjoy enlightened rule and perfect freedom. Spain began to decline from the day she drove out the industrious Jews, and has continued to be governed by an ignorant, bigoted priesthood. While industry and labour are despised by the Spaniards, the Dutch are noted and famed for their perseverance and indomitable industry. What makes a country great is, above all, liberty of conscience granted to all alike.

- Lecture by the Rev. Professor D. W. Marks. Jewish Chronicle.

---

## **NINEVEH: ITS PAST GLORY AND PRESENT DESOLATION.**

### **The Rise and Fall of the Assyrian Empire - Its Record in Sacred and Profane History - Kings of Nineveh - Wars with the Jews - Final Destruction.**

"Now the word of the Lord came unto Jonah, saying, Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it, for their wickedness is come up before me, . . . Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city, of three days' journey."

In this command to the prophet we have the earliest Scriptural reference, in point of date, to the City of Nineveh after the mention of its foundation by Nimrod. Jonah prophesied in the reign of King Jeroboam the Second, King of Israel; and, though the date cannot be exactly set, it was probably between the years 860 B.C. and 700 B.C. when the command was given him to denounce the Assyrian capital, and in its streets to foretell its impending destruction. It was then rapidly reaching the height of its pride and magnificence, and the terror of the prophet, on receiving the command to testify against it, and his flying in the opposite direction to Jaffa, may fairly be interpreted as indicative of the awe and fear with which it was regarded by the Jewish nation. But the command being again repeated, "Jonah arose and went unto Ninevah, and began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried and said, Yet forty days, and Ninevah shall be overthrown." The repentance of the people turned aside the Divine vengeance for the time, and the city was spared. It was to reach a greater height of pride and glory, to extend still wider its dominion, before the river which flowed by its walls should rise and throw them down before the besieging armies; but the day came at last. "The gates of the river shall be opened," cried the prophet Nahum, "and the palaces shall dissolve away." That day came about two centuries after Jonah had called its inhabitants to repentance. The city was taken, sacked, and destroyed; and when the "Ten Thousand" marched by the Tigris on their memorable retreat, two centuries later, the city was empty and void, its walls were crumbling to ruin, and they pointed it out to Xenophon as the ruined city of Mespila. The Assyrian Empire had run its course; the capital had even lost its name.

Of the date of its origin nothing certain has yet been determined, though future discoveries may do something to clear up the darkness in which it is now obscured. Theologians say that it received its name from Asshur, the second son of Shem; while the city was founded by Nimrod, 120 years after the Deluge. It is rather singular that one of the latest, as it is one of the most interesting of the tablets found in Ninevah, given us a remarkably full and graphic account of the flood and the building of the ark.

The record is written in the first person, as if by Noah himself; and agrees in nearly all respects with the Biblical account. That Kings reigned in Assyria twelve centuries before Christ we have the Assyrian records themselves to prove. From these records necessarily fragmentary, and incomplete as they are, a chronological table has been compiled of the various Kings who reigned from about 1250 B.C. to 690 B.C. Among these we have Pul, or Tiglath-Pileser, Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and

Sardanapalus, or Saracus. The last is supposed to be the King who, when the combined armies of the Medes and Babylonians stormed the capital, in 606, made of his palace, his treasures and his wives one great funeral pile. That the Empire was destroyed about that date there is scarcely any doubt; and as two Egyptian tablets of the fifteenth century B.C., it is found that Assyria and Ninevah then existed, it is safe to assume that the Empire lasted at least 900 years. After the sacking of the city by the victorious armies of Media, Ninevah was almost unknown and forgotten; though the largest of the great mounds, in which the palace of Sennacherib was buried, was used by more than one people as the site of a castle, if not a town. Silver coins of Maximus and Trajan have been found here, which were struck on the spot; and the Persians held the place for many years. But in the end all men deserted it; it became an utter desolation; and Nineveh was one of the great cities of Scripture which our early text-books used to tell us had perished from the face of the earth. Even its site became a matter of conjecture.

More than two centuries ago an English traveller, Sir Anthony Shirley, visited the spot. In his book of "Travels in Persia" he writes:

"Niniue (that which God Himself calleth that Great City) hath not one stone standing which may give memorie of the being of a towne. One English mile from it is a place called Mosul, a small thing, rather to be a witness of the other's mightiness and of God's judgment, than of any fashion of magnificence in its self."

Forty years or so ago a countryman of that traveller, who held a place of English Consul at this little town, set about exploring the great mound of Koyunjik, on the opposite bank of the Tigris, believing that he might possibly find there some remains of the once great Assyrian city. His discoveries have identified the name of Layard with Nineveh for all time. He brought the buried city to light, after thirty centuries of the darkness of the grave; and since that time scarcely a year has passed without some addition being made to our knowledge of a nation of which before we had only the scanty records given in sacred history.

Very little was known of the Assyrians till, in pushing their conquests westward, they came in contact with the Jews. Divided, as that nation then was, into the independent Kingdoms of Israel and Judea, no effectual stand could be made against so powerful and united a nation as the Assyrians. Their fame had preceded their arms, because the date at which Jonah was sent preceded that at which Pul is mentioned as having come up against Menahem, King of Israel, who paid tribute of a thousand talents of silver, and secured the support of the monarch "to confirm the Kingdom in his hand." After this, forty or fifty years, came Tiglath-Pileser, in the reign of Pekah, who spoiled the towns of Samaria, and carried off the people captives to Assyria. Afterward he assists Ahaz against Pekah and the King of Syria. Next, we have Shalmaneser exacting tribute of Hosea, King of Israel, who sends secretly to Egypt for assistance, and Shalmaneser discovering this, takes Hosea prisoner and keeps him in confinement. Samaria is again besieged, and after a three years' resistance is taken and the people carried into captivity. It is against this dependence on the King of Egypt for assistance that Isaiah denounces, calling on Israel to depend not on Kings, but on the True God. Up to this time, it was the Kingdom of Israel, or Samaria, which had suffered from the power of the Assyrian Kings, and paid tribute to them. The Kingdom of Judah appears to have escaped, and even to have received assistance in the war against its rival; but after the death of Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, who succeeded him, came up against that Kingdom, probably because tribute had been refused him by its King, Hezekiah. This appears to have been about B-C. 678. It is more than probable that both Israel and Judea had paid tribute to the Assyrian Kings, or at least done homage to them, long anterior to any mention of the fact in Scripture - Judea being the more remote being under the lighter burden. But Sennacherib was a conqueror who pushed his attacks much further than his predecessors, and it was probably the refusal of Hezekiah to pay an increased tribute which provoked him to attack his country. He came up against Judea, and his expedition, recorded with minuteness in the Scriptures, happens to be recorded with similar exactitude by the Assyrian King on the walls of his palace. He took all the fenced towns of Judea, according to the Hebrew chronicles. On the Assyrian palace we have this campaign illustrated in the most spirited style of the native artists. All the operations of a siege are depicted with the utmost minuteness. Battering rams are being employed to make breaches in the walls, from which the besieged are defending themselves with the greatest determination. Some of the defenders are using their bows and arrows, while others throw burning brands on the engines beneath to set fire to them. The besiegers are rolling up machines from which their archers can shoot on the same level as the men on the walls. One part of the town is taken. A procession of captives is seen issuing from the gate. In the foreground the captured are seen impaled on stakes, while the soldiers are bearing off the heads of the slain. The victory was in all cases on the side of the Assyrians, and Hezekiah, to save Jerusalem, sent

messengers to Sennacherib, offering submission and an indemnity. He was ordered to pay 300 talents of silver and 30 of gold.

So exactly do the Assyrian and Hebrew accounts of this expedition agree that, we find this very sum set down in the Assyrian annals as the indemnity which Sennacherib exacted. Beyond this point however, there is nothing written by the Assyrian King. The reason is obvious. After he had subdued Judea he returned to Nineveh; and Hezekiah appears to have sent secretly to Egypt for assistance, as Hosea had done before him. Though nothing is said of this in the Bible, such must be inferred from what followed. Sennacherib, aware of what had been done (he probably had spies at Jerusalem), immediately sent another army under three leaders against Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 17.) In the conference which took place outside the gate between these Captains and the Jewish messengers, Rab-Shaketh says: "Speak ye now to Hezekiah: Thus saith the great King of Assyria, What confidence is this wherein thou trustest? . . . Behold thou trustiest upon the staff of this bruised reed even upon Egypt;" and he speaks with scorn of the dependence that can be placed on Pharaoh. The Jewish messengers beg him to speak in the Syrian language, that the multitude on the wall may not understand him; but the Assyrian scornfully replies that he has been sent to speak to the men upon the wall, and to threaten them with famine and destruction. The terror and grief of Hezekiah when his messengers returned to him is graphically depicted. He seeks the prophet Isaiah, who returns him the answer as set forth in Chap. xix. 20-34. The reference to the "remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah," which "shall yet again take root downward, and bear fruit upward," is a significant indication of the terrible destruction which had been made of the nation in the first campaign. Nevertheless, the Lord will have pity on this remnant, and the "Assyrian shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield, nor cast a bank against it." "And it came to pass that night that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred four score and five thousand." It should be remarked here that, in the language of the East, a plague or pestilence, a destroying wind, or any other great natural destructive agent, is generally spoken of as the angel of the Lord. It is, therefore, quite in accordance with the meaning of the sacred scribe, to interpret this passage as meaning a sudden pestilence, or malarial fever, such as might arise from the marshy and swamp ground near which the Assyrians were encamped. As before stated, nothing of this campaign and its awful termination is recorded on the walls of Sennacherib's buried palace. Naturally, he would not desire to put it on record. He retreated from before Jerusalem, returned to Nineveh, and was afterward assassinated in the temple of his god by his two eldest sons. After the murder, they fled, and Esar-Haddon, his youngest son, ascended the throne. The complete destruction of Israel which Isaiah foretold came upon the nation under this King. He carried off the remnant into Babylon, which he had annexed to Assyria, and the Jews for the time ceased to be a nation. United, they might have withstood the power of the Assyrian Empire, but, divided into the two rival Kingdoms of Judea and Israel, always jealous, and frequently at war with each other, they fell before its consolidated strength.

The destruction of Nineveh was foretold by the prophet Nahum, who prophesied between the years 720 and 698 B.C. When he foretold its fall, it is clear it had attained the height of its pride and power, and was hastening to inevitable decline, steeped in corruption and blood. "Woe to the bloody city, he cries, "it is full of lies and robbery; the prey departeth not." The sculptures which recorded the Assyrian campaigns, no less than the records written on them, show the bloodthirstiness and cruelty of the nation. Captives are depicted, being flayed alive, having their tongues torn out, their brains beaten out with mallets, impaled, their eyes thrust with spears, and other abominable cruelties. One of the inscriptions reads: "Their men, young and old, I (Asshur-nasirpal) took prisoners. Of some I cut off the feet and hands; of others I cut off the noses, ears and lips; of the young men's ears I made a heap; of the old men's heads I built a tower; I exposed their heads as a trophy in front of their city. The male children and the female children I burned in the flames." In the tone of this record there is simply triumph expressed; it does not appear to have occurred to the Royal conqueror that he did anything in committing these revolting cruelties but express the complete and utter triumph which he obtained over his enemies. The Jewish records seem cruel enough sometimes; but of the God of the Hebrews, mercy and loving kindness were attributed. Among the Assyrians the words seem unknown. They themselves found no mercy when the day of their destruction came. In that time when the river rose and the walls of the city were overthrown, the combined Median and Babylonian army entered and utterly spoiled the city. The terror and confusion attending that entry were foretold. "The chariots shall rage in the streets; they shall jostle one another in the broad ways; they shall seem like torches; they shall run like lightnings ... They shall make haste to the wall and the defence shall be prepared... Stand, stand, shall they cry; but none shall look back;... the horseman lifteth up both the bright sword and the glittering spear, and there is a multitude of slain;... there is no end of their corpses; they

stumble upon their corpses ...The fire shall devour thy bars ... She is empty and void and waste.” When Layard drove his tunnels into the mound which covered the gate, the literal fulfilment of the prophecy was seen. Corpses there were none; but the charred remnants of the gateway which the fire had devoured were thrown up at every stroke; and Nineveh is empty and void and waste to this day. The once powerful city has become a place for pools of water, for a habitation of beasts - an utter desolation. - New York Times.

---

## **EMOTIONAL REVIVAL - PREACHING TO CHILDREN.**

WE have a lively recollection of the first time we experienced religion. Something like forty years since there came to a western New York village the Rev. Mr. Burchard, a Presbyterian clergyman; this was in the good old orthodox times, when the clergy preached a material hell of roaring fire, with bubbling, choking sulphur. The occasion now recalled to us was upon a Sabbath evening, in the basement story of the village church. It was before the era of gas or kerosene; the reading-desk was lighted with two tallow dips and the walls illuminated with here and there a tin “sconce,” just sufficient to make the darkness apparent. Mr. Burchard was the most celebrated of the revival preachers of the period, and the period was quite famous in the annals of revival preaching. He was eloquent beyond most men; his voice was soft as the music of the flute; his manner was graceful and charming, and he was as dignified as became one who sincerely thought his mission was to save and redeem lost souls. There was a magic in his sudden transition from flights of impassioned, soul-thrilling eloquence to silence; and from silence he would break forth, in a solo of plaintive music, breathing out in gentlest melody the simple words of some touching Christian hymn. The effect was electrical. His theme, of course, was sinners, sin, and the absolute certainty that, as a punishment for our boyish offences, God would impose upon our immortal souls the penalty of a never-ending eternity of torment. The whole sermon seems now graven upon our memory.

The preacher first described the human body, with all its delicate and intricate interwoven net-work of nerves, fibres, and tissues - its organism of bone, joints and ligaments - its clothing of flesh and cuticle - its arteries, through which coursed the blood - the curious mechanism of the vital organs - and then, extending his little finger toward the burning taper, exclaimed: “To place this finger within this burning flame, and to hold it there for even a moment of time, how terrible the pain! How acute the agony! But, instead of this finger, take the human body; instead of the human body, take the human soul, with its infinite capacity for receiving torment; instead of this weak and trembling flame, liable to expire at a breath of air, conceive a fathomless abyss, a boundless circumference of boiling, bubbling, burning sulphur, fanned to fierceness by the breath of God’s anger, into which the human soul is plunged for infinite ages, for an eternity of time - and oh! my beloved little ones, can you paint the inexpressible torture, can you conceive the limit of eternity! How can I describe to you an endless existence? Just imagine, far away in space, some great, boundless reservoir, into which were poured all the liquids of the universe, all the waters of all the oceans, seas, lakes, and rivers - all the streams, and springs, and dews, and fogs, since creation dawned; fancy these liquids turned to ink, and that upon the brink of this great reservoir will sit the recording angel, who, once in every ten thousand times ten thousand years, shall dip his pen and score a single mark! When the reservoir shall have been all exhausted then eternity will have just begun!” The effect upon a group of children, in the half-darkened room, amid the groans and “amens” of the good old deacons, and the sobs of anxious mothers, with this material hell so vividly described, may well be imagined.

When the invitation came for us to go forward upon the anxious-seat, we were not slow to avail ourself of the first opportunity to “hedge.” How fervently we repented ourself of stolen jam and cheating at marbles; how we resolved to chasten ourself of any future longing for birds’-nesting, or playing hookey from Sunday School, we well remember. The influence remained with us all night, and there was not a more thoroughly converted boy in all the village till the next morning, when the bright sun-light, the playground, and the genial air dissipated the influence of the eloquent preacher, the gloomy room, and the dismal hell that imagination had so vividly portrayed.

How far emotional preaching addressed to the fears of young children may be desirable, it is perhaps not within the province of secular journalism to discuss. When we observe that many of our Protestant clergy lend their presence, their influence, and their personal exertions in aid of the present sensational

endeavour to convert children, or, in the language of the churchmen, "bring them to Jesus," we suppose we must presume that they have well reflected upon the matter, and that this present undertaking is the result of a well-considered and matured judgment. It seems to us so contrary to common sense, and so utterly at variance with reason, that, even under the imputation of a presumptuous difference of opinion with honoured and excellent clergymen, who ought to know so much more about these things than we do, we cannot withhold our expression of dissent. We are the more emboldened to do this because we observe that several leading Christian churches do not lend themselves to this undertaking. We note the absence of the names of several of our most distinguished clergymen who are not generally out of view when good work is to be done. Hence we conclude that even among Christian folk there is an honest difference of opinion as to the effect of emotional revivals brought about by story telling and pretty anecdotes, mixed with enough of suggestive future penalties to affect the minds of young children. We shall not take it kindly, either, to have it said that this matter does not concern us - that it is none of our business. Everything that concerns the welfare of the young people concerns us. Every act touching the education of children concerns the citizen as well as the parent, and unless this business is clearly right and of unquestioned benefit, it should be discouraged. It is the first duty of clergymen to consider the matter in all its relations and bearings to the children and the permanent influence it is likely to exert upon them. The Press will very respectfully listen to their suggestions, and will be governed by them just so far as they are in accordance with reason and common sense. -- S. F. Chronicle.

---

## THE TALMUD.

The world supposes that the Talmud consists of pretty fairy tales, amiable laconics, and moral aphorisms, and that this pabulum forms the basis of the work; and that occasionally and by accident a few general customs, characterised by hair-splitting finesse, crop up to diversify the study and to prevent the sweets from clogging the palate. Tell the world that the Talmud contains the most profound system of logic, and that its jurisprudence, criminal and civil, is unrivalled for its acumen and far-reaching scope; and in return the world will tell you, if that be so, then it is the fault of the Jews alone that such erroneous opinions are held in regard to their cherished book. What has the world heard of the Talmud? The little that has been done in the shape of translation exists in Latin, and occasionally a renegade or a conversion-monger obliges the paying world by giving a few isolated scraps, culled from individual utterances to be found in this vast intellectual magazine, and he has the assurance to call "these cuttings" the dictum of the Talmud.

The truth is, that the Talmud is a comparatively sealed book, even to Jews. - J. J.

Dr. Wentzel, one of the learned Professors at the University of Pesth, in the course of a recent lecture on religious laws, referred to the Talmud, and said that there were few laws of the church so easy to place in harmony with the laws of "the country as were the Jewish laws; that it was a calumny to designate the Talmud as the source whence the Jews derived false doctrines; and that the Talmud was a highly spiritual and infinitely profound work; essentially contributing to the elevation of the mind.

- Jewish Chronicle.

---

## THE JEWISH JUBILEE.

THE subject of the Essay which I propose to read this evening is one of those festivals that were instituted by Moses at the command of the Almighty. But for the somewhat scanty particulars furnished in the law, it is not at all improbable that the Jewish Jubilee would long since have been forgotten, as historians have left little on record concerning it. I am not aware of any allusion in the Bible to its celebration, after its enactment; whereas, we have the observance of other festivals mentioned down to the times of the New Testament.

Throughout the world's history, we have no parallel to the state of affairs under which the law of Moses was given; it was promulgated in a wilderness, while the Israelites were in an apparently lost condition, beset with dangers, encompassed with difficulties, suffering at times almost from famine, and without any cheering hope as to the termination of their wanderings. Imagination can hardly picture the leader of a vast host, while marching through a desert, scarcely understanding where, giving laws

respecting an unknown country – laws which were to be a finality. Yet thus did Moses, journeying through the wilderness for forty years. He gave his people laws concerning their land; the cultivation of the corn, the vine, and the olive; for the regulation of their towns and cities; for the treatment of the stranger that might sojourn with them; laws relating to their everyday walk and conduct; and laws on a most elaborate scale with regard to their obedience to God in observing the numerous religious rites and ceremonies enjoined – all which ordinances were unchangeable. But how could Moses proclaim such laws, at such a time and under such circumstances? We may truly say, only by inspiration; he was instructed by God; his mission was divine. The term Jubilee is derived from the Hebrew word Yobel, and signifies a blowing of trumpets, a redeeming, a restitution. The year of Jubilee was one of the many festivals which, were to be kept by the Jews. Among these was the seventh day, or Sabbath; the beginning of the seventh month, or feast of trumpets; and the seventh year, or Sabbatic year; while the festival of the Jubilee recurred but once in fifty years. Its institution is recorded in Leviticus, chap. xxv. Every seventh year the land was to enjoy its Sabbath; that is, it was to lie fallow; not to be in any way cultivated. It was to enjoy seven Sabbaths in the space of forty-nine years, and then came the Sabbath of Sabbaths, or Jubilee. It commenced with the blowing of the Shophar, or trumpet, by the priest, on the evening of the tenth day of the seventh month, which was the Great Day of Atonement.

The peculiar arrangements of the Jubilee were in some respects similar to those of the Sabbatic year, but in others, they were far more important and remarkable; in neither year was the land to be tilled; the Jews were commanded not to sow, or to reap that which groweth of itself (verse 11); or to gather of the fruit of their undressed vines; that is, the owner of a vineyard, or land on which grew anything of “its own accord,” was not to gather it for his individual profit or benefit (verses 5, 6, 7). This increase could be gathered by any one as his own harvest: it was the common property of all, the rich and the poor: the servant as well as his master, their cattle and even the beasts of the land.

On being forbidden to cultivate the soil in any way, during the seventh Sabbatical year and the Jubilee year, two years in succession, an enquiry would naturally arise in the minds of the Jews, as to the provision made for their sustenance until the following year, when they could reap the produce of what they had sown. The gracious care of the Deity was announced in these words: “Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years. And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat yet of old fruit until the ninth year: until her fruits come in ye shall eat of the old store” (verses 21, 22.) The harvest ripened in the sixth year, which, under ordinary circumstances would have been consumed in the seventh, was to last for three years; not only through the seventh, but through the eighth and ninth; the crop sown in the ninth year coming in at its close to meet the wants of the tenth, thus showing that no difficulty or privation would ensue because the land was allowed to lie fallow for two years. While the care of the stranger, the poor, and the fatherless was enforced, the Israelites were taught that the land was the property of Jehovah, and that His providence, and not the fertility of the soil, was their guarantee for its supplying them with food: thus nourished by His promised bounty, they would learn to devote the spontaneous increase of the earth, willingly and gratefully, to the cause of charity. There is no reason to suppose that the prohibition against agricultural pursuits extended to any other kind of labour, in which different classes might be engaged; although the law does not say anything on the point, the year of Jubilee cannot be looked upon as a year of idleness. During the period that the ground lay fallow, no doubt there were various lawful occupations at which the people could be employed, such as the weaving of cloth for their clothes and their tents, the construction and repair of their dwellings, and many other things as well.

But one of the most important features of the Jubilee was, that every Jew who had sold himself as a hired servant, was now set free. The 39th verse reads, “And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant: but as a hired servant, and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee and shall serve thee, unto the year of Jubilee: and then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.” It was also provided in the law, that no Jew could sell himself for more than six years (Exod. xxi. 2), and further, that when the Jubilee came, he was not to go out in a state of poverty, but was to be liberally “furnished” from the flock, and from the floor, and from the wine-press (Deut. xv. 12-14.) One of the particular provisions of the Jubilee was, that at whatever period of servitude it fell, every man could then claim his liberty, even though he had not served his six years: neither could any sell himself as a slave, but as a hired servant only. The Israelites who had been forced by poverty or any other circumstance to sell or mortgage the inheritance of his fathers, now received it again. The law permitted such inheritance to be redeemed at any time, either by himself or by any of his relatives; its value was decided by the number of years to the Jubilee and the price for which it was sold. No doubt it often occurred that the seller was too poor to buy back his inheritance, his relatives as poor as

himself - no one to act the friend in need – then when the Jubilee came, it came with the most joyful aspect as a redeemer; it redeemed all that had been sold; the land immediately returned to the original owner, and that without purchase. The 23rd verse of the chapter declares “the land shall not be sold for ever; for the land is mine,” saith Jehovah. And in reality it had been sold, in the sense we attach to the expression; it was only the produce which the land brought forth between the sale and the next Jubilee that was sold. The price would therefore vary in proportion to the number of years that intervened; so that by the time the Jubilee came, the purchaser would have received full value for the money advanced. Upon this, the law was very explicit. “And if thou sell ought unto thy neighbour, or buyest ought of thy neighbour’s hand, ye shall not oppress one another: according to the number of years after the Jubilee thou shalt buy of thy neighbour, and according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee. According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it: for according to the number of the years of the fruits doth he sell unto thee. Ye shall not therefore oppress one another; but thou shalt fear thy God, for I am the Lord your God” (verses 14-17).

There were two exceptions to the action of the Jubilee on property. The first concerned houses in walled cities; they could be redeemed at any time within one year, only after the sale; if not redeemed within that period, they became the property of him who bought them, throughout all generations - they did not go out in the Jubilee (verses 29-30). But the dwellings in unwalled villages were considered as fields of the country: they could be redeemed at any time, and if not, they went out in the Jubilee (verse 31).

Why should this distinction be made between walled towns and unwalled towns. The inhabitants of unwalled towns were probably those who had inherited possessions of land from their fathers, were the tillers of the soil, and the owners of the dwellings in which they lived, as they could not lose their land beyond the Jubilee, neither could they lose their dwellings. The houses in the walled towns had no particular relation to the land; they would not be occupied by agriculturists, but by those who were engaged in trade, and by those who were of no settled habitation, just as towns are occupied now; hence the necessity for the operation of the law to extend to the one and not to the other: the houses in unwalled villages were counted as land, and it was the land the Jubilee affected. The other exception to the stipulations of the Jubilee was on the property in the cities belonging to the Levites; it could be redeemed at any time up to the Jubilee (verses 32-33), whereas in the other case of property in the cities, if not redeemed within one year, it was lost for ever. There was a further exception with regard to the land belonging to the Levites; it could not be sold, for it was to be a perpetual possession (verse 34.) Everything sanctified, or set apart, was to be the inheritance of the Levites; anyone could so set apart land unto the Lord, the produce of which was to be the Levites; but if at any time before the Jubilee he who had dedicated it, wished to redeem it, he could do so. The produce of the land was to be valued by the priest, according to a prescribed scale, and the man was to pay to the priest in addition one fifth part of such valuation; his land was then restored to him (chapter xxxvii. 16-19). If the land were not redeemed and the original owner should sell it to another man and thereby make his offering void, such land was not to be redeemed anymore; when the Jubilee came, it went out as a thing holy and devoted unto the Lord, the inheritance of which was to be the Levites for ever (verses 20-21).

Again, if a man set apart land for the Levites, land that he had bought and which did not belong to him as an inheritance, the priest was to value it according to the number of years to the Jubilee, and the offerer was to give such valuation as a holy thing unto the Lord. When the Jubilee came the land returned to its original proprietor as his inheritance (verses 22-24).

There is no account of debts being cancelled at the Jubilee; although it is highly probable that debts connected with the land were cancelled: had it not been so, the Israelite could not have returned to the inheritance of his fathers.

As I have before stated, the year of Jubilee began on the evening of the Great Day of Atonement, Israel’s greatest day, a day peculiarly adapted for its commencement, for while they had been seeking forgiveness from God, it would no doubt remind them of their duty to forgive each other’s trespasses.

We may ask what could have been the motive for the establishment of the Jubilee? It was a check against tyranny, and a safeguard against the selfish desire of the more wealthy to become possessors of the freeholds of their poorer brethren. While it would more or less relieve every family from the effects of constant poverty, brought on possibly by the misfortunes of their forefathers, it would be the means of preventing those who had sold their possessions from emigrating, or leaving the territory of their own tribe, as it was forbidden that any inheritance should “remove” from the tribe it had originally been allotted to (Num. xxxvi. 9). This arrangement would also ensure a better cultivation of the land, and keep the several tribes distinct, as each head of a family would have the strongest inducement to preserve the

evidence of his hereditary descent, that he might present proofs of his claim when the Jubilee returned. This was one of the many attestations of the Divine authority under which Moses acted. Had a legislator of his own will required such a surrender of property every fifty years, would a people in actual possession have given it up, if they had not been fully convinced that his demand rested on the word of God. That the Jews, whose leading characteristic was "rebellion" "or walking contrary" to their Heavenly King, and who were designated by Moses himself as "stiff-necked," should have submitted to laws seemingly inimical to their own interests, is a remarkable illustration of the Divine authority by which they were governed.

From these premises it would appear that the Jubilee restored to the Israelites the position in which God originally placed them with regard to their liberty and their possessions. There was a tendency to fall into covetousness and tyranny on the one hand, and into destitution and misery on the other: upon these evils the Jubilee was designed to put a stop, and to renew from time to time the arrangement instituted by the wisdom and goodness of the Lord.

The principle on which the land returned in the Jubilee to its former proprietors was that it belonged to Jehovah; the Israelites never received it as a possession of their own; it was distributed among them by lot, and God's absolute ownership was thus recognised; it was His therefore to bestow with just consideration towards those who had first received it. Righteous are all His ways. In the same manner the persons of the Israelites were not their own; God was the proprietor of them as well as of the soil; they were His servants whom He had brought out of the land of Egypt, and He held the right to restore to them the freedom which they had at any time forfeited. This then was the procedure of the Almighty - every fifty years he gave back the inheritance of his fathers to the man who had been obliged to mortgage it, and broke the bonds in which any might have been enthralled for a number of years; thus began a new life in their history.

With respect to the estimation in which the Jews held their hereditary possessions, we have a striking incident in the case of Naboth; he refused to satisfy the avarice of King Ahab, saying, "The Lord forbid it me that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee." There is a somewhat similar case in relation to the daughters of Zelophehad, and their claim to the family inheritance on the death of their father.

It must indeed have been a great day of thanksgiving and praise for the chosen nation, when they had seen their sacrifices accepted, and had received forgiveness for their past offences, and with the evening came the glad sound of the Jubilee trumpet to proclaim the year of redemption.

I think I may safely assert that we as a body are anxiously looking for a Jubilee which shall indeed be the restitution of all things. Such an idea was certainly inculcated by Jesus, and believed in by His Apostles. In the fourth chapter of Luke, we have an account of Christ in the Synagogue at Nazareth; the eighteenth and nineteenth verses are quotations from Isaiah Ixi. 1, and read, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." The Saviour in the days of His flesh did preach the Gospel to the poor, the glad tidings of the restoring of all things at the establishment of the Kingdom of God; he did also heal the broken-hearted by raising the dead, curing the blind, the lame, the withered, and those suffering from other afflictions; but what a healing of hearts will there be at His second coming. He was anointed to preach deliverance to the captives, to set at liberty them that are bruised. These words will have a literal fulfilment in the Jubilee He is to inaugurate.

Isaiah, speaking further of this year, says, (chap. xxxiv. 8) "For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion." Also, (chap. Ixiii. 4) "For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come," and (chap. i. 26) "I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning." There are many other passages in the Scriptures alluding to the great day of restitution, the future Jubilee. We read of the venerable Simeon as waiting "for the consolation of Israel"; of the prophetess Anna, as one "that looked for redemption in Jerusalem"; and of the two disciples, when going to Emmaus, saying to Jesus, after His resurrection, that they had trusted it had been He which should have redeemed Israel." We also find that Jesus Himself, in answer to a question put to Him by one of the Twelve, promised them their reward "in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory"; and at the ascension, the Apostles asked Jesus whether He would at that time "restore again the kingdom to Israel." We also read of Joseph of Arimathea, as one who "waited for the kingdom of God." I think that these passages are sufficient to show that our Lord taught, and that His disciples expected a redemption, a restoration, a Jubilee for Israel. Josephus says nothing about the Jubilee, beyond the fact of its institution, and the only mention of it in history, so far as I know, is that it was celebrated down to the time of King Zedekiah. If this statement be correct, how

grandly the declaration of Peter in the temple (Acts iii. 21) follows the prophecy of Ezekiel (chap. xxi. 27). As the kingdom was overturned through that "profane wicked prince," so shall it be restored by Him "whose right it is," at His Jubilee, or "restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began." We may form an idea of the anxious desire with which the Israelites of days gone by would look forward to the Jubilee, recurring but once in fifty years; few could hope to see it more than once: how great would be their happiness on hearing the sound of the trumpet, as it echoed from city to village through the length and breadth of the land. Let the desire of the Israelite of old be our desire, that when the great Jubilee shall come, and the Great Restorer appear in his glory, we may be able to say, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for Him; we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation" -(Isaiah xxv. 9). In conclusion, I cannot do better than read a portion of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, (verses 1 to 11). This, brethren, to my mind, will be the Jubilee restored, Paradise regained.

- GEORGE RIGGOTT.

---

## REMARKS ON BRO. CHARLES REID'S LETTER OF LAST MONTH.

THE spirit of this letter is decidedly Christian, and we should like to see it more widely imitated among the brethren. While our Lamp "holds out to burn" - and at present there is no intimation of its flame "expiring" - we shall endeavour to conduct it in the manner approved of by Bro. Reid in his letters. Suppression and exclusion may serve the purpose of cruel domineering priests, but are quite out of place among the disciples of Christ, whose spirit is not Roman but Berean.

"The fact," writes Bro. Reid, "that difference exists among the brethren proves that there are ideas present foreign to the word; else all would be harmony; how desirable it is, then, that we should have the wisdom and courage to sift out and renounce every such idea." This is true, and well said; and we hope the writer will apply his own rule to the subject which is the occasion of his letter. He says, further on in the letter we are quoting, "The controversy looks a diminutive affair. I adopt neither theory, believing that both contain an element of evil." This is possible: contraries cannot be true. But, what is the "element of evil" on our side? Bro. Reid's answer, so far as can be gathered from the letter before us, is this: "Your theory seeks to supplement the word by the use of unscriptural terms, such as free life." But in what way free life is an unscriptural term Bro. Reid has not attempted to show. All will agree that our lives are either free or bond; that is, we ourselves are either slaves or free men; for when we speak of life we mean living men, not life in the abstract, if such a thing can be. Now the question is very simple and easy of decision. Instead of its being, as Bro Reid intimates, an untaught question, it is a question as distinctly and impressively taught as any question in the Word, and for the very reason that it is a question second to none in vitality. If our brother were like some, ignorant of the text of his Bible, it would be needful for us to quote at length, but his knowledge of the letter will save us that trouble, and make a general reference quite sufficient. We repeat the question, then. Are we the professed disciples of the Christ - free or bond? FREE! will be, doubtless, the unanimous response. Being free from sin, and our life hid with Christ in God, is not our life a free life - free from the penalty to which we were obnoxious previous to our purchase by the blood of Christ? It must be so, otherwise redemption has availed us nothing. Now with respect to freedom and bondage, in this sense, we ask, was there ever a moment when our Redeemer was not free? Was there ever a time when death, the wages of sin, had a claim against the Christ himself? No more emphatic negative could be given to this query than what is apostolically given, namely, that "He did no sin," and further that "IN Him is no sin" To his immediate brethren John wrote, saying, "ye know" this to be true, but now there are some who do not know it, and who affirm the opposite teaching that Christ died for Himself, and that He was a son of Adam!

Besides these conclusive statements of Peter and John, the very essence of redemption itself requires the redeemer to be free from the bondage in which the persons to be redeemed are held. To say that it is God who redeems is nothing to the purpose. God truly redeems - for He only can redeem; but by whom does He accomplish the great work? There is only one answer; God hath redeemed us by Jesus the Christ. To this end He begat Jesus, that He might be a holy seed, undefiled by any sin that was in the world, and yet by His mother be the brother of all mankind. And we reiterate it with all emphasis that no other relationship, no other literal fatherhood could have constituted Jesus free; could have enabled him to give

his life effectually for the sins of the whole world; and we further repeat that no other satisfactory reason than this can be given to show why the Almighty was the Father of Jesus Christ.

Brother Reid further objects to the phrase “constitutional sinner;” not, however, to our use of it. But he will find it perfectly scriptural as regards the descendants of Adam, though unscriptural as regards Christ. For example, the apostle Paul, in Romans v. 19, says, “for as through the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners.” (κστεσταθησαν from κθιστημι, to constitute.) This made them sinners by law or constitution, or constitutional sinners. In like manner the obedience of one constituted many righteous; such are constitutionally righteous. Paul is not here speaking of the nature and quality of human flesh; but of men who were constituted right in the eye of the law of God, who by disobedience were before-time not right in His sight.

Brother Reid strikes home when he asks this question, “Why persist in saying that He died for Himself, when the scriptures are silent on the subject?” But a Greek verb in the middle voice is said to support this view! We reply, first, that if that is all the proposition rests on, it has a very slender foundation. Dr. Thomas used to say, “No doctrine should be built on a single text; if true; it will be sustained by the word in general.” Because Christ obtained eternal redemption for Himself - as He unquestionably did - does that prove Him to have stood in need of redemption from sin and death in the sense other men need it? By no means. The word redeem signifies to deliver, as well as to set free from sin. When Jehovah’s Holy One was dead, lying in the barred vault, who was to redeem or deliver Him? His Father, for He the Child had no strength. His power consisted in His right to life - right of birth and right of obedience - a right unforfeited. We demur entirely to Brother Reid’s supposition that, on our part at any rate, the present question has arisen either out of personalities, or through speculating on Christ apart from His mission. Personalities have nothing to do with our argument and standing in this matter. It is by considering the mission of Christ; the object of that mission; the state of those to be benefited by it; the justice of the Almighty in originating it and carrying it to the mighty issue and ultimate triumph over sin and death; it is, we say, a prayerful study of these things which has placed us in the immovable position we joyfully occupy. God grant that while we try to cultivate the admirable disposition expressed in the letter before us, we may not lose “the wisdom and courage to sift out and renounce” what we find to be opposed to right reason, and derogatory to the righteousness and goodness of the Most High. Amen.

EDITOR.

---

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

### To the Editor of the Christadelphian Lamp.

HALIFAX, April 1st, 1875. - Dear Bro. Turney, - In the Christadelphian Lamp for February, page 123, there is an article headed “The Father and the Son” in the opening part of that article reference is made to Heb. ii. 16, and the writer contends that “God” is the proper antecedent to the pronoun ‘he.’ He says, “Jesus was the result or effect of the Father’s taking hold of the seed of Abraham.”

In the number for March, page 183, there is another article with the same heading, by W. D. Jardine, in which he contends that the proper antecedent to the pronoun ‘he’ is not God but Jesus.

For myself I must say that I cannot endorse either. The verse literally translated runs thus, “For, doubtless, he (or it) takes not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he (or it) does take hold.” So that the taking hold was not something past, but something present. Now what is the proper antecedent to the pronoun ‘he’? I take it to be that which is mentioned in the 14th and 15th verses, viz., death. Death does not take hold of angels, because they are out of its reach, being immortal; but the seed of Abraham, being mortal flesh and blood, are taken hold of by death. This being so, it was needful that Christ, who came to destroy that having the power of death, by means of death, and so set those free who, through fear of death, were their whole life under bondage, should take hold of the seed of Abraham; in order that it might be possible for death to take hold of Him, without which there could be no deliverance.

If this be worthy of notice in the Lamp, use it; if not, refuse it. - Yours, in hope of life eternal,  
A BROTHER.

### REMARKS.

We have looked carefully into this matter, and believe the reading above given to be correct. It will, also, be found to be supported by the construction of the next verse, which construction would appear unintelligible on the supposition that “God” or “Jesus” were the nominative of the verb to “take hold.” For elucidation: the Apostle says, “He does not take hold of angels; but He does take hold the seed of

Abraham.” Then he proceeds, “Hence He was obliged in all things to be made like unto His brethren.” This “hence, He was obliged” shows a necessity for His (Jesus) appearing in human nature; but if the pronoun “he” in the previous verse has “God” or “Jesus” for its nominative, we fail to perceive any force or even sense, in the words He was obliged.” It was just because death seizes or takes hold of the seed of Abraham, and holds (them) fast such is the meaning of the Greek verb - that “He (Jesus) was obliged,” as Paul writes, “Hence, or because of this, He was obliged to be made like unto His brethren.” In other words, the Redeemer must needs assume the nature on which death had seized, and by His own voluntary death in that nature “deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage.” But if the Redeemer had appeared in “bondage” like those he came to deliver, His presence would only have mocked at their calamity. While He certainly did appear in the nature of His enslaved brethren, He did not appear in their chains. Herein was the deep wisdom as well as the love of God made manifest. By His Father He was free from bondage, by His mother He was human.

EDITOR.

**To the Editor of the Christadelphian Lamp.**

Dear Sir, - Can you through the columns of your valuable Magazine answer the following query for a friend of mine who is an Israelite, and with whom the Prophet’s statement is a difficulty.

“Why did Isaiah in prophesying the birth of the Messiah make use of the word hoalmo instead of the word bisulah, and what is meant by the word horo?”

An answer will oblige in your next number. - Yours faithfully, JAMES MARTIN.

**REPLY:** - The passage in Isaiah to which our worthy correspondent’s query refers is found in the 14th verse of the 7th chapter, and reads thus; “Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” The word translated ‘virgin’ in this verse is in the original almah; in a few other places rendered maid. Bethoolah is also translated maid and virgin. The former word is defined to signify a virgin whether marriageable or not, and the latter a marriageable virgin. In truth there is little difference between the two. Bethoolah has been supposed to convey the idea of virginity more perfectly than almah. The noun almah occurs seven times in the Hebrew Scriptures, and according to Vitringa, in five of these it is certainly used for an undeflowered virgin. Both words are, moreover, employed in the conventional sense to signify an unmarried female, just in the same way that we use maid and virgin to express the same condition. We might repeat our friend’s question, and enquire why we sometimes say maid, and at other times virgin, when speaking of unmarried females? What answer can be given but that custom sanctions it, and so we imagine it was with the Prophet when speaking of the birth of the Messiah. To contend as do the Jews that in this passage almah signifies no more than a young woman is to reduce it to an absurdity. Surely a revelation from heaven was not required to inform us that a young woman should conceive and bare a son, for that is an everyday occurrence, and would have been no sign either to Ahaz or the house of Israel. But for a virgin to conceive and bring forth a son was a marvel indeed, and one well calculated to satisfy the most incredulous of the certain fulfilment of that of which it was the sign.

If the word bethoolah were always used when the object was to define the chaste condition of a female with certainty, there would be some force in the objection raised by the Jews to the translation the authorised version gives of Isaiah vii. 14, but such is not the case. To place the matter beyond dispute an explanatory phrase is added after the word bethoolah, and this would be unnecessary if the word itself were as absolute in its signification as contended. In proof of the justice of our remark, let the reader turn to the following passages, namely: Gen. xxiv. 16, and Judg. xxi. 12. It will naturally be asked, then, why were not similar words used by the Prophet in the passage under examination? The answer is that the prophecy itself is abundantly sufficient to prove the point without the addition of any such explanatory phrase; being perfectly clear as to its meaning to any unbiased mind.

The word horo signifies to conceive. In Isaiah vii. 14, it is used adjectively, and means gravid, big with child, from the Hebrew root harah, to protuberate, to swell, be tumid or elevated, to rise in height; signs characteristic of pregnancy.

There is really no difficulty in the passage except to those who obstinately reject the Lord’s Christ.

- S. G. Hayes.

-----

# THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM

## SECOND ARTICLE.

In my former article on this subject, I endeavoured to explain certain passages upon which objections are founded, and which are supposed to teach that the kingdom had an existence in the days of Christ and His Apostles. There still remain a few more texts calling for notice in the same way, which I now take the liberty to bring before the readers of the Lamp.

In Matt. xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, and Luke ix. 27, we have a promise given by Jesus to certain of His disciples. His words, according to Matthew, are, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom." Mark's account has a slight variation as follows, "Till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power;" and Luke's, "Till they see the kingdom of God." With this verbal variety there is substantial agreement to the effect that certain persons to whom Jesus spoke should, before tasting of death, see the Son of man coming in His kingdom. Cobbin says, "Entering upon His reign, and giving earnest of His judgment in the fate of Jerusalem." Brown (on Matt. xvi. 27-28.) says, "For I who am now attended with all mean circumstances and sinless infirmities of human nature, will, in the last day, gloriously appear and judge men to eternal life or death, according as their works shall manifest them righteous or wicked; as the earnest of which some of you present shall, before they die, see me appear gloriously transfigured, and powerfully erecting my gospel church, in the abolition of ceremonial ordinances, and awfully destroying the city, temple, and nation of the Jews, for their obstinacy and unbelief."

"The Son of man coming in His kingdom" is thus interpreted, "Powerfully erecting His gospel church." A solution which should retain the natural and scriptural sense of the words is certainly to be preferred. Observe, then, that verse 27 is admitted to refer to a future personal coming of the Lord to judgment: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works." The parallel passages in Mark and Luke have a similar intimation prefixed to the promise under consideration. It is evident from this that the "coming in His kingdom" can refer to nothing else than the "coming in the glory of His Father."

It is supposed that Jesus promised that certain bystanders should live till this glorious event should actually take place. But this is a mistake. And although He had made such a promise, it could have been fulfilled by translation, that they should not see death; as in the case of Enoch. But Jesus merely promised that they should "SEE the Son of man coming in His kingdom." All three passages concur in this.

One of those bystanders informs us that he was an "EYE WITNESS of the majesty" of Jesus. He says, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known to you THE POWER AND COMING of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of His majesty, for He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from heaven, we heard when we were with Him in the Holy Mount" (2 Pet, i. 16-18). There was something SEEN on the occasion of the transfiguration of Jesus, which Peter calls His majesty," and which he declares was a good ground for his having "made known to them" the power and coming of our Lord.

Now it is very remarkable that, in each of the three Evangelists, the account of the transfiguration immediately follows the promise of Jesus that SOME bystanders should have a sight of Him "coming in His kingdom;" and, moreover, that this took place only a week after. It had not, therefore occurred prior to the promise; and it occurred so shortly after it, as to be placed by all the narrators at the distance of one week from the promise.

According to Scripture usage there are two ways of "SEEING" an event, namely, by witnessing the actual fact take place, and by seeing it in vision by anticipation. We have several instances of the latter, even in relation to the coming of Christ in His Kingdom. Thus Daniel had a sight of this glorious event. "I SAW in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man come with the clouds of heaven.

- - - And there was given to Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and nations and languages should serve him." The whole of this vision is explained to the prophet as having its fulfilment in the future. "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which SHALL arise - - - but the saints of the Most High SHALL take the kingdom," etc. But the future cannot be SEEN in the present as an actual fact; yet by the power of God it can be presented to the vision with as much vividness as if it really existed.

Have we anything corresponding to this in the case of the transfiguration? Yes, it is distinctly called a vision. "As they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of Man be risen again from the dead." Matt. xvii. 9. Mark has it "what things they had

SEEN." The things they had seen were, according to Luke, "his glory," and according to Peter, "his majesty," as demonstrative of his "power and coming." John sums up the whole matter in one verse, "We BEHELD his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (i. 14). Matthew's description of the glory of Jesus, as thus manifested, is, "His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light." Jesus, therefore, was SEEN as He shall be when He really appears to establish His kingdom, in "his glorious body."

But this is not all. Luke informs us that "there talked with Him two men, which were Moses and Elias; who appeared in glory, and spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." Moses died, and was buried; Elijah "went up by a whirlwind into heaven." These two glorified men may, therefore, be regarded as representing the resurrected saints, and those who shall be alive when the Lord descends from heaven. The question as to whether Moses and Elijah were actually present in person, or whether they were only present in vision, does not materially affect the purpose for which the representation was given. That purpose seems to have been to shew that the faithful shall, in the kingdom, share the glory of Christ. Speaking of himself and the faithful, Paul says, "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Know this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. xv. 49-50). And John, "We know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is," "He shall change their vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body."

It has been suggested, and with some shew of reason, that the three disciples themselves represented another element of the kingdom, namely, the nations of men in the fleshly nature, who shall form the subjects of the Christ and His saints. With this additional element in the representation we have a miniature view of the kingdom of God, in several of its main elements, embracing rulers and ruled. The idea that the church is the kingdom has, therefore, no foundation upon any reasonable view of the transfiguration, and the promise which preceded it. The glorified saints have no place in the church; for, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah, and possibly Moses, they are sleeping in the dust, or living in the flesh. And even those privileged individuals are as yet unperfected, being among those of whom the Apostle says, "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided (or foreseen) some better thing for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect."

Then the Apostles, though they exercised a certain degree of authority in the church, were, like all their fellow disciples, simply HEIRS of the kingdom." They suffered persecution, even unto death, and knew by experience what they told the churches, "That through much tribulation they must enter the kingdom." Paul reproved the Corinthians for their party zeal, and their partiality for certain men; and ironically taunted them with imagining they had already passed through the tribulation and become possessors of the kingdom. He says (1 Cor. iv. 6-9), "And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes; that ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another. For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it? Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us; and I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you. For I think that God hath set forth us the Apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels and to men." The Apostle here not only ridicules the idea of their then reigning but he recognises their reigning on the earth, and further expresses his strong desire for it, so that he might reign also.

It is confirmatory of the view we have taken of the transfiguration, that Peter tells us that we have thus the prophetic word more confirmed. In connection with this it is worthy of notice that in all three accounts of the transfiguration it is preceded by the confession of the Apostles of the Messiahship of Jesus, and His first intimation to them that He should be crucified. Christ crucified was to the Jews a stumbling block; and it was both necessary and desirable that the Apostles should have some sustaining influence in the adverse times which were awaiting them. And was not the promise of a SIGHT of His glory, with so ample a fulfilment of it so shortly afterwards, well fitted to afford such support? They might not hope to be privileged to escape death, as was Elijah; but, even should they suffer to the death, they had the case of Moses to give them hope of being partakers of the glory that should be revealed. As Jesus taught them in close connection with the promise we are considering, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me. For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall find it." To be assured of the coming glory was a strong motive to steadfastness.

There is another class of passages, which are supposed to teach a present existence of the kingdom. One of these is, Luke xvi. 16, "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of

God is preached, and every man presseth into it.” But if this be held to prove anything as to the setting up of the kingdom, it proves too much; for it would prove that it was set up by John the Baptist, who preached several years before Jesus. But if Jesus meant to teach here that the kingdom was set up, why did He simply say it was “preached”? But then He said, “Every man presseth INTO it.” But it is to be kept in mind that “into” might as well be “unto,” or “towards.” Even the Roman Catholic version makes it “towards” - “every one useth violence towards it.” If we retain part of the common version we may perhaps be near the exact truth, “Every one presseth towards it.” And where is there here any necessity for construing it as a present kingdom? John and Jesus both preached a coming kingdom, and all men pressed towards it. How? By believing the glad tidings of its approach, and rendering obedience to Jesus, its Anointed King, as their Lord and Master.

We have a parallel passage in Matt. xi. 12: “From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.” The Scribes and Pharisees were opposed to the preaching of John and Jesus, and also to such as believed it. It required both courage and zeal on the part of such as were determined to become the followers of Jesus, and inherit with him the kingdom when the time should come. The previous verse throws light on this point of futurity - “Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.” That is, John as a prophet endowed with the Holy Spirit, is not surpassed by any of the prophets of past times; yet he is but mortal flesh and blood. But he that is least in the kingdom of heaven (when it shall be established) is greater than John is now. If the disciples of Jesus were then in the kingdom, it certainly could not be said they were at that time greater than John. A kindred passage is found in Matt. xxi. 31-32: “The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe Him.” This was spoken to “the chief priests and elders of the people” (verse 23), and is the practical application of the parable of the father and his two sons. “He came to the first and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. He said, I will not; but afterward he repented and went. And he came to the second and said likewise. And he said, I go, sir; and went not. Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him the first.” That is, the one that actually did his father’s bidding, apart from mere professions. Jesus taught His disciples, “The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say and do not.” Their self-righteous spirit rendered it more difficult for them to comply with the conditions of believing and obeying the gospel, than persons who made no pretension to peculiar sanctity or good character. So the publicans and harlots were said by Jesus to “go before them into the kingdom of God,” or as it might very well be rendered, “they go in advance of you towards or unto the kingdom.”

This leads us naturally to notice another passage of the same class, Matt. xxiii, 13: “Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.” These were the ruling and influential classes, as we would say, both in church and state. Besides the influence of their example in refusing to acknowledge Jesus and His gospel, they had passed a law” that if any man did confess that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.” John ix. 22. Nevertheless, there were many among this class who secretly believed on Him, of whom, probably, Nicodemus was a specimen. John says (xii. 42), “Among the chief rulers also many believed on Him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess Him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue.” When the officers returned without having apprehended Jesus, saying, “Never man spake like this man,” the Pharisees said, “Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed. Nicodemus saith unto them (he that came to Jesus by night, being one of them), Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth? They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.” Thus they tried to “shut up the kingdom of heaven against men by refusing to press towards it themselves, and using all their influence to prevent others from doing so. It only remains to be noted here that the phrase “go in” in this verse is, in the Greek, a compound word, the part rendered “in” being more properly, into, unto, or towards, as in the other passages quoted.

The future establishment of the kingdom in contradistinction to any supposed present existence of it, is well brought out by Jesus in commending the faith of the Gentile centurion, whose son was sick of the palsy. Jesus said, “Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And, I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth” (Matt. viii. 10-12). This weeping and gnashing of teeth evidently

points to some epoch of judgment, when the classes referred to shall be manifested and receive their due awards. So also Luke xiii. 24-29. Of similar import is another text bearing on the same point, Matt. xxi. 43, "Therefore, I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." The parties addressed were "the chief priests and elders of the people" (verse 23), otherwise termed, the chief priests and Pharisees (verse 45). As was admitted in former article, they were the nominal possessors of the kingdom of God, in so far as that kingdom could be said to have any existence; for they were merely permitted to exercise a certain degree of administrative authority by the favour of the Human Emperor, under his viceroy Herod. At an almost infinite distance, they were the representatives of such men as Moses and Aaron, Joshua, Samuel, and David. But the kingdom of God was to be re-established under a new constitution, in virtue of which it should, according to Divine prediction by the prophet Daniel (ii. 44), "not be left to other people." This is to be secured by its being given to the Christ and His immortalized saints, "a royal priesthood, an holy nation." The fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 72) witnessed the departure of the last vestige of even that nominal authority which was exercised when Jesus uttered the prediction we are speaking of. And if anyone should think that the Jews in their scattered condition since that time have had, in any measure, the law of Moses enforced among them as a rule of life, through their priests and rabbis; even this shall be taken from them at the advent of "Him whose right it is to reign."

It is worthy of notice that it is in the then future that the kingdom is to be given to "a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." It is the future that is employed in both parts of the prediction; "shall be taken from you," and "shall be given to a nation," is the full rendering of the Greek, though, in the latter clause, not necessary to be expressed in English, seeing that the previous clause makes it intelligible enough.

On various occasions our Lord clearly pointed out the futurity of the kingdom in His ordinary teaching.

Thus, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, YE SHALL in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 20). The disciples, thus addressed, could not have been in the kingdom. Again, "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me IN THAT DAY, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, etc." Here again it is a future thing, and evidently at an epoch of judgment. Again, a young man said to Jesus, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Jesus said to him, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shall have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me." When the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions. Then said Jesus to His disciples, "Verily, I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of God." When His disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, "Who; then, can be saved?" Then answered Peter, and said unto Him, "Behold, WE HAVE FORSAKEN ALL AND FOLLOWED THEE, what shall we have, therefore?" Observe, Jesus spoke of the kingdom of God as the reward of following Him; and Peter, in view of this, put the question. And what is the reply of Jesus, "Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Here, then, is the kingdom of God placed in the future at the time when the Messiah "shall sit in the throne of His glory;" for this, as He himself tells us, is at His second appearing, "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, THEN shall He sit upon the throne of His glory" (Matt. Xxv. 31).

We have an interesting illustration of the way in which the present tense is employed in speaking of the kingdom, when it is certain that the future is meant. In Matt. xviii. 1, we are told "the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Our orthodox friends would conclude from the present tense here that the kingdom was then in existence, and of course that the disciples were in it. But the answer of Jesus forbids such a conclusion. "Except ye be converted and become as little children, YE SHALL NOT ENTER INTO the kingdom of heaven." Now they certainly were converted, but they may not have quite become as little children, which is a more lengthened process, at least with most persons; and the present tense of their question must be understood as referring to the coming kingdom when it should be established. And so in the next verse, where Jesus adds, "Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is (shall be) greatest in the kingdom of heaven." In the 17th verse of this chapter He gives the company of His disciples their right name, and by which they are known all through the subsequent history, down to the Revelation - the CHURCH. If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." This is a distinction I referred to before, but it is interesting to find it made by the Lord Himself in such close connection with those questions of His disciples about the kingdom.

Another passage which calls for notice is Matt. xii. 28. "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." The parallel passage in Luke reads – "Come UPON you," which is a more literal rendering, the Greek word being *epi*. It will be at once seen that this is very far from affirming that the kingdom had actually come. "Come upon you" is a qualified statement, being limited in some way to the persons addressed, who were the witnesses of the miracles referred to in the text.

In order to see the true import of our Lord's words here, we must observe the circumstances in which they were spoken. He had cast out a demon, blind and dumb, and the possessed both spake and saw. "And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David" – that is, the Messiah. "But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils." Who does not see that in these circumstances the words of Jesus were an indirect assertion of His Messiahship? He was engaged in preaching a coming kingdom – "The kingdom of God is at hand," and His miracles, if real, were a proof of the truth of His preaching. Hence the kingdom of God had come upon them as an impending reality, proclaimed by Him who had been anointed as its Divinely selected King. This conclusion rests on his successful refutation of the accusation of the Pharisees: "If Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself; how shall, then, his kingdom stand. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. BUT if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come upon you."

It is very evident from the whole gospel history, that those who received Jesus as the Christ during His own ministry, did so rather from indirect testimony, than from any direct claims put forth either by Jesus Himself or by His Apostles. In the circumstances above narrated, therefore, there can be no doubt that His claim of performing His miracles by the Spirit, and alleging this as a proof of His preaching being true, would be accepted by the honest-hearted as sufficient evidence of His being "the Son of God, the King of Israel."

There is nothing, therefore, in such passages as this to shew that the kingdom had any existence in the days of Jesus' preaching. He preached a coming kingdom to the close of His ministry, and we find no distinct intimation that as a matter of fact it had come or been set up. It is rather singular as shewing the absence of Scripture testimony on so important a point, that the advocates of a presently existing kingdom are not at all agreed as to the precise time when it came into existence. We have seen that many hold that it began during the personal ministry of Jesus. But there are others who hold that it was not till after Jesus had left the earth, and ascended to heaven, that His kingdom was set up, namely, on the day of Pentecost. But there is just as little evidence for this theory as for the other.

In addition to what I advanced in former article on this later portion of New Testament history, I would notice here that Jesus distinctly told His disciples what should take place on Pentecost; but we find that the coming of the kingdom is never mentioned. He told them He should leave them and go to His Father, and that He would come again. That He would pray the Father, and that the Father should send them another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth; and that they, thus endowed, should be witnesses for Him to the ends of the earth; that is, in making known "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." For he had previously told them that "this gospel of the kingdom should be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." He told them it should be preached, but was silent as to the time of its being established. But He did this in very peculiar circumstances. After His resurrection He had several interviews with His disciples. Luke informs us (Acts i. 3) that, He was "seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." At what was probably the last of those interviews, they asked Him a very remarkable question regarding the kingdom, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Observe, they expressed no doubts as to the nature of the kingdom. For several years they had been engaged in preaching the kingdom, having been chosen for this mission by Himself; and it is thus, beyond doubt, that they knew the nature of the kingdom. Then they had the benefit of His teaching during those forty days after His resurrection. But one point they had not been sent to preach, namely, the time when the kingdom should be set up. And this they now wished to know by putting the question just quoted. They were, however, doomed to disappointment; they were to be kept in the same state of ignorance on the point of time as before, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me," etc. There is a marked distinction here between the mission of the Apostles and the time of the restoration of the kingdom. It is not for you to know the times. But ye shall receive power." As if He had said, The kingdom may be restored to Israel sooner or later, as the Father may determine; but, in the meantime, ye shall receive power. It is clear from this, and from the force of the adversative "BUT," that the restoration of the kingdom, and the reception of power by the Apostles, are two things entirely distinct from each other.

This is also seen in the promise of the Spirit being really fixed to a brief space, in this very passage (verse 5), "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost NOT MANY DAYS HENCE."

We have seen that our Lord, when He spoke of going away, and sending the Spirit, said He would come again. And here it is important to note that, as if anticipating the idea now so common that the kingdom should come during His absence, He spoke one of His parables to teach the very opposite. We read in Luke xix. 11, "He spake a parable because He was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said, therefore, 'A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom AND TO RETURN. And he called his ten servants, and delivered unto them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.'" "And it came to pass, that, when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading," etc. It is at once evident here that the nobleman exercises no kingly authority till his return. His authority over his servants is exercised in virtue of his relation to them as their master, before he goes away to receive a kingdom. And it is only when he returns that he shares with them his kingdom, by making them rulers over the cities of it. This is amply corroborated by the usage by which the parable is derived. Hartwell Horne says, "Our Lord here alludes to the case which no long time before had actually occurred in Judea. Those who had pretensions to the Jewish throne travelled to Rome to have it confirmed to them. This was done by Herod the Great and by Archelaus. In the case of the latter the Jews sent an embassy to oppose his appointment (verse 14). On his return he inflicted severe punishments on those who opposed him (verse 27). Kitto says, "We are not to understand that he went to receive a kingdom in a different kingdom, but to be confirmed in the royal power over that country in which he lived." It is thus to his second advent we must look for the appearing of the kingdom.

The Apostle Paul refers to this event in such a way as to put it beyond a doubt that it is to the real personal appearing of Jesus, and not to any so-called spiritual coming, that the setting up of His kingdom is related. In writing to Timothy, he says, "I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom." And a few verses further on, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give at that day, and not to me only, but unto all them, also, that love His appearing" (2 Tim. iv. 1-8). Here, in plain language, we have the re-appearing of the Messiah, in connection with His kingdom, and the bestowal of a crown upon the faithful, in exact correspondence with the main points taught in the parable of the pounds. The Apostle Peter also places the actual entrance of the faithful into the future, "If ye do these things (adding to faith, virtue, etc.) ye shall never fall, for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

From a full consideration of what has been advanced in this and former articles, I submit that the gospel of the kingdom relates to a visible, glorious re-establishment of that Theocracy which existed in the nation of Israel in the days of old. Jesus, although the Anointed of Jehovah for that kingdom, is as yet, even in His present exalted position, only "HEIR of all things," "from henceforth expecting till all His enemies are made His footstool." His disciples are "joint-heirs with Him," and are waiting, looking for, and loving His appearing as the goal of their hopes, and the time of their reward, as sharers in the throne and kingdom of their Lord.

For maintaining His claim to that kingdom He was put to death. Pilate asked Him, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" He replied in Hebrew form of strong affirmation, "Thou hast said." He had been previously adjured by the high-priest of the Jews to tell him whether He was the Christ or not. Another form of the same question, and His reply was the same. With an important addition, however, pointing to His coming in the clouds of heaven (in the language of Daniel's vision), as the time when His Messiahship should be demonstrated.

His claim before Pilate is termed by Paul, "a good confession," and if the popular belief be correct, we might well ask, How or where has its goodness, or even its truth, been shewn? The Jews have received no advantage as yet from having such a king, and if He come not to gather the dispersed of Israel and turn away ungodliness from them as a nation, the cause for which the Son of God was put to death shall prove to have been a grand mistake, and the plain word of God found to be of none effect. But the "gifts and calling of God are without repentance," "Like as I have brought all this great evil upon this people, so will I bring upon them all the good I have promised them." It is the rule laid down by God Himself as to His dealings with Israel.

Even His cross is a standing witness to His crown. Pilate wrote and placed upon it over His head, "THIS IS JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS."

But the truth concerning His royalty has been lost sight of in the fact of His sacrifice. But God has connected both in the scheme of redemption, and has made the cross itself to speak forth the truth. The

gospel is glad tidings to Israel as a nation, and to all the nations of the earth, as well as to a world of sinners; and finds its comprehensive summary in the confession of the Apostles, intelligently made, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God; thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel."

Edinburgh. J. CAMERON.

-----

The garden of Science is strewn with many bright and beautiful flowers; they all display the wonder-working hand of Deity.

## QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

**Question:** - "Could mortality, after the fall, rise to immortality apart from a sacrifice? If not, Christ being mortal, must He not die for Himself as well as for us." F. W.

**Answer:** - There is no text in scripture which says Christ died for Himself; but there is one which says "He was cut off, but not for Himself." If you mean sinful by the word mortal, Christ was not mortal. If you mean perishable or corruptible, man was so before the fall.

Your question begs the conclusion, and is, therefore, wrongly put. Once more we say that mortality means deathful on account of sin. It is always so used in scripture; Christ did not die in consequence of sin in His own person, but as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. There is a sense in which Christ died for Himself, if you will have it so. As a matter of fact He could not complete His work without dying; therefore, had He not died He could not have enjoyed the glory to follow; but a child may see the difference between this and dying to redeem Himself from the inherited effects of sin, which is not only untaught in the Word, but absurd in itself. No son of Adam can redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him.

**Question:** - "Manifestly the question or thought of substitution does not occur in Gal. iii. 13. If so, our blessed Lord could have said, "I am free, I never came under the law, therefore, I am able to bear the curse for the lawless." Instead of that it was necessary that our Lord should get under the curse that He might bear it away. - H. V.

**Answer:-** Our correspondent does not apprehend the sense in which we use the word free in relation to Christ. We do not mean free as if Christ were under no law whatever. He was born under the law of Moses; but He was not born under its curse. The curse came upon Him innocently when His enemies suspended Him on the tree. Having borne the curse without deserving it, He can, on specified conditions, remove the weight of that curse from those on whom it justly fell; or, in the Apostle's language, redeem them from the curse of the law. It was His freedom maintained through the necessary trial that gave Him His redemptive power. The price was precious because it was free; unsold to sin; unclaimable by death. Christ is, therefore, by right of purchase, at the expense of His own life, Lord both of the dead and the living. Subject to justice. He can do with them whatsoever He pleases: He can raise and quicken whom He will, or He can make all their memory to perish. His Father has, for the above reasons, given all things into His hand; so that the Father now judgeth no man, having committed all judgment unto the Son.

-----

## CHILDREN'S COLUMNS. OBEDIENCE TO PARENTS.

The Apostle Paul, among the many injunctions that he gave respecting our conduct one towards another, wrote, "Children, obey your parents in all things; for this is well pleasing unto the Lord." It is for your happiness, my dear young friends, to take heed to this divine command.

A little anecdote, which is the more pleasing because it is true, will best enforce the lesson I wish to impress upon you.

Several boys were playing ball. In the midst of their sport, dark clouds gathered over their heads, and the rain began to fall. Freddie stopped and said, "I must go home; mother told me I must not be out in the

rain." "Your mother! Nonsense! The rain will not hurt you, anymore than it will us," exclaimed two or three voices at once.

Freddie turned upon them with a look of pity, and the courage of a hero, and replied, "I will not disobey my mother for any of you."

It required some courage to face the boys to whom this remark was made but it was promptly and bravely done. Freddie did not stop to consider whether he should be laughed at; he knew that he was right, and that was the governing thought in his mind.

Few children stop to recall the reasons why they should obey their mother - they have faint ideas of a mother's love; they forget the care and kindness they have received at her hands. He who commanded "Honour thy father and mother" knew well the human heart, and gave that commandment to be remembered and obeyed.

## HOSANNA.

A very long time ago in the old world, the world of the prophets and patriarchs, stood a beautiful city, in which a grand feast was held every year, and strangers came from all parts of the country to attend it.

One year, as people were pressing onwards to the old place, there was a stir, a whispering among them. "A king," they cried "is in the midst of us!"

I do not know how they found out he was a king. He was riding humbly on an ass; but you may be certain there was an expression of quiet majesty on his face. As he looked at the city before him, and the crowd around him, his countenance was grave with pity and sorrow; and yet his face was all bright with love, and meekness and benevolence.

Many of the people had never seen him before, but they had heard of his fame - they had heard what wonderful works He had done. Some of them took off their outer garments, and spread them out on the ground for the king to pass over. This was a manner of showing reverence and respect very common in the East at that time.

Children plucked branches of palm trees, and strewed them in the way. It was a beautiful sight. They waved palm branches in the air, and raised their young voices in grateful song. It was very pleasant to hear them singing, as they went along, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Oh, children, a lovely and delightful thing it is to be thankful. Only try and bless God for your everyday mercies. The spirit of discontent and discomfort cannot live in such an atmosphere, and the good scattered so abundantly on your pathway will fill your hearts with wonderful happiness when you take it as a gift from God.

Our little readers will have no difficulty in making out the city, the people, the feast and the king; but perhaps some of them may not know the meaning of Hosanna. It signifies, save, we, beseech thee, and was a form of blessing, or wishing well to a person, in use among the Jews.

Partly selected from the "Quiver."

---

## INTELLIGENCE.

**ABERGAVENTNY.** - Dear Bro. Turney, - I have had in my mind to write you for some time past, but have been so worried and over-worked by the illness of two of my clerks that I could not until now settle down to it. First of all, let me say with what interest we look for the appearance of the Lamp each month. We are so isolated here that but for it and the Old Sun Dial we should know but little of what is taking place amongst the brethren. Bro. Schofield, of the Mumbles, called and broke bread with us a fortnight ago, and we were much cheered by his unexpected visit. We are well acquainted, as he used to be in our service here (the L. and N. W. Co.). I have been distributing some of your Lectures, the "Old Sun Dial," and "Bible Echo," on Sundays, amongst my neighbours; and one or two seem interested, while others are, as usual, dreadfully alarmed at the "awful doctrines" enunciated. On my first round, some weeks ago, I had only one refusal to take in a tract, on the broad ground that "they had plenty of literature;" and oh! the unchristian and pompous spirit in which this was uttered was a sort of earnest of what might be expected in many places. On my second round I was called into one house, and the views were sympathized with, and I hope I shall be able to (at no distant date) get them to obey the truth, but must not be too sanguine.

One of the Plymouth brethren would have no more, as he would never believe but that as life was eternal punishment would be eternal too." He is an old and bigoted man, and would not be amenable to reason or scripture, and so I have left him for the present. His idea of eternal punishment is, of course, "eternal tormentation." Another, who is a master of the British (alias Dissenting) Schools, could not face me himself, but sent his servant to say "they did not want any more." A fourth, a Scotchman, was desperate in his denunciations of "Antipas" and his lies. He liked people to tell the truth. A fifth, an engine driver, could not get over the Rich Man and Lazarus; if the wicked were to be destroyed and not tormented eternally. I am sticking to him rather closer than he likes, and have invited him to come and see me, but he seems afraid. Another old man called me in, and seemed to have read extensively. He looks with much interest to the arming of Russia, Prussia, and France, and seems to be watching the political horizon closely. So much for my efforts, which I find a sort of relief in writing to you, although I fear I shall rather tire you with so much detail. The "Rev." Hugh Stowell Brown, the noted lecturer, of Liverpool, was invited here by the Baptists a short time ago to lecture on "Latimer's Candle - Is it to be put out?" and seeing in the "Bible Echo" that he had discarded the Pagan doctrine of the "Immortality of the Soul," and been advocating life only through Christ, Mr. Charge and myself consulted together, and the enclosed correspondence passed between us. I am sorry, however, to say that Mr. Brown's moral courage was not sufficient to induce him to even hint at the subject. He was supported on the platform by the "Vicar," and ever so many other "Revs.," and if he had only come out like a man, I can fancy what a glorious confusion there would have been amongst the Clerics. I should certainly, have seconded his views there and then without ceremony. This only shows, I fear, that little is to be expected from converted "Revs.," but perhaps, taking all the circumstances into consideration, I am judging him harshly. If you should be going out for a trip anywhere this coming spring or summer, I cannot express how delighted myself and dear wife should be for you to sojourn here for a few days. We have some splendid mountains to climb and could probably arrange for an address or two, if it would not be taxing you. Trusting you are well, and that, if our Lord delays His coming, you may be spared many years to labour in His vineyard - with Christian greeting, in which my wife joins, I am, dear Brother, yours in the hope of Israel, - WM. BEDDOES.

**ABERGAVENNY**, Jan. 25th, 1875.

My dear Sir, - Seeing that you are about to come to Abergavenny for the purpose of delivering a lecture on "Latimer," and knowing that you have recently been advocating the great truth that the natural immortality of the soul is without scriptural foundation, immortality being only obtainable through Christ at the resurrection by those "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for it," I have thought that on the night following the lecture you would probably (if disengaged) be good enough to give us an address in furtherance of these views which are so essential for a man to believe before he can rightly comprehend the great scheme of salvation as set forth in the Scriptures. Some few of us who hold these truths have thought that a few words from you would carry great weight, and set in motion a spirit of enquiry amongst professing Christians which may, by God's blessing, be productive of an immense amount of good, and assist in bringing them to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. A reply will oblige, so that the necessary arrangements may be made. - I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,  
(Signed), WM. BEDDOES.

The Rev. H. S. Brown, Liverpool.

**LIVERPOOL**, Jan. 27th, 1875.

Dear Sir, - I am sorry to say that I cannot remain in Abergavenny to deliver the address you propose. I must return to Liverpool on the Wednesday morning - Yours faithfully, H. S. BROWN.

Mr. Beddoes - Jan 28th, 1875.

Dear Sir, - I am favoured with yours of yesterday, and much regret you are compelled to return to Liverpool so early. As the question of "Natural Immortality" is of immense importance, the doctrine since its introduction by Plato and Herodotus having been tenaciously held by the Papacy, and not entirely got rid of at the Reformation, if a spirit of enquiry can be set on foot amongst the people of this small town, many may ultimately be brought to the truth, and probably saved from the intrigues of the Romish Harlot, who is striving so tremendously to make proselytes, and Romanize the whole kingdom. The propagation of this great truth will, I feel sure, do more to prevent the total extinction of "Latimer's Candle" than anything I know of; and if you can show this point up in your lecture, or say a few words upon it at the close, I believe by God's blessing your words will have an abundant entrance into the hearts of many who are investigating the subject, but who are weak in the faith, and want building up by the earnest advocacy of a powerful orator, such as I have the pleasure, by experience, of recognizing you to be.

Feeling confident you will do your best for us in this great matter, I remain, dear Sir, yours very sincerely,  
WM. BEDDOES.

[Our absence on the Continent was the cause of the foregoing intelligence not appearing last month. Touching this house-to-house work, we counsel a more general adoption of it among the brethren. It is good policy, and has long been successfully carried out by different parties of professing Christians. With regard to fellowship we would say, - Be convinced that the persons named are 'baptized' believers of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ," then all will be right. Reverend gentlemen will, as a rule, only venture far enough to create attention without the slightest danger to their position. The fuss some of them are making about the soul question is contemptible, because they dare not acknowledge the source whence they found the doctrine. Let them teach the kingdom and the life, renounce their heathen Trinity and their heathen devil, put on Christ by baptism for the hope for which Paul was bound with a chain, pull off their badges, and boldly preach the kingdom of God, and we shall begin to think they mean business. As the matter stands at present, we reject their partial co-operation, and despise their timidity and antagonism. We are much obliged to our brother and sister for their kind invitation, but cannot at present get away. - ED.]

**BIRMINGHAM,** - I have the pleasure to send you the report of our labours during the last month. We have been enabled to make great improvements in our place of meeting for the comfort of the audience, and are satisfied that all has been done in that direction which was needed. The lectures have been as follows: - March 14, "The Saints' Everlasting Rest," Wm. Ellis. March 21, "The Trinity: the Doctrine of Anti-Christ," F. N. Turney. March 28, "Baptism: its value to believers," Henry Turner. April 4, "Paradise: Where is it?" W. Ellis. April 11, "State Churches: the State Church of the future," H. Turney. The audiences have been satisfactory. On Easter Monday we had the pleasure of assisting Mr. Frederick Stanford to put on Christ by immersion, after an intelligent confession of the things concerning the kingdom, and the name of Jesus Christ. His obedience to the truth is encouraging, inasmuch as we believe he has obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which will give him the hope of eternal life. On Easter Tuesday a tea-meeting was held, to which interested friends were invited. Upwards of fifty were present. After tea the meeting was addressed by the presiding Brother (James Flint), Brethren Ellis, H. Flint, Rayer, Trigg, Jennings, and Turner. A profitable evening was spent; anthems were sung between the remarks of the brethren. On Tuesday, April 6th, the usual quarterly business meeting was held, to receive the reports and to pass the accounts. The reports shewed a very good attendance at the table during the late severe winter; and though the Treasurer's Report shewed a deficiency, owing to heavy expenses incurred for improvements, we are in good hopes of soon getting straight. We cheerfully accept the yoke placed upon us, and the burden also; for they are easy and light. We only require the Father's continued blessing in the future, as in the past, and our labours will then be crowned with success. CHARLES JENNINGS.

**LEICESTER.** - It affords me pleasure to again have to report an addition to the family of Jehovah, and to ask you to record the same in the Lamp. On Saturday evening, April 3rd Mrs Eliza Grain, 28, was assisted by us in the putting on by immersion the name which is alone given whereby men can be saved, having made the good confession for which Peter was commended, that Jesus was the Christ the Son of the living God. A tea meeting was arranged for Wednesday in Easter week, which took place accordingly; a goodly number sat down, and a very enjoyable evening was spent, in speaking one to another of the grand prospects in store for such as "by a patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honour and immortality," I rejoice to say that some few others are expected shortly to render the necessary obedience. - CHAS. WEALE.

**MALDON.** - I am thankful to say, on last Sunday morning we baptized Mr. W. Perry, husband of Sister Perry. He has sat under the sound of the gospel for a long time, and has at length been brought to seek refuge in the only saving Name, through father's last visit to Maldon. He now rejoices in the knowledge of sins forgiven, and hope of life everlasting. May we all be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Just One. C. M. HANDLEY.

**NEATH.** - I have much pleasure in informing you that we have another addition to our Ecclesia, Edward Tapper, of Neath Abbey, aged 51, who has been a zealous and much respected member of the Baptists for 26 years, but there not being an English congregation in that place, he has of late met with a sect who call themselves Bible Christians. But Bro. Morgan having placed before him the truth the Bible contains, Bro. Tapper, being wise, accepted the same, and by a diligent search of the scriptures, soon saw he had not the faith of the Bible, which was once for all delivered to the saints, and then laying aside the hidden things of dishonesty, and no longer handling the Word of God deceitfully, became obedient to the word by being immersed into the Christ, on Sunday, March 28th, and is now rejoicing in hope of eternal life. On Sunday last, April 11th, we had a refreshing visit from Bro. Clement, who in the evening delivered a lecture on the

riches of Christ, to an attentive audience. The truth is making progress in this place, and those who do not accept it and become obedient, are not so ready to accept the teaching of the clergy who give for doctrine the commanding of men. - W. J. GREGORY.

**NOTTINGHAM.** - There have been six immersions during the month, names and particulars are as follow: Thomas Copeland, and his wife Elizabeth, both 35 years of age, formerly neutral; their own statement is, that after trying all the various religious bodies, they could not settle down among any of them until they found the truth at the Christadelphian Synagogue, where the first person they happened to hear lecture was Bro. Clement, of Mumbles, whose discourse struck them both so much that they attended regularly from that time onwards, and they now rejoice in having rendered the obedience of faith; Mrs. Elizabeth Handley, aged 42; formerly a Plymouth sister, Mary Priscilla Liggett, aged 17, daughter of Bro. and Sister Liggett; and Ruth Parkes, aged 16, daughter of Bro. and Sister Parkes. There are some other cases still pending, and further additions are shortly expected. A tea-meeting was held on Easter Monday, at which more than a hundred members and friends were present, including Bro. Weale and Bro. Edwin Lester, of Leicester; Bro. Brown, of Birmingham; and Bro. and Sister Henry Turney, of Stourbridge. Bro. Farmer presided on the occasion, and after prayer and singing opened the meeting by reading a portion of Scripture, and making a few appropriate remarks. Bro. Weale, who was first called upon by the chairman, then gave an address, in the course of which he spoke encouragingly of the state of the Ecclesia in Leicester. Bro. Brown, who was the next called upon, followed in the same strain respecting ecclesial affairs in Birmingham. Addresses were also given in succession by Brethren Richmond, Haines, Brierley, and Handley, the prevailing tone of which was hopeful and encouraging, and interspersed with many exhortations to continued watchfulness and perseverance in the good work going on. The proceedings were brought to a close in the usual way, and the brethren dispersed with the feeling that they had not spent an unprofitable evening. Bro. W. Lewin reports that the number of children at present in attendance at the Sunday school, amounts to 58, there having been an increase of six. There is also an Adult class, numbering seven members, and another in course of formation, especially for young men. The staff of teachers is still deficient as to numbers, otherwise the school is quite a success. We hope more volunteers will shortly come forward and assist in the important work of educating the young especially in the implantation of correct religious ideas in their minds. The reading of Essays at the Wednesday evening Bible class has been steadily continued, and judging by the numbers attending there is no diminution of interest in them. The following have been the subjects of the papers read since our last report: "The kingdom of God," Bro. J. Liggett; "Elijah the Tishbite," Bro. Riggott; "The use and abuse of Prayer," Bro. Brierley; "The Prophecies concerning Jesus Christ," Bro. Windle; "Faith and Works," Bro. Pottinger. The Sunday evening Lectures have been well attended. Last Sunday Bro. Turney gave the first of a course of four, on the Revival of Apostolic Christianity, subject, the "Kingdom of God," its nature and establishment. The subjects of the other lectures delivered during the month have been, March 21st, "If going to heaven is not the reward of the righteous, what is?" Bro. Handley; March 28th, "The Hope of Israel for which Paul was bound with a chain," Bro. Glover; April 4th, "The Great Salvation," Bro. Richmond.

**STOURBRIDGE.** - Although unable to report any addition to our number this month, I am glad to say that we are not standing still, "but pressing forward toward the mark for the prize of our high calling." All the world being occupied with the fleeting things of the present, few are found who give heed to the voice of warning and the words of promise, sounded so plainly in the Scriptures of truth. We are still, however sounding forth the "Word of Life," and praying that more may be led to "know the joyful sound." The addresses have been fairly attended; subjects as follows: March 21st, "State Churches," Bro. H. Turney. March 28th, "Address on Ephesians iv. 3," Bro. F. N. Turney. April 4th, "Baptism: its value to believers," Bro. Turner. April 11th, "The Trinity, a relic of Paganism, not the God of Christianity," Bro. F. N. Turney. Thinking it would be conducive to our mutual improvement, we have recommenced our Thursday evening meeting on a new plan. It is now conducted in the same way as the Nottingham meeting, that is, essays by the brethren are read and criticised. The following papers have been read: "Human Responsibility," Bro. Wooton; "A sketch of the Life of Christ," Bro. H. Turney; and "Charity," by Bro. J. Cope. The meetings have been well attended by the brethren and sisters, and several friends have also been present. The plan seems to promise well, and will, I trust, be to the edification and instruction of all. Next month I hope to be able to report further progress. - F. N. TURNEY.

## FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

**MILWAUKEE.** - Brother Hugh Sharp, under date 15th March, writes to the following effect: - I would have transmitted before this the small sum that is due towards the maintenance of the Lamp, but having

had to pass through a severe winter demanding the strictest economy to "make ends meet." I trust this will be a sufficient reason for the delay. To say I approve of all the Lamp contains would hardly be true but I will not find fault with a well-intentioned effort to do its very best to disperse surrounding darkness by the all-potent beams of divine truth. A mistake of this sort is to be excused. It is a very different affair from casting oneself across the stream of light in order to save "my creed." But I do not for a moment think that this autocratic dogmatism is any part of the Lamp's policy; it is not solicitous to preserve "what I have written" at all cost, and in defiance of all honest criticism. The ready admission of the admirable articles by John D. Coffman is a plain proof that the spirit which guides the Lamp is one of willingness to hear as well as to teach. And it may yet transpire that the entire pages of the Lamp shall brightly reflect the Son of God. The Coffman articles deserve a separate publication. The knowledge of the true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, is of much greater value than this rising about a kingdom, or chattering over the mortality of the soul. I mean it ought to take first rank. Ask for the doctrine of the Christ as taught by the Apostles, and you will receive all sorts. With one exception, they all arrive at the following conclusion: Salvation through HUMANITY created by Divine Power for this end. Is this true? No! It is not the import of Jno. D. Coffman's letters. He throws himself right athwart this teaching, and antagonises it by statements which cannot be disproved. Salvation is of Jehovah, paternally manifested to this end. This manifestation is not one of power only, but of sacrificial flesh and blood inherently precious like the oath of the Almighty. The language used of the only begotten Son is unique; it is never employed toward any living soul whether in the garden of Eden or out of it.

[After these remarks Bro. Sharp goes very lengthily into certain matters which we do not feel at liberty to publish. Not that they are damaging to us; indeed, quite to the contrary, as they show up the spirit of malignity, over-bearing, and gross inconsistency - which it has been our duty to unmask. If this letter be true, hypocrisy and ingratitude to benefactors lies heavily at the door. We hear also of Brother Donaldson's labours in the gospel. It is a pity that intelligence is not sent regularly from the different working centres. - ED.]

Bro. S. further says: We - the Americana - did not send our money to support blasphemy; to proclaim the blasphemy that "Christ was a constitutional sinner," which is the language of the Christadelphian; but we contributed freely of our substance in the hope that things would change according to promise, and we have been condemned for lifting our voice against this shameful thing. [We cannot account for the non-delivery of the Lamp - ED.]

**DETROIT, MICHIGAN**, March 9, 1875 - Dear Sir, - You will please find enclosed \$2 50c. which renews my subscription for the present year. I have circulated the Lamp as much as I possibly could among all my friends here, and they think much more of it than they do of the Christadelphian; and I myself am no exception. I like the Lamp for its humble manner, and for the ability it displays in replying to those from whom it differs. I like it because it is a reform, and we have great need of reform. I like it for its moral teaching, which alone is worth the price of subscription. I like it for its boldness in setting forth its views, new or old, irrespective of men or their opinions. I believe it has opened the eyes of many on one essential doctrine, viz., - "The temptation of Adam and Jesus." Although your views are not altogether new to some of us, your article on that question is in itself a masterpiece, and will do much to settle the matter in the minds of all earnest thinking people who have read it or who may read it. But, while I agree with your teaching concerning the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, I differ from you in this respect, that Jesus was under the condemnation passed upon all men, still my eyes are not closed against conviction. It seems so plain to me that it was through His mother Jesus became heir to the throne of His father David. If, therefore, through this descent Jesus inherited all the power and glory of David, is it not fair to conclude that, through the same channel, He should inherit the condemnation of His ancestors? To take a clean thing out of an unclean thing is impossible. The testimony in support of this view is so plain and abundant that I can see no reason for dispute. I admit there is a difficulty in reconciling the admission that Jesus was our sacrifice while He was under the same condemnation, and needed the same redemption for himself. This is a real difficulty against all who contend that Jesus was as much under the curse as other men. This is indeed tantamount to saying that He was the son of Joseph, and wholly related to the flesh. But it must be admitted by all, that He was as much related to God, His Father, as to His mother, which created two contending principles in Him. From His birth He inherited by His mother the curse, and from His Father the spirit of life. God knew that a creation could only result in failure, as did the first. God prepared a body peculiar to Himself, suitable to meet all the requirements of the case; but this you will never be able to see so long as you maintain the possibility of Adam working out a perfect character. This idea is in direct conflict with the Scriptures. 1 Cor. xv. 42-49 shows that the first man, Adam, or the human race, was sown a corruptible, dishonourable, earthy body; a mere creature of the earth, who could

only manifest a character in keeping with his grovelling and earthly nature, and utterly incapable of walking in the perfect law of God. - PETER PATON.

**REMARKS.** - The foregoing is part of Mr. Paton's letter. In the remainder, which will be given next month, he writes on the subject of the gifts of the Spirit in our own day. We thank our correspondent for his flattering mention of the Lamp, and his kindness in introducing it to his friends. It will be observed that there are several points on which Mr. Paton cannot concur with its teaching; these we will state, and briefly reply. First. Jesus inherited through His mother the power and glory of David. Is it not fair to conclude that, through the same channel, He inherited the condemnation of His ancestors? Answer. Jesus did not inherit the right to David's throne through His mother only. The Scripture saith, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of His father David." David's throne was Jehovah's. "Solomon sat upon the throne of the Lord." "I," said Jehovah, "will give it Him (Christ) whose right it is." The primary right of Jesus to David's throne came, as these texts demonstrate, not from Mary, the mother of Jesus, but from God the Father. In looking at Jesus and His claims, we should not overlook this: His origin is not with flesh. Mary was the second cause or medium coupling Jesus to David's throne. A Gentile woman had no claim to it. Now as regards the supposed condemnation of Jesus along with all other men. This idea arises from an insufficient attention to the subject. The condemnation which exists in the world entered by one man. The man is the head of the woman. Posterity were in the loins of the man, not of the woman. The action of a woman alone could not affect the future, for there could be no offspring. The evil must be traced to its source. The penalty which the man transferred to his children was death by fixed law; and no child of his loins, however remote from him, could evade the sentence which through him passed on all, "in whom," that is, in him, all sinned. But a son whose Father was God surely alters the case. If all the children of a rebel are disinherited, are not the children of a free man free? Is not this Christ's own argument and assurance. If Christ shall make you free ye are free indeed. The necessary relation to all sinners came through the mother; the freedom or power of deliverance through God the Father. Hence when men become by adoption the brethren of Jesus, they all call His Father their Father; being no longer bondmen in Adam, but free men in Christ; having put off the old man, and put on the new. Do not testimony and reason here unite to show that Jesus was not included in the common ruin? Secondly "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." These words, of Job have been much abused of late through misunderstanding. To whom is reference made by the words "not one?" Who is the "not one" that cannot produce a clean thing from an unclean? Find the proper answer to this, and the passage is clear, "Not one" among men can produce a clean thing from an unclean. Mary was unclean in a legal sense; "not one" among men, however righteous, could have produced from her a clean thing in this same legal sense: and why? because "not one" existed who was legally clean. But if we turn from man to God, we behold a Deliverer. To meet the requirements of the case, God said, "I will be to Him for a Father, and He shall be TO ME for a Son." The Chaldee translation of the passage agrees with this view. It reads, "Who will produce a clean thing from man, who is polluted with sins, except God who is one." But it is imagined that Mary was defiled in herself; that her nature was unclean, sinful, vile. We shall believe the doctrine of sinful flesh as soon as we see it proved; until then we must deny it. How many times must we affirm that sinful flesh is not found in the Scriptures? Find the text which styles the flesh very bad since the Divine decree that it was "very good," and we will receive it. Our sinful flesh preachers have stultified themselves by the contradictory statement not yet withdrawn that sin did not alter the quality of the flesh. Very well, then; seeing that the quality was pronounced by Him who made it "very good," does it not remain so? Flesh is nowhere said to be unclean of itself; it is legally defiled or undefiled. Those who profess to esteem the utterances of the late Dr. Thomas as conclusive will do well to note this; for he has made them with emphasis. Thirdly. Mr Paton acknowledges that redemption is a real difficulty on the supposition that the Redeemer was Himself in the common condemnation. To overcome this, Mr. Paton proposes to split the difference; to regard Jesus as partly affected by the curse; at the same time possessing the spirit of life, which He received from God, to counterpoise the curse. We wonder our correspondent did not observe the fallacy of this view before he let it pass out of his hand. If Jesus had imbibed poison, so to speak, and was in possession of an antidote, then it were as if He had imbibed no poison at all. If you lay an ounce of gold on one side of the balance, and an ounce on the other side, is not the balance even? No, no. All supposition falls to the ground. It was the Divine fatherhood that constituted Jesus "the Holy Child," "undefiled, and separate from sinners," Fourthly. Mr. Paton affirms, that it was impossible for Adam to work out a perfect character; that God knew man "could only manifest a character in keeping with his grovelling and earthly nature, and is utterly incapable of walking in the perfect law of God." This statement carries its own refutation. For what was the law intended? Was it designed by God to be kept or to be broken? If God knew it to be utterly impossible for man to keep the law, then it was plain that God designed His own law to be broken, and, therefore, set it before

man as a trap and a snare, instead of a guide to righteousness. This is a singular way of showing the goodness of the Creator to the creature. But whether we cite the old or the new Testament, the voice of God is, Obey my law: keep my commandments. If man could not obey God in the days of Moses, how is he to obey Him in the days of Jesus? “Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord; shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father, who is in heaven” (Matt. vii. 21). “I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live” (Deut. xxx. 19). We offer these remarks for the benefit of our correspondent, who, we are glad to read, has “not closed his eyes to conviction.” – Editor.